

**VILLAGE OF RED HOOK  
PLANNING BOARD MEETING  
October 30, 2025**

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

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

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

Chair Pagano announced members present for a quorum.

**Chair Pagano made a motion to approve the Planning Board Minutes dated September 11, 2025. Motion seconded by Member Markusen-Weiss. All in favor. Motion approved.**

**Agenda Item #1**

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 advised this was a continuation of site plan review.

Mr. Dupont came forward and advised he was present with Mr. Graminski and that property was on Firehouse Lane in the NMU District and that one modification from the last time was the change of mechanical equipment on the front buildings which has been subsequently relocated to the sides of the buildings. Mr. Dupont advised he made these modifications after the last planning board meeting so that it could be sent to the County for reviews of submission from last time with only change being mechanical change which was reflected on the elevations too.

Mr. Graminski said since last meeting which has been 6 weeks they did receive comments from the County and comments from Delaware Engineering for water and sewer.

Mr. Dupont said the County had three items:

- #1. Discussions about having front building façade facing the road consistent with the pattern book.
- #2. A line of trees along the sidewalk.
- #3. Although they only proposed two lighting fixtures they felt the lumens were too high.

Mr. Dupont asked to address those issues starting with:

**Lighting:**

Mr. Dupont said these lighting fixtures are only 10 feet in height and a full cut off fixture so directing illumination directly down. There is a high illumination at the ground level but is only a 10 foot circle @ 10 foot candles. Mr. Dupont said they deliberately put the fixtures there for security purposes and there is no other illumination of light out there and fixtures are a 100 feet out from the road so not going to be visible and felt it was good to have lighting there especially when bringing their garbage to the dumpster. Mr. Dupont said because of the intensity of the light below the fixture it has a broader spread of lower illumination, so it drops off pretty good as far as what County thought was acceptable. Mr. Dupont said they can easily change bulb to warmer due @ 2000 kelvin but thinks this illumination level is correct.

Mr. Dupont mentioned Traditions which is more of a taller fixture so it doesn't direct the light straight down and broadcasts it out and if this Board prefers that they can entertain that too.

**Trees:**

Mr. Dupont said as far as trees they should plant more trees and agree with putting trees along the sidewalk.

Mr. Dupont said from last meeting question was .... do they want trees so they can't see the buildings, or do they not want trees so they can see the buildings. Mr. Dupont feels a line of trees is consistent with Knollwood Commons.

**Building Orientation:**

Mr. Dupont said they feel very confident that this plan is the correct layout and this plan was started back in April and he really looked at this site and the difference between this and something like Traditions (which is in the Town) is that is really a residential grid and when you go there it is sort of a residential island and a grid of streets and Firehouse Lane is more of a thoroughfare. Mr. Dupont said he is from this Town and when going to Agway there is very few pedestrians down here, and vehicles are going fast through here, plus the presence of the firehouse which is right across the street and the broad apron where all the apparatus comes out will shine right into the site of the homes.

Mr. Dupont said not only is he working for the owners, Dave and Michelle, but trying to work for the Board to comply with the Village Code and also advocating for the people that will be living there and frankly people living there and having all their porches face that main thoroughfare is not going to be a great place to live and having the primary porches on the side facing greenspace will give these folks a sense of privacy. Mr. Dupont said the building really only has 3 primary facades: 1) the street faced and most attractive façade 2) car façade and 3) other porch façade; so they feel strongly that this is the correct layout and lining up along Firehouse Lane would not be a proper way to lay this site out.

Mr. Dupont said he carefully looked at the pattern book in regard to the things advocated for, and one thing "it is a guide to design", and although it does talk about porches at page 2 under General Design Considerations it states .... "The general rule should not result in rigid uniformity. Designers should take their cues from the existing community, which displays a degree of variety and surprise within a coherent and pleasing overall context"... Mr. Dupont said these building were placed on this site to fit within this corky size and it's not a rectangle and only 300 + feet, it provide privacy and can still provide, what he believes, is the intent of Zoning which is the line of the façade consistent with the properties next door which it does (referring to Knollwood) so not only a member of the broader society but creates a smaller development.

