

**VILLAGE OF RED HOOK
PLANNING BOARD MEETING
November 13, 2025**

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

Chair Pagano opened the November 13, 2025 Planning Board Meeting at 6:32 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 October 30, 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

Chair Pagano advised this was a continuation of site plan review from October 30, 2025.

Chair Pagano advised that amended plans were submitted by Mr. Dupont on November 7, 2025. Digital copy provided to all Board members and Planning Board Attorney via email dated Nov. 7th.

Chair Pagano advised that amended water/sewer plans received from Mark Graminski dated November 7th and forwarded to all members and Planning Board Attorney; and hard copy provided to Village Engineer.

Mr. Dupont came forward and advised that this was multi family development on Firehouse Lane in the Neighborhood Mixed Use District and lot being about 1 ¼ acre and proposing each building as a two-family dwelling. Mr. Dupont said since last meeting comments from the County were reviewed and design discussed and what has been revised since last time is that the building is moved slightly back from the road and originally the buildings were parallel to the southern property line which is not parallel to the road and in the zoning ordinance it actually talks about parallel to the road so they reoriented it slightly so it is parallel to the road and not property line.

Mr. Dupont said by moving it back it allowed them to install a line of trees along the street. Mr. Dupont said Mr. Hughes is proposing red maple. Chair Pagano asked if red maple is ok with road salt. Mr. Dupont said yes, but they are not right on the road and there is a 6 foot green space between road and the sidewalk but will have to get pruned and managed so to not get overly big.

Mr. Dupont spoke about front façade and proposed wrap-around porches which will have a porch facing a private area and street front.

Mr. Dupont spoke about lighting and that they agreed with lower bulbs and that they are only 10 foot tall light poles.

Mr. Dupont showed the Board the final proposal on board with models.

Attorney Polidoro asked about the bump out for the sidewalk for ADA which needs to be 5 feet. Mr. Dupont said it was drawn to 4 foot but he will address that. Mr. Graminski said he will take care of that.

Mr. Graminski came forward and spoke on Village Engineer's comments from letter dated November 7, 2025.

Sheet 2 of 4: modified flow design which has been done.

Mr. Graminski advised SWPPP was not required due to being under an acre.

Mr. Graminski advised with stormwater there were 6 seepage pits with grading which directs all the stormwater to the pits as well as the storm water and soils are well drained.

Mr. Graminski advised utility easements shown on sheet 3 of 4 with sanitary sewer and said he would coordinate with the Village attorney about what type of legal documents are required.

Attorney Polidoro advised they have a standard Village easement. Mr. Graminski said he looked at previous plans of CT Male approved and there wasn't any descriptions filed, and he was happy to do descriptions. Attorney Polidoro said descriptions are better. Mr. Graminski said he will have to do another sheet to include that. Board said ok.

Mr. Graminski addressed 8-inch Ductile Iron Class water main.

Mr. Graminski addressed each building having ¾ inch tap.

Mr. Graminski addressed buildings 1&2 being tapped.

Mr. Graminski advised they provided sewer details and that they change tank size.

Mr. Graminski addressed lateral connection.

Mr. Graminski addressed low pressure sewer lines.

Chair Pagano made a motion to classify the site plan application for Firehouse Lane listed under Tax Parcel ID 6272-10-388518 as an unlisted action with the Village Planning Board to act as lead agency with no interested outside agency involvement. Motion seconded by Member Markusen-Weiss. All in favor. Motion approved.

Chair Pagano advised that the public hearing notice was published as legal notice; added to Village website and put on Village bulletin Board. Public hearing notice mailed to all adjacent property owners.

Chair Pagano made a motion to open the public hearing for the site plan application for Firehouse Lane listed under Tax Parcel ID 6272-10-388518 at 6:48pm. Motion seconded by Member Markusen-Weiss. All in favor. Motion approved.

Chair Pagano asked Secretary Hart if any written letters or emails had been received. Secretary Hart advised no.

Chair Pagano had the sign in sheet and no people were listed to speak.

Attorney Polidoro asked about the sidewalks being on private property and not the right-of-way and another condition will be granting the Village an easement for the right to walk on the sidewalks and a note on the plan that the sidewalks will be maintained by property owner. Mr. Graminski said a formal easement. Attorney Polidoro said yes, a public access easement. Attorney Polidoro said she will add as a condition. Attorney Polidoro said she will give Mr. Graminski a model for that easement.

Chair Pagano asked the Board for comments. No comments.

