

**VILLAGE OF RED HOOK
PLANNING BOARD MEETING
September 11, 2025**

Present: Chair Elizabeth Pagano, Member David Markusen-Weiss; Member Steve Zacharzuk & Member Laura Avella

Chair Pagano opened the September 11, 2025 Planning Board Meeting at 6:30 pm.

Chair Pagano asked all to stand for the Pledge of Allegiance.

Agenda Item #1

Marie Welch, L.S. for Thomas LeGrand
St. John Street – Site Plan
Tax Parcel ID: 6272-06-389759
Present: Marie Welch, L.S.

Marie Welch came forward and said this was a site plan for small building on St. John Street and that elevations plans were submitted as requested showing changes to windows and porch. Marie advised that the change has not yet been made to the site plan but she will get that done and submitted. Marie said we have talked about the parking; hedges and plantings in front of building.

Chair Pagano advised that the changes to the elevations were the last thing this Board asked for. All Board members were satisfied with submission and thanked Marie for making the changes.

Marie Welch indicated they are still waiting on Board of Health.

Chair Pagano made a motion to open the public hearing for St. John Street listed under tax parcel ID 6272-06-389759 at 6:33pm. Motion seconded by Member Markusen-Weiss. All in favor. Motion approved.

Chair Pagano announced that no persons were present for the public hearing and confirmed with Secretary Hart that no comments have been received via regular mail or email.

Chair Pagano made a motion to classify the site plan application for St. John Street listed under tax parcel ID 6272-06-389759 as a TYPE II Action requiring no further environmental review. Motion seconded by Member Zacharzuk. All in favor. Motion approved.

Chair Pagano advised that escrow has been replenished.

Chair Pagano made a motion to close the public hearing for St. John Street listed under tax parcel ID 6272-06-389759 at 6:36pm. Motion seconded by Member Zacharzuk. All in favor. Motion approved.

Chair Pagano read aloud said Resolution prepared by Village Planning Board Attorney Victoria Polidoro:

**VILLAGE OF RED HOOK
PLANNING BOARD**

A meeting of the Village of Red Hook Planning Board was convened in public session at the Village Hall, 7467 South Broadway, Red Hook, New York on September 11, 2025. The meeting was called to order by Chair Pagano.

Moved by:

Seconded by:

RESOLUTION TO GRANT CONDITIONAL SITE PLAN APPROVAL

WHEREAS, the applicant, Thomas LeGrand, has submitted an application for site plan approval to build a 2400 sq. ft. 2-story commercial office building with an apartment on a vacant lot located at 3 St. John St., Red Hook NY 12571, Parcel No. 6272-06-389759 (the “Property”), in the General Business (“GB”) Zoning District (the “Project”); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 200-10B(33) of the Zoning Law, business/professional offices are a permitted use in the GB Zoning District; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 200-10C(2) of the Zoning Law, an accessory apartment in a commercial structure is permitted use in the GB Zoning District; and

WHEREAS, the Project is depicted on a site plan set entitled “Site Plan Prepared for Thomas Legrand” prepared by Welch Surveying, dated February 29, 2024, last revised April 11, 2025 and architectural elevations entitled, “Proposed Exterior Elevations” prepared by Cummings Engineering, P.C., dated March 23, 2025, last revised August 20, 2025 (together the “Site Plan Set”); and

WHEREAS, the applicant has submitted a revised Short Environmental Assessment Form (“EAF”) dated February 28, 2024, pursuant to the State Environmental Quality Review Act (“SEQRA”); and

WHEREAS, in accordance with SEQRA, the Planning Board is required to determine the classification of the Project; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to 6 NYCRR § 617.5(c)(9), construction or expansion of a primary nonresidential structure or facility involving less than 4,000 square feet of gross floor area is a Type II action; and

WHEREAS, the Project was referred to the Dutchess County Department of Planning and Development pursuant to Section 239-m of the General Municipal Law, which responded on May 9, 2025, that the Project was a matter of local concern with comments; and

WHEREAS, a duly noticed public hearing was opened May 9, 2024, and closed on September 11, 2025, during which all who wished to speak were heard.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board hereby classifies the Project as a Type II SEQRA action.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Planning Board hereby approves the Site Plan and authorizes the Chair, or her authorized designee, to sign the Site Plan after satisfaction of the following conditions:

Payment of all fees and escrow.

Department of Health approval for the methods of water supply and sewer disposal.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that it shall be a continuing condition of approval that all lighting on the Property shall be downward facing and have a temperature of 3000K or less.

Beth Pagano, Chair	Aye
David Markusen-Weiss	Aye
Lara Avella	Aye
Steven Zacharuk	Aye

Beth Pagano, Planning Board Chairperson

VOICE VOTE Aye- 4 Absent- 0 Nay- 0 Motion Carried

Marie Welch thanked the Board for their patience during this process. Chair Pagano thanked Marie for working with this Board.

Agenda Item #2

Robert Dupont, Architect & Mark Graminski, Engineer

Owner: Hughes Holdings of Dutchess, LLC

Firehouse Lane

Tax Parcel ID: 6272-10-388518

Present: Robert Dupont, Architect, Mark Graminski, Engineer, & Dave Hughes (owner)

Chair Pagano reminded Board that this was the parcel that was previously approved for the art gallery.

Robert Dupont came forward and advised parcel was on Firehouse Lane and in the neighborhood mixed use district and basically right across the street from the Firehouse.

Mr. Dupont said this is currently an empty lot with a 4-foot grade change at the southern edge along Firehouse Lane with good sandy soils; with water main right along southern edge; overhead electric utilities and it is in the sewer district which they fully intend to connect into.

Mr. Dupont said what they are proposing to do is a residential development with 3 building cluster which will be two-family dwelling units, which is a permitted use in this zone, and advised in this zoning there are no setbacks specified for this use but should be consistent with adjacent properties and advised they have ample room for building they are proposing; referring to commercial buildings at Knollwood Commons further northeast which is 18-20 feet off the property line and they are proposing parallel to the property line 20 feet off.

SIDEWALK:

Mr. Dupont said they are proposing a concrete sidewalk going east and west all the way with full pedestrian access to the Village.

ACCESS:

Mr. Dupont said cluster of the buildings is pushed a little but further east and ingress has clear site lines with only one way into the site with two-way traffic. Mr. Dupont showed location of central driveway location.