### **Water/Sewer:**

Mr. Graminski said water/sewer is fairly straight forward and he did receive the comments from Delaware Engineering and spoke with them about it and there was one comment in that they requested that part of the project provide SWPPP. Mr. Graminski said from initial presentation they keep under an acre of land so did not meet criteria for SWPPP and development is less than 5 acres so all they have to do is provide sediment quality control. Mr. Graminski said since this is multi family it falls under different criteria for NYSDEC so disturbance greater than 1 acre does require full SWPPP and we are below that threshold at 0.89 acres. Mr. Graminski said Mr. Flores of Delaware Engineering and him also agreed on that they have the best method discussion for stormwater management and he will provide Mr. Flores with his calculations and seepage pits and address any concerns with easements for water supple and sewer disposal and that tanks get upsized a little bit and provide the Village with an easement. Mr. Graminski said overall he can provide and make those changes and if it is ok with this Board would like to deal Mr. Flores directly. Board agreed.

### **Parking:**

Mr. Dupont said another comment from the County was about parking and they do have additional parking than provided by Zoning but as explained last time that number is skewed sometimes and they are providing an interior parking space for each one of these units so feels that should not even count and minimum required by Zoning is 1.5 per apartment - 6 x 1.5 – 9 but they provided 18, but if you take out the 6 that are inside you would still need a driveway so you are down to 12 and we provided additional parking outside of garage because 1) it is rare for somebody to only have one car 2) parking a car in front of the garage with a car in the garage does not work functionally; so having 2<sup>nd</sup> space makes sense to allow people to use buildings and good for visitors and they tried to minimize the amount of paving as possible.

Mr. Dupont said they are allowed to have 40% lot coverage and Mr. Graminski confirmed they were at basically 30%.

Mr. Dupont said they can eliminate some of those extra spaces but does not feel it is the right thing to do because building won't function as they should for the people living there.

Mr. Dupont said Mark and him did an exercise to look at this and see if there is an alternative layout to try an address the Board's major concern which is trying to line all the buildings up along the front and presented plans showing the original and new proposing all of the buildings lined up parallel to Firehouse Lane and rotates them so the front porches are facing Firehouse Lane and subsequently what that does is - if porches are in the front it puts it puts parking in the rear.

Mr. Dupont said per Zoning with 2-family dwelling units they are allowed to park in the side yard but recommend it should be screened.

Mr. Dupont said here they are – about 20 feet off sidewalk - and the consequence was instead of having a hammerhead now it is more a loop concept and would be one way allowing road to be 18 feet wide for backup issues.

Mr. Dupont said he hates this proposal and if you are living here you are now surrounded by blacktop and in the front you faces this road from porch and now you don't have even 25 feet between building so persons are looking right into each other's homes with no privacy and what it is like over at Traditions. Mr. Dupont said he feels people do not use communal space prefer to be in their own homes.

Mr. Graminski said based on County planning comments he went through and looked at original plans and wrote down overall disturbance, total impervious, total buildings, total pavement and total concrete and summarized it all and this layout is about 600 square feet more pavement than original proposal.

Mr. Graminski said both proposals are similar with total disturbance and initial one is 0.89 acres and this one is 0.85 acres. Mr. Dupont said both still not requiring SWPPP.

Mr. Graminski said with respect to this Board it is a concept, and although he did not go through grading and drainage he could have an open discussion.

Mr. Dupont said a lot of times it is two dimensional drawings and he built a little something for the Board to see – presenting models on the plans in 1-20<sup>th</sup> scale (which Mr. Dupont built by hand). Mr. Dupont asked Board to look at how it looks from Firehouse Lane.

The Board thanked Mr. Graminski and discussed proposed plans with models.

Member Pagano asked about the trees that will be planted along the sidewalk. Mr. Dupont said now you will see what happens when all these building line up (which he feels looks terrible) and too uniform and obviously they could do changes like at Traditions, but they don't want it to look like that, saying this is my Town too and wants it to look nice - and one thing they do show is Mr. Graminski pulled the buildings back and installed a line of trees and they

can certainly do that with this plan, but what he was hoping to get the Board to agree to is to find a middle point that is acceptable. Mr. Dupont said it seemed like the biggest objection was not having porches on the front. Mr. Dupont said in looking at calculations he checked footprint and building area he actually has 64 square feet to spare of building size in here (doesn't count as footprint) what they can do is line buildings up (as shown) and take whole thing and pull back to allow for trees the 64 square feet to spare he can take the front porch and wrap the outside corner and now creating a solution to make everyone happy – giving the tenant a private area and front having a porch.

Member Avella asked if it would be done to all of them? Mr. Dupont said yes to be uniform.

Member Pagano felt the trees were a better idea.

Mr. Dupont said they felt the design reinforces all three criteria.

Member Markusen-Weiss said after walking there on Firehouse Lane he thinks the biggest argument here is the firehouse itself and it is just this one property and are we doing the right criteria.

Member Pagano asked how the disturbance would change if you moved the houses back. Mr. Graminski said he will keep it under 1 acer and would still have like 4-5,000 square feet.

Chair Pagano asked if we needed all that turnaround space. Mr. Dupont said a matter of perception, and it looks like a lot of pavement but it is really not. Dumpster enclosure and truck maneuvering was discussed. Mr. Graminski said he will work with Rob and everyone wants less pavement. Dumpster space area was discussed and Mr. Graminski said he can shorten that up.

Member Markusen-Weiss said he is swayed by this argument here and appreciates this presentation.

Mr. Dupont said we are passionate about this design and feels this would be an improvement to the Community.

Member Avella said she strongly prefers this plan (original plan) and did earlier too, and thinks for their reason, we don't think this has the characteristics of the Village and that it's a different street and allows us to feel this but likes the bump-back and trees but not the wrap around and porches.

Mr. Dupont went over the wrap around porch and features. Mr. Dupont said in the pattern book it talks about porches wrapping corners and they recognize it. Mr. Dupont also mentioned the pattern book was done before it was NMU District.

Chair Pagano said she likes the addition of trees and it helps with the size of the houses and the street, and the street scape having it pushed back of trees - she said she parked and went back and forth with ideas and as much as it would be nice if they all could all face Firehouse Lane – she has come around to this proposal.

Mr. Dupont asked about the porches. Chair Pagano said she likes the porches. Member Markusen-Weiss said to do the porches. Member Avella said she would be fine with the porches.

Member Markusen-Weiss said trees, porches, push-back – anything else?

Chair Pagano said regarding lights it is more about the harshness. Member Markusen-Weiss felt it was so far back. Mr. Dupont said it is shielded but the two buildings, so you won't even see from the road. Member Markusen-Weiss said and the trees. Mr. Dupont said they are intended for the safety of tenants going to the dumpster at night.

Chair Pagano asked height of building. Mr. Dupont said 29 feet. Chair Pagano said so it is a 20 foot pole being hidden by a 29 foot building. Mr. Dupont said yes – you will not see it and just to illuminate and minimal. Member Markusen-Weiss asked for the 3000 kelvins. Chair Pagano said if it doesn't work you will be back.

Mr. Graminski asked since it seems the Board is satisfied can we set the public hearing. Chair Pagano said she feels we can, or do we have to wait until the plans/everything be done with comments.

Attorney Britton said since you are not making them do the row-houses she feels this Board could argue the wrap-around porches are the only change to be made and small enough to not impact so could set the public hearing but up to the Board.

Board agreed to set public hearing.

**Chair Pagano made a motion to set a public hearing for the site plan for Firehouse Lane listed under Tax Parcel ID 6272-10-388518 for November 13, 2025 at 6:30pm. Motion seconded by Member Markusen-Weiss. All in favor. Motion approved.**

Mr. Graminski said generally this Board requires materials 2 weeks prior to next meeting. The Board agreed to Friday, November 7<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Graminski said he will provide.

Attorney Cassondra asked about water/sewer lines and utility easements. Mr. Graminski showed on the original drawings. Member Markusen-Weiss said they are on the mechanical set of plans. Attorney Britton said you will need utility easement. Mr. Graminski said yes and it is all in the Village Engineer's comment letter and will provide easement areas. Attorney Cassondra said that will be determined by the agency who is taking the easement and

recommending reviewing it and preparing an easement for whoever is taking it. Mr. Graminski said it is the Village of Red Hook.

Attorney Britton asked about sidewalk and if it was proposed to be out of the way and not requiring pedestrian access. Mr. Graminski said correct. Attorney Cassandra asked 100%. Mr. Graminski said yes 100%.

Chair Pagano asked Mr. Graminski if her got a copy of the clear title. Mr. Graminski said yes and he will get a copy to us.

**Chair Pagano made a motion to table the site plan for Firehouse Lane listed under Tax Parcel ID 6272-10-388518 for November 13, 2025 at 6:30pm. Motion seconded by Member Markusen-Weiss. All in favor. Motion approved.**

**Agenda Item #2**

Connor & Liam O'Farrell  
31 East Markert Street  
Tax Parcel ID: 6272-10-482721

This is a continuation of a site plan review.

Chair Pagano advised that escrow for Village Planning Board Attorney services and Engineering review has been received.

Chair Pagano advised that applicant has requested that application be tabled to the November 13, 2025 Planning Board meeting.