FOOTPRINT:

Mr. Dupont did mention they have a restriction on the size with a maximum footprint of 2000 square foot and maximum gross square footage of 4000 square feet and two stories are encouraged. Mr. Dupont said these buildings are within that range as footprint of each building is 2000 square foot and gross square footage is a little under 4000 and within height regulations of 35 feet.

DRIVEWAY ACCESS:

Building is a little unique in that it still has two apartments in it but there is an allowance in Zoning that allows for 2 buildings to be joined by what is called a connector and that is what we are doing here. Mr. Dupont showed connector on plans – blue area in center – and are allowed to have 500 sq. foot per floor-2 stories but are only proposing a one story max 500 square foot area. Mr. Dupont said this one part will be used as property maintenance for the owners/ property managers to have storage, utility hub and an unstaffed office.

PARKING

Mr. Dupont said as far as parking with Zoning and multi-family they want 1.5 parking spaces per dwelling unit. 1 & 2 family residential but this is only one and feels that 1 space is not enough as they are proposing 3 bedroom apartments so they are proposing (which includes an internal garage bay on the ground floor) with one space and in addition to that each one has two stall areas on the outside where cars can park. A lot of people have 2 cars and there is a secondary car space and in front of the garage door there is an apron where another car can park. Mr. Dupont said they are well over their parking allowance.

LOT COVERAGE

Mr. Dupont said they are well within the lot coverage in that they are allowed 40% and are a little under 30%.

SIGNAGE

They are not proposing any signage.

LIGHTING

They are proposing two 10 foot light poles. Full cut off LED fixture and can put in a warmer bulb at 3000K if that is what the Board prefers. Chair Pagano said that is the max. Mr. Dupont asked so they cannot do 5000K which is a cooler light. Mr. Dupont said it is not the lumen and just the quality of the light and thinks it's a 55-watt fixture. Mr. Dupont said the lower the number the warmer the light is.

Attorney Polidoro said 3000 is warmer and above that starts to get that cool blue. Chair Pagano said we do not want that cool blue.

Mr. Dupont said we will do warm.

DUMSPYTER ENCLOSURE:

Mr. Dupont showed location = 12 x 18 – fenced in with chain link fence that everyone will share. Mr. Dupont said as far as circulation path there is an area for a garbage truck to come in and retrieve and back up and back out again and well as having a hammerhead to help with deliveries.

LANDSCAPING:

They are proposing modest – evergreen screening on the northern and eastern boundary line at the cemetery which will be green giant arbor-vitae – spaced 5/6 foot on center 10-foot tall / 3-foot diameter and they prefer these due to deer not liking them and they thrive in this climate. Eventually it will be a nice green wall in the back of the property.

Mr. Dupont said per zoning for commercial use properties parking has to be in the back of the building but with these first 2 buildings they have parking to the side of the building, but with single and 2-family that is an exempt requirement for parking regs, but they are still going to plant the arbor-vitae to block from Firehouse Lane. They are trying to create an attractive entrance coming into the site and create privacy.

SEWER:

Attorney Polidoro asked where the connection to the sewer is. Mr. Dupont said Mr. Graminski will go over all that.

FLOOR PLANS:

Mr. Dupont showed detailed floor plans of basement level; first floor level and second story – 2000 feet square footage.

Mr. Dupont said there is a distinction between cellar/basement and he went over with Gary Beck and cellar will not count towards square footage. Chair Pagano said correct. Basement is small for mechanicals and storage.

1st floor: internal garage bay area; pedestrian access; large common living area (14 x 24 feet); kitchen; dining/living room area; switchback staircase going down to the cellar and also to the second floor.

Mr. Dupont said another nice thing about these apartments is they all have an 8x12 covered porch.

2nd floor: 3 bedrooms 2 full bath (one being an ensuite) and to break up the façade a staircase landing.

MATERIALS/COLORS:

Plans show both 1st & 2nd floor and elevations. Mr. Dupont said it's a traditional style on the exterior; white painted board & batten siding; probably a dark shingled roof; windows and accents (like hardware & lighting) will be black and will use natural wood accents to overhead doors and main entrance doors – basically the pallet colors.

Mr. Dupont showed on plans the primary entrance façade where vehicles are and where people will be walking showing entrance door coming in.

Mr. Dupont discussed primary façade facing Firehouse Lane showing primary gable and projection of staircase with one-story porch on the back. Mr. Dupont said on the private side it will be a little simpler form but projection of a one-story porch there as well. Mr. Dupont said the elevations make it look flat but 3 dimensions will be quite dynamic.

PARKING SPACES:

Chair Pagano asked where the second parking place would be for each unit. Mr. Dupont referenced apartment 1 showing interior parking and indicated immediately outside of that there will be blacktop where you can park another vehicle in front of the garage door. Chair Pagano said ok - basically pull one car in garage and the other car is in the driveway. Mr. Dupont said correct, but not ideal because of blocking the car inside so it is more for a visitor to use or for deliveries; so other spot will primarily be the second parking space for whoever is renting the apartment (1-2 for each unit plus interior) – there is an apron in front of the entrance side that is 2 cars wide – 9x18. Chair Pagano said so second parking place is partially in front of the porch. Mr. Dupont said correct.

STORMWATER/SEWER/WATER/UTILITIES:

Mark Graminski, Engineer, came forward (6:53pm)

Mr. Graminski said Rob gave a great overview of the project site and detailed information about buildings and parking and he will get into the site grade and utilities required to service the proposed buildings.

Mr. Graminski stated with the access which is right out of the Fire Code – single access with hammerhead turnaround.

Site grading off Firehouse Lane there is a low point and if you look at each side to the east and to the west there are 2 seepage pits there so it will handle any run-off coming off of Firehouse Lane and the sidewalk. Mr. Graminski said also with the way this road is graded with low & high points it will be able to handle sheet flow from the imperious surface going into 2 seepage pits.

Mr. Graminski said this is multi-family dwellings so as part of stormwater regulations that they have to adhere to and that NYS DEC has certain practices for stormwater management and in this case because it is multi-family it is only if the site disturbance is greater than 1 acre and in this case they under 1 acre and are .9 acres.