**Chair Pagano made a motion to table the site plan for 31 East Market Street listed under Tax Parcel ID 6272-10-482721 to November 13, 2025 at 6:30pm. Motion seconded by Member Markusen-Weiss. All in favor. Motion approved.**

---

**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

Chair Pagano advised that escrow was received on 10/29/2025.

Ms. Dousharm advised that they have been in touch with the Village water department and have been advised to do a separate water service line for new proposed building in the rear.

Ms. Dousharm advised that they reviewed storm water and there are two existing catch basins in the parking lot that are set up well to pitch to so the concept is to expand as needed and no change to surface of the parking lot but would be potential expansion on the grounds depending on the capacity.

Ms. Dousharm advised they looked at the sidewalks and thought about it a lot and this is an intersection in between Blue Echo and end of the Village sidewalk system and their proposal is to just regrade it better, wider and raise it up so it is not wet in lower area at wester side towards the Village but to keep the same that is there because as an active user of that trail it should be where it is and not against the street because basically after the Village fabric ends everyone hits the gas and could be dangerous, so they feel the location is reasonable and it aligns with Blue Echo, so they propose to leave as is with improvements.

Ms. Dousharm advised they looked at parking and scooted it over to maintain the tree line on western side towards the Village and not dripping into that at all.

Ms. Dousharm said they added a bike rack.

Ms. Dousharm said they looked at ADA Parking and have 1 space by the smaller building, and 2 spaces by the larger building.

Ms. Dousharm advised they reduced lighting levels to 300 kelvin and they really dialed that back and spent time on what was necessary with how people would be exiting the building to getting into their cars so using County standards as a guideline. They are missing a note on the drawing they need to have a timer on the lights.

Ms. Dousharm advised they have been in touch with BOH on the setbacks.

Chair Pagano asked if you are putting in a separate water line. Ms. Dousharm advised yes which will go directly from street to the small building.

Member Avella agreed with their sidewalk solution because she feels cars do speed up at that area.

Chair Pagano asked how you were going to address that water low line issue. Ms. Dousharm asked for the path. Chair Pagano said yes. Ms. Dousharm said it is pretty much deteriorated with a little bit a stone dust left, so they need the recommended width (4-5 feet wide) so in order to make it that width it will have to be brought up, widened and graded off of that. Ms. Dousharm said there is already a catch basin that low area so should take care of that problem and want to keep stone dust, let it be what it is being this transition between Blue Echo and the network of sidewalks.

Chair Pagano asked if we had the zoning table. Ms. Dousharm said yes. Attorney Britton advised they fixed parking setback so longer an issue.

Board had no other comments.

Chair Pagano asked if the Board was ready to submit to County for 239m review. Board agreed.

**Chair Pagano made a motion to deem the site plan application for 87 East Market Street as complete for submission to Dutchess County Department of Planning and Development per 239m review. Motion seconded by Member Avella. All in favor. Motion approved.**

Chair Pagano asked if the Board should classify the action.

Attorney Britton advised SEQR should always come before 239m so should classify if this Board feels It is ready to go to the County and asked if EAF was submitted. Secretary Hart advised yes.

Attorney Britton said based upon the population it will be an unlisted action but asked if there would be any other involved agencies. Ms. Dousharm said yes to County Planning and BOH. Attorney Britton asked about DOT. Ms. Dousharm said no to DOT because they are not modifying the driveway and all internal. Attorney Britton asked about water/sewer. Ms. Dousharm said septic is on site and water is Village water.

SEQR classification was discussed.

**Chair Pagano made a motion to classify the site plan application for 87 East Market Street listed under Tax Parcel ID 6272-11-646717 as an unlisted action declaring the Village of Red Hook Planning Board as lead agency with coordinated review with Village of Red Hook Water Department. Motion seconded by Member Markusen-Weiss. All in favor. Motion approved.**

Attorney Britton recommended not setting public hearing until next meeting.

Ms. Dousharm asked if it made sense not setting the public hearing and then they come back with response.

Chair Pagano asked what that would gain. Secretary Hart advised if the County came back with a response. Ms. Dousharm said if County could come back and we would coordinate with other agency and at next meeting we would be able to discuss all of it at that public hearing and if that didn't happen you can continue the public hearing.

Chair Pagano said she is trying not to put this Board in a position where we are constantly rolling over a public hearing. Chair Pagano asked if Secretary Hart felt she would have a response. Secretary Hart said she does not know.

Ms. Dousharm said when you close the public hearing then you are held to close within a time frame, but if you open the public hearing and you leave it open for a meeting or two it's actually just bringing to the benefit of the public to hear what's going on.