Mr. Graminski said keeping in mind that they don't have to necessarily adhere to NYS DEC regulations they are still going to provide a drainage plan and proper management of stormwater at this site.

Mr. Graminski said they also are taking into considerations all the stormwater practices; for example seepage – being a total of 6 on the site and showed low points, with well drained soils typical of the Village, and utilizing storm water vegetation, which will help treat the storm water. Catch basins will be raised up a little bit. Mr. Graminski said seepage pits will be able to handle all the stormwater. Mr. Graminski said in addition to handling the roadway with these 2-family dwellings, they are also considering having it catch all the roof water too.

Mr. Graminski said as you go through to the North – regarding done in such a way to direct any surface run off from the site – creating swales.

WATER/SEWER:

Mr. Graminski said site will be served by central water and central sewer.

Mr. Graminski advised he met and had discussions with the Village water department about servicing and providing water supply to each unit. Mr. Graminski said there is an existing water main line at the western side of Firehouse Lane and their proposal is a water main that will service and have individual water services going to each building.

Attorney Polidoro asked if they will have separate meters. Mr. Graminski said yes – separate meters and nice part is how it will handle sanitary too because this site is in the sewer district.

Mr. Graminski said he had a discussion with Robert Flores (Village Engineer) to discuss and he had worked on another project at property to the west and pulled those plans for sewer and have developed a network to connect into the sewer system which is located in the far north west corner by force main out to Route 9. Mr. Graminski said they can finalize after discussions with this Board.

Attorney Polidoro asked if each unit would have a separate tank. Mr. Graminski said yes – 6 tanks – each until having individual water/individual sanitary.

Mr. Graminski said being familiar with the connection into the Village sewer if any easements are required, they can provide.

Attorney Polidoro asked if connection was in an easement area. Mr. Graminski said yes and it is shown on the plans.

Mr. Graminski asked the Board for questions.

Member Markusen-Weiss asked about site plan and thought process of 3 properties and putting one in the back and not all on the road frontage as per the Village Pattern Book.

Chair Pagano asked why are we doing another cul-de-sac.

Mr. Graminski said it is not a cul-de-sac and a hammerhead.

Mr. Graminski referenced the porches and patios in the back for privacy and from his perspective it was developed for this particular layout for easy access for emergency vehicles and Rob (Mr. Dupont) considered the coverage on this site so what this does is minimizes the hard surface area and utilizing the existing site typography to our advantage to manage storm water and have ease of access to all utilities.

Mr. Dupont said the only thing he could add is for anyone living in one of those apartments he pictured living there he would not want his porch facing Firehouse Lane so by turning the buildings in such a way to make the porches more private and also the footprint of those buildings is 40x50 so they had close to 100 linear feet when building the façade along Firehouse Lane and 3rd unit in the back is also give opportunity for more privacy making a more desirable unit in the back, but primarily was engineering and keeping in spirit of what Zoning was asking for.

Chair Pagano said what you have done is put the side of the building on Firehouse Lane and you put the heat pumps on the street side and is what you will see driving down the street.

Chair Pagano said the best example she has is what is more in line with the pattern book and what they have at Traditions where front of buildings in front and driveway in the back of all the building so everybody accesses parking garages and driveways.

Mr. Dupont said Traditions is a much bigger development and streets are more private, and Firehouse Lane has a lot more traffic on and a different situation.

Chair Pagano said it is a different development with own pocket but you have the condos next with front commercial buildings facing the street and there is a lot of people who can drive right into their garage and just thinks the we created a kind of not cul-de-sac/cul-de-sac instead of the lining of houses on a traditional street.

Attorney Polidoro asked if they looked at the Pattern Book. Mr. Dupont said yes. Attorney Polidoro referenced pg. 28 patterns for townhouses and pg. 29 patterns for 2-3 family and new development.

Mr. Dupont asked if it was mandatory. Chair Pagano said it's a Guide.

Chair Pagano said you do have an entry porch, and she would prefer but not for her to say, per pattern book and in the Village in general everybody's porches are on the front and at least your little entry porch is on the street. Mr. Dupont said they are both on the street, just not facing the street and that was the reason why because that street is busy and across from the Firehouse so they deliberately rotated the buildings that way so the people living there would have a nicer porch experience.

Attorney Polidoro asked how much space is in between sidewalk and road and is there a grass strip. Chair Pagano said 20 feet from the center of the road to the façade of the house. Attorney Polidoro said she was asking because when you have a sidewalk and a grass strip it feels more setback. Chair Pagano said except that you have mechanicals in Firehouse Lane. Chair Pagano said it seems from sidewalk to the setback seems less than 20 feet. Mr. Graminski said from sidewalk to the face of the building is 10 feet. Mr. Dupont said there is a grass strip as well.

Mr. Dupont said if the major objection is the mechanical equipment it does not have to be there and could be brought around (showing location on plans) but fenced in as well.

Chair Pagano said you are building residences which is wonderful and we are thrilled to have more housing. Mr. Hughes said they want it to look nice with nice typography. Mr. Graminski said there is a site consideration to being that it is a one acre lot. Chair Pagano said right 322 feet wide on the street. Mr. Graminski said ok - and how would you access it.

Attorney Polidoro said what if you turn the two in the front. Mr. Dupont said that is the Board's preference. Chair Pagano said it is her preference, but she is only one on the Board.

Member Markusen-Weiss said in looking at it - it definitely feels like a pull-in spot. Mr. Graminski said we are trying to offer privacy. Member Markusen-Weiss said he gets it but his concern is we are not giving this road an opportunity to be front facing residences. Chair Pagano said right because no residences face the road.

Member Markusen-Weiss asked other Board members for comment.

Member Avella said she is not as bothered by it but asked to see the plans of façade again to see what it looks like facing the street.

Mr. Dupont showed façade facing Firehouse. Chair Pagano said but you are not showing the mechanicals. Mr. Dupont said it is dotted in but can add those in. Chair Pagano said for

someone who is visual you want to see what it looks like what someone who is driving down the street is going to see.

Mr. Dupont said the plan was to have a 4-foot white painted fence to screen mechanicals so they were trying to be sensitive to that.

Mr. Dupont said this was modeled more on an urban type house because of how busy that road is and was rotated 90 degrees with porches still exposed but focus not on the street and focus on the greenspace left around the space.

Member Markusen-Weiss said you have 10 feet inclusive of mechanicals and that is just grass. Mr. Dupont said correct but will have plantings next to the paved areas where cars come in. Mr. Dupont said they could add landscaping too screen it. Member Markusen-Weiss said we want to see the façade. Member Avella said she feels the mechanicals should be moved and does not like facing the street.

Member Zacharzuk asked if that would be done with both units. Mr. Dupont said yes and will consistent with all of them.

Chair Pagano had discussions on porches and Member Markusen-Weiss said if that means parking in the front that is not what we want. Mr. Dupont said he agrees with that.

Member Zacharzuk said with parking in the front if you turn to face Firehouse Lane having vehicles pulling into it that goes back to the 50's suburban style. Mr. Dupont said they did not feel having cars parked in the front was preferable. Member Avella said she had concerns if people were to leave their garage doors open it leaves more opportunity to disrupt visual in facing the road.

Member Markusen-Weiss said when you look at typical housing it is housing in the front with parking behind asking if there was an opportunity to rotate those building to have parking behind and switch porches on the side and swap kitchen with porch side but still have porch as private but not on the road. Mr. Dupont said if you rotate 90 degrees now these porches face Firehouse Lane. Member Markusen-Weiss asked if they could be put on the side at adjacent corner. Mr. Dupont said flipping around asking what would that do. Member Markusen-Weiss said if your concerned about porch not facing the road and privacy. Mr. Dupont said the problem is with rotating and bringing porch around to other side it faces ingress to the site and as oriented now they are always facing a private area which is nice.

Mr. Graminski said there was consideration of the people who would be living there.

Mr. Dupont said they thought they were presenting an attractive façade on Firehouse Lane. Member Markusen-Weiss said you and façade is attractive but further closing off that street and treating as the egress it is and not thinking about years from now.

Chair Pagano said it's creating another property that is cut off from Village life.

Mr. Graminski asked how and feels it's almost like a small community. Chair Pagano said it is its own community. Mr. Graminski said it is still walkable through the Village. Mr. Dupont said yes and still a dialog with porches on Firehouse Lane.

Member Markusen-Weiss asked about back unit – middle connector – is that a flat roof. Mr. Dupont said no it will be a gable roof.

Mr. Graminski said they tried to utilize site configuration, site typography and safe access.

Member Zacharzuk said we have to remember where the firehouse is located and where the trucks/cars are actually coming out compared to where the apartments are. Mr. Dupont showed apron and which one was most affected.

Member Markusen-Weiss said with the setback there is probably not room to put all 3 on the street and why it was oriented this way. Mr. Dupont said no what Mark and I described is they deliberately oriented it this way. Member Markusen-Weiss said with 3rd one. Chair Pagano said having everything on Firehouse Lane.

Mr. Graminski spoke on coverage and the time they spent on this and once again trying to be considerate of hard surface areas and still provide saturation and utilizing stormwater.

Chair Pagano said she still feels it's a lot of parking in the front.

Member Markusen-Weiss asked to discuss the plantings. Mr. Dupont said it is on the site plan and shows a line of arbor buddy trees spaced out and starting at 10 feet tall/3 foot diameter and are fairly quick growing being a green hedge so could be a screen by next year for parking, and if people renting only have one car the car will be inside.

Attorney Polidoro said Code states building façade shall be parallel to the street with major roof ridges either parallel or perpendicular to the street and consistent with existing patterns so thinks the obligation would be on you to show that what you propose is more consistent with not being in rows and putting the buildings parallel to the street.

Mr. Dupont said it is parallel to the street. Attorney Polidoro said it is just a façade. Mr. Dupont asked what's the façade and they have 3 facades. Chair Pagano said there are 4 facades.

Mr. Dupont said it does not say the 4th has to be on the street and he gets where you are coming from but that is why they did it that way and they think is a better solution.

Attorney Polidoro asked if the roof pitches match and that the Code says roof pitches have to match. Mr. Dupont said he did not see that but they have 6/12 pitch. Attorney Polidoro said ok.

Member Zacharzuk asked about units on the side and what will actually be there. Mr. Dupont said air source heat pumps. Member Zacharzuk said ok with fans and asked how much noise was going to be generated. Mr. Dupont said air source heat pumps are fairly quiet and much less noisy than a conventional a/c condenser and also will be high efficiency system. Mr. Dupont said there will be gates so they can be serviced.

Chair Pagano feels that they should not be on Firehouse Lane. Mr. Dupont said he hears you and will switch around to that side and not a problem.

Member Markusen-Weiss said you mentioned putting a fence in front of that. Mr. Hughes said a small fence and shrubs around it. Chair Pagano said right now there are no shrubs. Mr. Dupont said just a fence enclosure now but if the Board would prefer them to move it around to here - they can do that and not a problem. Member Markusen Weiss asked should we come to terms with what they have laid out here. Chair Pagano said we do not need to finish tonight. Member Markusen-Weiss agrees that compressors should not be on Firehouse Lane.

Chair Pagano asked about the curly que that goes up the west side of property line (the cloud). Mr. Graminski said it is existing vegetation.

TITLE

Attorney Polidoro asked about possible current connection to the graveyard. Mr. Graminski said Mr. Hughes took care of that with purchase of property. Mr. Hughes advised they didn't even know they had it and gave them a letter taking it off their deed.

Attorney Polidoro asked if they extinguished easements of the property. Mr. Graminski said yes and there is clear title on the property.

Member Zacharzuk asked where that was and felt it should be investigated further because while on the Village Board there were a lot of questions about that road.

Mr. Graminski said they have clear title. Attorney Polidoro said Board will need to get a copy of that.

Member Zacharzuk said he has concerns. Attorney Polidoro said it shows on the subdivision map but doesn't say a road per say. Member Zacharzuk said there is a lot of discussion about it.

SNOW REMOVAL/PARKING

Member Zacharzuk asked about snow removal. Mr. Graminski advised right to seepage pits and with the hammerhead it really works well for that, and all the grading is there. Member Zacharzuk said no push out to Firehouse Lane. Mr. Graminski said no push-out.

Member Zacharzuk asked about over-flow of parking. Mr. Dupont said as demonstrated they have more than enough parking spaces for occupancy. Member Zacharzuk said yes but what happens if they have a party and said Firehouse Lane will be blocked off with no parking due to fire trucks having to exit.