Chair Pagano asked the Board how they felt. Member Markusen-Weiss felt if you think there is a 50% likely of getting something than we should.

Attorney Britton said the question for the Board is...is there any changes that you know you want to see in waiting for the County to come back or if you really think there are no changes or a ton of comments, but if you have a couple of comment and want to see how the County comes back or you want to see their next reiteration – it just depends on the how much change you think it is going to need or if you think it is ready to be approved and just waiting on County referral.

Chair Pagano felt this was pretty complete and well designed and this Board did not have a lot of comments last time and worked out the water and sewer, so that means for the next meeting we will be doing SEQR, public hearing and reviewing County comments, if any.

Attorney Britton advised the Board that they should classify tonight to get SEQR started and the determination of significance (neg or positive dec) will have to be done before you close the public hearing; and recommended at the start of the next meeting the Board to start by going through SEQR then opening the public hearing then close and move forward.

Attorney Britton asked Ms. Dousharm about having an easement for the water. Ms. Dousharm asked why for their own property. Attorney Britton said because they would have to have access to the water line. Ms. Dousharm said you need an easement no matter what to get from the property line and understood and makes sense. Attorney Britton said usually with septic and water they are all together but since you are just doing water and going through the street and under you would need an easement but if it is just connecting at the property then you are not, but you will need to clarify. Ms. Dousharm said they will clarify.

**Chair Pagano made a motion to set the public hearing for the site plan application for 87 East Market Street listed under Tax Parcel ID 6272-11-646717 for November 13, 2025 at 6:30pm. Motion seconded by Member Markusen-Weiss. All in favor. Motion approved.**

**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 November 13, 2025 at 6:30pm. Motion seconded by Member Markusen-Weiss. All in favor. Motion approved.**

#### **Agenda Item #4**

Marie Welch, L.S.

Owner: Judith Walsh Carr

15 Maizeland Road

Tax Parcel ID: 6272-06-280945

Present: Marie Welch, L.S., and Judith Walsh Carr

Marie Welch advised plans were for a 3 lot subdivision with one being an existing dwelling with water and septic on site and two proposed lots with proposed connection to Village water and on site sewage disposal systems that are in preliminary design by David Ryder (sheets 2 & 3) and that the only thing he is waiting on for submission to the Board of Health is a letter from the Village water department that they will service these two lines and preliminary approval from the planning board and that both lots are over an acre each.

Chair Pagano asked if you are sure you want to leave the big lot almost 3 acres. Marie advised that's what her client wants. Owner is present and confirmed.

Chair Pagano asked the Board for comments. No comments.

Marie advised that soils are excellent for drainage for the septic design.

Chair Pagano said you will need BOH approval but not for the subdivision. Marie said this Board could require BOH and her client is in the process of getting it anyway and could be final with permission to file but because they are one acre lots it made sense for her to get BOH approval so they are approved lots.

Marie asked if this Board could do as permission to file and they will file cover sheet and bring back BOH approved plans signed.

Chair Pagano asked if soils were tested. Marie Welch said soils were tested and design done.

Member Markusen-Weiss said it was great and a nice size piece of property with 2 more residences in the Village with no comments.

Member Avella had no comments.

Secretary Hart confirmed she spoke with Jake from DPW that driveway permits will be ok for the two proposed lots.

**Chair Pagano made a motion to classify the minor subdivision application for 15 Maizeland Road listed under Tax Parcel ID 6272-06-280945 as an unlisted uncoordinated action declaring the Village of Red Hook Planning Board as lead agency. Motion seconded by Member Avella. All in favor. Motion approved.**

**Chair Pagano made a motion to set the public hearing for the minor subdivision application for 15 Maizeland Road listed under Tax Parcel ID 6272-06-280945 for November 13, 2025 at 6:30pm. Motion seconded by Member Markusen-Weiss. All in favor. Motion approved.**

**Chair Pagano made a motion to table the minor subdivision application for 15 Maizeland Road listed under Tax Parcel ID 6272-06-280945 to November 13, 2025 at 6:30pm. Motion seconded by Member Markusen-Weiss. All in favor. Motion approved.**

Marie asked if this Board would give preliminary approval. Chair Pagano said it is only two more weeks.

**Chair Pagano made a motion to adjourn the October 30, 2025 planning board meeting at 7:51pm. Motion seconded by Member Avella. All in favor. Motion approved.**

Lara Hart  
Secretary to the Planning Board

---