Attorney Polidoro asked if parking was prohibited there. Member Zacharzuk said he did not know and asked Secretary Hart. Secretary Hart said she did not think there was allowed parking on Firehouse Lane.

Attorney Polidoro said they can talk to the Village Board.

Member Markusen-Weiss said no parking on Firehouse Lane with signage. Member Zacharzuk said they will not want parking on either side.

Mr. Dupont said they do not want to create a big parking lot for rare events and seems it is good as it is. Attorney Polidoro said no it's already no parking.

Chair Pagano asked the Board if they were ready to table the application.

Attorney Polidoro asked Board members about referring to County Planning to start comments.

Chair Pagano asked for Board comment. All members agreed ok to send to County Planning.

Chair Pagano advised that escrow in the amount of \$1,500.00 has been collected for Village Planning Board Attorney representation.

Chair Pagano advised that escrow in the amount of \$1,500.00 has been collected for Engineering consultation due to this property being in the new sewer use area.

Chair Pagano made a motion to deem site plan application complete for submission to Dutchess County Department of Planning and Development per 239m review and to Delaware Engineering for sewer review. Motion seconded by Member Markusen-Weiss. All in favor.

Chair Pagano made a motion to table the site plan application for Firehouse Lane listed under Tax Parcel ID 6272-10-388518 to October 9, 2025 AT 6:30pm. Motion seconded by Member Markusen-Weiss. All in favor.

Mr. Graminski asked if this application will require public hearing. Chair Pagano said yes and felt it was easier to schedule at end and we can get you through public hearing in one night rather than scheduling now and having to table every month.

Attorney Polidoro asked if the Board wanted more on landscaping. Chair Pagano said yes and where sewers will be placed. Mr. Graminski said it's all (water & sewer) are shown on the plans.

Mr. Dupont had questions on 239m referral and time frame. Secretary Hart advised County Planning requires 30 days to respond - options were discussed. It was decided that Mr. Dupont

would submit amended plans tomorrow and Mr. Graminski will hand deliver to County Planning with referral.

ELEVATIONS/BUILDING MATERIALS

Attorney Polidoro asked with elevation plans if they have materials. Mr. Dupont advised yes they have that noted. Mr. Dupont indicated painted hardy board. Attorney Polidoro said to indicate that. Chair Pagano asked if they needed to list colors. Attorney Polidoro said this Board can review colors per pattern book but does not know if the County will weigh in on that but told Mr. Dupont the more information you give the better. Mr. Dupont advised it would be painted aluminum either black or white. Mr. Hughes said black on white. Attorney Polidoro advised to add that. Mr. Dupont said ok.

Agenda Item #3

Connor & Liam O'Farrell

31 East Markert Street

Tax Parcel ID: 6272-10-482721

Present: Martin Willms, Engineer, Connor & Liam O'Farrell (owners)

Mr. Willms came forward and advised he was the engineer working with Connor & Liam O'Farrell for their property at 31 East Market Street.

Mr. Willms advised this property is an existing 2-story structure with a small commercial space and residential apartment and that his clients would like to expand this lot by adding 4 one-bedroom apartments and one 2-bedroom apartment for a total of 5 residential apartments and commercial space.

Mr. Willms said the lot is tight and we are working on parking and currently have 6 spots for parking; showed dumpster location and that they will be connecting to municipal water and sewer.

Mr. Willms advised lighting will be downward sky lighting.

Mr. Willms advised there would be one 1 tank serving 6 bedrooms and commercial space. Connor advised they would be moving existing septic tank and enlarging to accommodate proposed use.

Connor showed on plans the main corridor with hallway and laundry in the back and where the apartment split off and advising that the story apartment will have its own separate entrance (being on the side so as to not dump out onto the street).

Chair Pagano asked if that was an easement – the driveway between the two buildings. Liam said yes, it is an existing easement in their title and deeded forever.

Mr. Willms said they wouldn't be increasing their non-conformance in that way but would still be using as the same way but shifting any parking to the back lot.

Attorney Polidoro asked if the right-of-way lets you add more structure. Mr. Willms said he did not see anything that precluded it but will definitely verify.

Chair Pagano said in looking at the property line it goes up and curves so that's their property line. Attorney Polidoro said then you will need to show the driveway going back there. The parking for the neighbor was shown. Attorney Polidoro asked if they have parking here (pointing on plans). Connor indicated on the plans where their parking would be located. The fence for Charlie O's was shown with parking.

Attorney Polidoro said you will have to figure out far your right of way extends because by doing this you are preventing this from being developed on Mr. Henke's property.

Mr. Willms said they need to review that. Attorney Polidoro asked if they had a survey when they bought the property. Connor said yes they have a survey prepared by Mr. Decker.

Liam felt they had a deed with right of way access. Chair Pagano said research and note that on the plan.

Attorney Polidoro asked about emergency access to the back. Mr. Willms said this right-of-way coming back there is between the buildings. Liam said that is why instead of them staying closer they kept it back as far as possible because with the 2 existing structures they were never going to get a firetruck back there anyways, but the opportunity to get a firetruck back here along the fence line to do anything... Connor advised this was not changing from how it sits now.

Chair Pagano asked if basically you were decapitating the existing building and putting a 2nd story on. Connor said ideally we wouldn't have to but were told that's it easier to reframe so that the building will look pretty much the way it looks now. Chair Pagano said it will not be the eyebrows. Connor said it will not be the eyebrows. Liam said it will mirror the Henke building and that they are keeping the front porch but updating it.

Chair Pagano said there is a little back section behind the building now and porch on the end of that – existing now. Connor said yes in these drawings you don't see it because we are getting rid of that.

Attorney Polidoro asked if they reviewed this with the building inspector. Mr. Willms advised not at this point and that they just wanted some preliminary feedback before moving forward.

Attorney Polidoro said she just didn't want to get too far down spinning the wheels here if fire code would require you to have some kind of access you can't get, or sprinklers. Mr. Willms said he does not think it requires sprinklers but will verify with them. Mr. Willms said next month they will have more detailed plans.

Chair Pagano asked about little out crop before the porch existing now and is guessing that is the bathroom right now – Connor asked if it was the little connector piece – Chair Pagano said yes – Connor said yes – Chair Pagano asked if that was going to 2 stories as well. Connor said if you look at side profile ... Liam said it's helping to tie everything in – Connor said its allowing for the 2 buildings to have that straight angle on the property. Liam said it's like a continued dormer.

Bathroom and connector were discussed. Connor explained that if you are looking at the front door of the 2-bedroom so if you flip back that door is that door (showing on plans) – Chair Pagano said ok.

Attorney Polidoro asked about the easement in the shaded area and asked is what you are building over that easement. Mr. Willms said they will take a look at verify that. Attorney Polidoro said she just wants to make sure you care capturing all the easements because it is such a tight lot. Mr. Willms said yes.

Attorney Polidoro said when the sewer was built some of the parcel actually the as-builts are slightly different than what the easement is so if you know for a fact that maybe there was a change or get what was recorded, but this is what is showing as an easement down the whole side of the property. Mr. Willms said they will start and check on as-builts.

Chair Pagano asked about commercial garbage pick-up and if car was parked on the side. Mr. Willms said that will have coordinate that. Liam said it will have to be something written in., i.e. “no parking on garbage mornings”.

Chair Pagano asked what the siding will be and if you are going to try and make it look like existing building that is there. Connor said they are just learning about the pattern book and will look at that. Attorney Polidoro said it is attached to the Zoning Law. Connor asked if it had siding specs. Attorney Polidoro said it had a lot of information on what would be appropriate. Connor advised nothing has been picked out yet but will match with surrounding area. Attorney Polidoro advised it frowns on vinyl, aluminum and hardy board.

Chair Pagano asked about 4 little marks in front on the plans. Connor advised they are existing bushes that will remain and that they will be landscaping the front.

Member Markusen-Weiss asked about the lights they were showing. Connor advised they want to do lighting around the whole perimeter but same kind of lighting facing down and not spilling over but keeping site safe.

Chair Pagano said we will need cutsheets for lighting. Member Markusen-Weiss said warm and down lighting.

Chair Pagano said another thing she would want to think about with this whole water plan is you are taking away a lot of permeable and making it non-permeable. Mr. Willms said a lot of it is already a gravel parking area and is considered sort of impermeable. Chair Pagano said so a

gravel parking area is considered impermeable. Mr. Willms said after being driven on over-and-over again but were thinking about perhaps adding a drywell in the backyard to capture some of those rear liters and give some storm water retention plan there. Chair Pagano said we will need that on the plans.

Member Markusen-Weiss said you will have Village water and sewer and asked if there is fuel. Connor said plan is to do everything electric with heat pumps. Mr. Willms said they will go on the back north side of the building. Attorney Polidoro said you have enough room. Mr. Willms side yes in the parking area and parking area can be shifted north.

Member Zacharzuk asked what fuel is existing. Connor said oil. Member Zacharzuk asked where. Liam advised in the basement. Member Markusen-Weiss said those additions will be on grade. Connor said yes. Member Zacharzuk asked do we need plans to show existing and new proposal. Chair Pagano said if they give us the survey from when they bought the property It will be existing survey. Mr. Willms said they can give details. Member Zacharzuk just asked to see how it is set up now vs. what they are proposing. Chair Pagano asked to add that to the plans.

Liam spoke about proposed parking spot over here would be cutting the curb and one or two panels of the sidewalk tilting down just like the driveway is. Attorney Polidoro asked was this State or County Road. Liam advised State. Attorney Polidoro advised you would need permit from DOT into that driveway and should talk to them because it can be costly to get a road opening permit and DOT will frown upon a second road opening.

Member Markusen-Weiss asked if there were no setbacks in this district for coverage. Mr. Willms said they are proposing about 48% coverage and thinks the upper limit is 65%.

Member Zacharzuk asked about snow removal and that you cannot plow out onto State Road. Mr. Willms said they cannot, and they will need to place against northern edge of concrete but will need to take a hard look at that.

Chair Pagano asked if that was the minimum width for their center at stairwell/common entrance or can you get yourself a couple of more inches. Mr. Wilms said shift down a little more and that is a great idea - and they will look into that.

Member Markusen-Weiss asked what the bays were for. Connor advised space for a washer and dryer but could be a space to fold or store something. Connor said it sounds like that could be removed.

Mr. Willms said they will make contact with the building department. Attorney Polidoro advised to start with the survey and speak with Mr. Decker advising him that you will need to show where the easements are so that you know where to put the building.

Chair Pagano suggested looking at how they park the cars on the Henke property. Liam said they basically back upon into their lot. Attorney Polidoro said generally parking space is 18 ft long with 20 ft isle.

Escrow was discussed. Chair Pagano felt Attorney Polidoro could help them and between us we can really help them so recommended attorney escrow. The Board agreed.

Chair Pagano made a motion to request escrow in the amount of \$750.00 be collected for Village Planning Board Attorney representation and Engineering review for the site plan for 31 East Market Street listed under Tax Parcel ID 6272-10-482721. Motion seconded by Member Markusen-Weiss. All in favor.

Chair Pagano made a motion to table the site plan application for 31 East Market Street listed under Tax Parcel ID 6272-10-482721 TO October 9, 2025 AT 6:30pm. Motion seconded by Member Zacharzuk. All in favor.

Agenda Item #4

Kristina Dousharm (Dousharm Architecture)

Owner: Red Hook Commons, LLC

87 East Market Street

Tax Parcel ID: 6272-11-646717

Present: Kristina Dousharm and Zak Hall – Architects

Kristina came forward and asked the Board what they need.

Attorney Polidoro asked if there was a survey. Kristina said they can get us a survey.

Kristina said basically this is an expansion of the existing office building previously approved and the use has not changed and still an office and they are proposing an accessory structure which is going to be used as a conference room with a training facility for perspective tenants that are using the office building, so all kind of one complex and one use.

Chair Pagano asked if they were expanding the purpose. Kristina said TBD as tenants are not disclosed to them.

Attorney Polidoro said right now they are individual units and are you trying to make it one building unit with a shared space.

Kristina said they are designing the interior so it has flexibility and it is all office use.

Chair Pagano thanked for the red dots (new & existing).

Chair Pagano asked what happens to the garages in the back and asked if they would be going away and becoming office space. Kristina said yes.

Chair Pagano said it almost looks like you are designing this for one user. Kristina said they are looking at it to maximize efficiency and how many people could fit in the building and they understand that office space is an allowed use in this Zoning district so they are coming to planning Board with this proposal and interior floor plan is tenant based, and does not know if that is under the purview of site plan approval but are looking at an office building at the footprint as presented to you and how they calculated parking requirements and septic. Chair Pagano said fair enough.

SEPTIC

Attorney Polidoro asked if septic and expansion are already approved and that is the current location.

Kristina said they are working with the County on that and you will see calculations on the first page so we are presenting what we preliminarily are assuming is going to be area of the expanded septic field and based on based on the data they currently have available.

Kristina said they are looking forward to approval parallel to this process.

Attorney Polidoro asked but that is the same spot where it is now. Kristina said same spot but expanded. Kristina said if you look at the existing which is in the upper left-hand corner it is expanded from what it was but they are very careful to leave a buffer between this property and residential district.

Chair Pagano asked if the expansion is moving from where you are proposing to put the training shed. Kristinas said there is an existing leech field and they are going to expand the leech field, keep what they have, and expand it and we are showing in good faith what we currently know to be the area in which the expansion will take place – based on what they know today.

Chair Pagano said it is going to be based on - depending on the number of different businesses that are in the complex that will dictate if there are more bathrooms than you have planned on here. Kristina said no and it is not based on the number of businesses but occupancy in each building. Kristina said it could be achieved in less than what they are showing. Zak said what they are presenting now is from conversations with DOH.

HEATING/FUEL

Attorney Polidoro asked about the propane tanks. Kristina they are existing -2 tanks – that are part of the system. Attorney Polidoro asked if they will continue to heat with propane. Kristina said yes and be electric with supplementary propone.

Chair Pagano said you are significantly expanding parking. Kristina said yes. Chair Pagano said it goes along with expanding the building. Kristina said yes.

STORMWATER

Chair Pagano said you are also creating a lot more tar and your ratio of blacktop to soaking up ground is decreasing asking are you adding drywells - how will that be handled.

Kristina said in terms of stormwater they are looking at that in terms of lot coverage and are under the threshold that is requires. Kristina said stormwater will be addressed. Chair Pagano said we will need a stormwater plan.

Chair Pagano said she knows when it rains it gets mushy in that ditch and over where you are building your extension it is also low there. Kristina said they will be looking at that. Kristina said the path is very wet.

SIDEWALKS

Chair Pagano said the sidewalk stops at this property and asked Attorney Polidoro the rules about sidewalks and wonders if they have to extend the sidewalk to the end of their property which would be nice for walkers. Zak said they are already extended past. Attorney Polidoro said sidewalk is different than a path.

Attorney Polidoro referenced Site Plan Section 200-16-(21) – every site plan shall be reviewed for pedestrian or bicycles potential including the need for sidewalks or bike racks. Adjacent commercial structures should always be connected by sidewalks along the frontage.

Chair Pagano said existing sidewalk ends at beginning of property line. Kristina said it does. Chair Pagano asked that we extend sidewalk to the end of this property. Kristina said as a user I would say what also ends at the end of this property is fabric of the Village and that it essentially turns into a highway after it, so as a user she thinks it is safer with a buffer going down into the property rather than running a sidewalk a few feet way from traffic going super-fast. Kristina said there are no other buildings across the street and completely vacant so its right at (after community center) everyone steps on the gas and feels potentially dangerous. Kristina said she knows it is wet and when that gravel gets super saturated (when she runs there) and where a sidewalk would be right along the road.

Chair Pagano asked does a sidewalk have to be in the right-of-way and could be on private property and would just require an easement for public. Member Markusen-Weiss said the path is already set back quite a bit and far from the property line.

Kristina said there is also the question of the history of how that gravel path originated and Through previous site plan approval.

Attorney Polidoro asked if you have a copy of previous site plan approval. Kristina said she has a copy of the site plan but not minutes or resolution. Attorney Polidoro asked if it said sidewalk on it. Kristina said there is stone dust on that path and it is an actual path. Kristina said her only thought with it is gets wet at the western end. Chair Pagano said yes it is the lowest point.

Member Markusen-Weiss referenced adjacent property and where the sidewalk ends so would you cut up this person's driveway to cut over to a path.

Kristina feels we could fix the wetness issue and drainage.

Member Markusen-Weiss asked how we can make that path better.

Chair Pagano said if you are not going to have a sidewalk, we need to think about making the path better.

Member Zacharzuk feels a sidewalk makes more sense. Chair Pagano said she feels it makes more sense. Member Markusen-Weiss said it makes more sense if it's buffered because the adjacent sidewalk is right on the road. Chair Pagano said a lot of Village sidewalks are right on the road and it would be nice if there was a buffer.

Kristina said another thing to consider is that the grade there that dips way down so if they were to put a path or a sidewalk in - there are 2 easement locations – either right on the road or it's where it is - and in between there is a big hill so you would have to majorly change the grade and you can't the sidewalk half way in between where it is now and the road because that would be extreme change to grade. Chair Pagano said to take a look at what's possible.

Chair Pagano said she is thinking about the wet and off to the west and that part of the property is the lowest part. Kristina said it is - but weird that it ends when you go to Borenstein's driveway and then it's sidewalk.

Chair Pagano said she is off the sidewalk now and sees a drainage issue and does not know if you will need to build up to support the new extension or maybe that up to setback is still flat and it goes down. Wetland buffer zone was reviewed by Board on Markusen-Weiss' phone.

Zak said all the water on that site and in the road comes into the path. Kristina said and why it is wet and that it's all going down into that curb/sidewalk/path but that they can definitely fix that issue. Chair Pagano said look at what can be done because right now it's not good.

Chair Pagano asked if on the west side you were removing a lot of trees. Kristina said not really – there's really no trees over there now – and scrappy stuff. Attorney Polidoro said it is hard to see but here there are a lot. Kristina said there is really nothing and they are not removing mature trees. Chair Pagano referenced greenery in upper left corner. Zak said that is the entry. Chair Pagano asked if moving trees on the east. Kristina said on the east even less so and that there are trees that exist between parking lot and the residence to the east and they are not touching that and only expanding parking in that area that is currently lawn. Chair Pagano said ok.

Chair Pagano asked if certain parking can be within the setbacks. Attorney Polidoro said we will have to look at that. Zak said they can lose 3 because they have an extra 7.

DUMPSTER

Chair Pagano asked where you were moving dumpster to. Kristina said the same concept as last site plan approval farther to the west. Chair Pagano asked so within setback. Zak said yes.

Attorney Polidoro asked with dumpster does dump truck have to go in and back out. Kristina said yes and the only ideal place to put it and how it's functioned since they opened.

EV CHARGING

Chair Pagano asked how many EV charging stations were there. Zak advised a quad – 4 spots. Chair Pagano asked on the concrete path with hole in it. Kristina said exactly.

Chair Pagano asked about the 20 foot height on accessory gable building – what is tree height back there. Kristina said more than 20 feet and trees are taller than the building.

Attorney Polidoro said with EV parking you exceed the Code as it requires 2 for every 40 so you have 4 – so asked to reference that on the plans.

BIKE RACKS

Attorney Polidoro asked about bike parking you have to show you have 1 bicycle for every 750 feet of building space. Kristina said ok. Attorney Polidoro asked to calculate and add to plan.

HANDICAP PARKING

Member Zacharzuk asked about increase in parking from 63 to 100 and asked if you have to increase your handicap parking spaces. Kristina said yes and portioned to overall parking.

What they are proposing is 3 but it is showing 2 so they will check to make sure that meets requirements. Kristina said you were right we need 3 and will add another one.

Attorney Polidoro advised no parking is permitted in front yard so does not know if that front space is in the front yard. Chair Pagano asked if handicap spots. Attorney Polidoro said yes. Kristina said they move back and her logic is whatever was there is there. Chair Pagano agreed and to treat as existing parking. Attorney Polidoro said ok so long as existing. Kristina said they are not increasing the parking towards the front and referenced darker gray area for new proposed parking.

Attorney Polidoro got back to Zak's inquiry and advised it says you can't use the front yard for parking but doesn't necessarily say side yard.

DUMPSTER

Member Zacharzuk asked how far is the dumpster pad to the property line. Zak estimated at 1-2 feet. Chair Pagano said we will have to check the Code on that.

LIGHTING

Chair Pagano asked if 20 lights and that's a lot. Kristina said she would be happy to reduce it. Chair Pagano asked for 3000 to be the maximum.

Chair Pagano said 20 lights around the property. Kristina said it is more about the footcandles in the parking lot so you tell us what you want. Chair Pagano said 9 are 100 watts.

Chair Pagano said if everyone if everyone is coming in – is that a lot of light. Kristina advised everyone enters at one entrance and rest is about parking. Chair Pagano said on the north side you do have doors on. Kristina asked north side. Chair Pagano said yes.

Lighting on plans was reviewed. Kristina said just tell us the threshold and we will make it happen. Chair Pagano asked for height of poles - 20 foot.

Kristina said if you want us to keep the footcandles similar to what we presented and not have 20 foot poles then they would need more poles so it's a balance – or brighter lights. Member Markusen-Weiss said the question is how much.

Attorney Polidoro said Code does not have a hard limit but the County does have hard lines. Options were discussed. Kristina said they can turn it down but need guidelines. Chair Pagano said R10,000 are in the trees and asked what the circles were with the 2 antennas. Kristina said those were the poles.

Chair Pagano asked what the lights that are doing the 11 marking. Zak said those were flood lights.

Proposed lighting on plans was reviewed.

Member Markusen-Weiss asked if people will be using other egress on the north side. Kristina said right.

Attorney Polidoro said the things that the County recommends you look at is: uniformity, so you want a ratio that it is not so bright like 5 to 1 instead of 20 to 1; footcandles levels are recommended to be more than 1 in parking areas. Attorney Polidoro forwarded the guide to Board members and advised some people may think it is too low, but this Board has discretion with that.

Chair Pagano said it depends if blue or yellow. Kristina said 2000 is traditional.

Attorney Polidoro said one thing you could do is have some of the parking lot lights go off at a certain time. Kristina asked how that would work. Attorney Polidoro said she does not know what kind of office this is but probably would not work. Chair Pagano advised CVS turns off after certain hours. Attorney Polidoro said you could have timers and do that. Kristina said it could be from dawn to dusk with a cut-off.

Chair Pagano asked the Board for further comments. No comments.

Chair Pagano said some things still need to be looked up so not ready to submit to the County.

Kristina asked about SEQR. Attorney Polidoro asked how many square feet and if under 4000 square feet of gross floor area could be a TYPE II Action but to provide the Board with that number.

Attorney Polidoro advised at the next meeting you will need to provide zoning table for parking; EV; bikes; footprint; sidewalk/path option and cut sheets for lights.

Kristina asked if we are good with overall footcandles that were presented or do you want toned down a little. Kristina said they agree with shutting off after 9pm or an agreed upon time. Chair Pagano said they should be good with that.

Chair Pagano made a motion to request escrow in the amount of \$1,500.00 to retain services of Village Planning Board attorney. Motion seconded by Member Markusen-Weiss. All in favor.

Chair Pagano said you are working with the BOH and BOH approval will be a condition.

Chair Pagano reminded applicant to add planning board approval stamp and signature box on plans.

Member Markusen-Weiss asked if water/sewer connection to accessory structure. Kristina said yes and they working with the County for that.

Chair Pagano made a motion to table the site plan application for 87 East Market Street listed under Tax Parcel ID 6272-11-646717 to October 9, 2025 at 6:30pm. Motion seconded by Member Markusen-Weiss. All in favor.

Chair Pagano made a motion to approve planning meeting minutes from August 14, 2025. Motion seconded by Member Markusen-Weiss. All in favor.

Chair Pagano made a motion to adjourn the September 11, 2025 planning board meeting at 9:07pm. Motion seconded by Member Markusen-Weiss. All in favor.

END OF MEETING / OTHER BUSINESS DISCUSSION:

October planning board meeting date was discussed. Both Chair Pagano and Member Zacharzuk are unavailable on October 9th and we would not have a quorum, so an alternate date needed to be decided - Board agreed on October 30th at 6:30pm.

Lara Hart
Secretary to the Planning Board