Chair Pagano made a motion to close the public hearing for the site plan application for Firehouse Lane listed under Tax Parcel ID 6272-10-388518 at 6:51pm. Motion seconded by Member Markusen-Weiss. All in favor. Motion approved.

Chair Pagano read aloud proposed Resolution from NOW THEREFORE, paragraph.

**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 November 13, 2025. The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Elizabeth Pagano.

Moved by:

Seconded by:

RESOLUTION TO GRANT CONDITIONAL SITE PLAN APPROVAL

The Farmhouses at Red Hook

WHEREAS, the applicant, Hughes Holdings of Dutchess LLC, has submitted an application for site plan approval for the construction of a multi-family development and associated improvements comprised of three two-family dwellings, totaling six residential dwelling units (the “Project”) located in the NMU District in the Village of Red Hook; and

WHEREAS, the proposal is shown on a plan entitled, “The Farmhouses at Red Hook” prepared by Robert J. Dupont, Architect., dated August 27, 2025, and last revised November 6, 2025, Sheets A1-A4 (the “Site Plan Set”); and

WHEREAS, multi-family dwellings are a permitted use in the NMU District subject to site plan approval; and

WHEREAS, the applicant has submitted a Short Environmental Assessment Form (“EAF”) dated August 29, 2025, pursuant to the State Environmental Quality Review Act (“SEQRA”); and

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

WHEREAS, pursuant to 6 NYCRR § § 617.4 and 617.5, the Project is an unlisted action; and

WHEREAS, the Site Plan Set was referred to the Dutchess County Planning Department pursuant to General Municipal Law 239-m, which responded by letter dated October 9, 2025 that the Project is a matter of local concern with comments, and the Planning Board has considered such comments; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board has reviewed the EAF, and all available information concerning the potential impacts of the Project and found that the Planning Board has sufficient information on which to base a determination of significance; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board has considered the criteria contained in 6 NYCRR § 617.7 and thoroughly analyzed all identified relevant areas of environmental concern; and

WHEREAS, a duly noticed public hearing was held on November 13, 2025, during which all those who wished to speak were heard.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board hereby classifies the Project as an unlisted action and adopts a determination of significance, a negative declaration, determining that the Project will not result in any significant adverse environmental impacts.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Planning Board hereby approves the Site Plan Set and authorizes the Chairperson to sign the Site Plan Set after compliance with the following conditions:

- 1. Payment of all fees and escrow.**
- 2. Approval by the Village Attorney and Village Engineer of a sewer easement and recordation of same with the Dutchess County Clerk.**
- 3. Approval by the Village Attorney and Village Engineer of a sidewalk easement granting the public the right to access the sidewalk and obligating the owner to keep the sidewalk clear.**
- 4. Revision of the Site Plan Set to include ADA sidewalk bump outs as required, to the satisfaction of the Code Enforcement Officer, and a note requiring the property owner to maintain the sidewalks.**

It is the applicant's responsibility to track the time within which this approval will expire. No notice will be provided by the Village.

____ Elizabeth Pagano
____ Laura Avella
____ David Markusen-Weiss
____ Stephen Zacharzuk

Elizabeth Pagano, Chairperson

Chair Pagano asked if we needed BOH approval. Attorney Polidoro said it is not required.

Chair Pagano read aloud and completed PART II of SEQR.

Chair Pagano said it has been determined, based on the information and analysis above, and any supporting documentation, that the proposed action will not result in any significant adverse environmental impacts.

Chair Pagano made a motion to declare a negative declaration for the site plan application for Firehouse Lane listed under Tax Parcel ID 6272-10-388518. Motion seconded by Member Markusen-Weiss. All in favor. Motion approved.

Chair Pagano made a motion to accept and adopt the Resolution to Grant Conditional Site Plan Approval for Firehouse Lane listed under site plan application for Firehouse Lane listed under Tax Parcel ID 6272-10-388518.

VOTE:

YES__ Elizabeth Pagano

YES__ Laura Avella

YES__ David Markusen-Weiss

YES__ Stephen Zacharzuk

All in favor. Motion approved.

Agenda Item #2

Connor & Liam O'Farrell

31 East Markert Street

Tax Parcel ID: 6272-10-482721

Chair Pagano advised this was a continuation of a site plan review from 9/11/2025.

Chair Pagano advised that applicant has requested that application be tabled to the December 11, 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 December 11, 2025 at 6:30pm. Motion seconded by Member Markusen-Weiss. All in favor. Motion approved.

Agenda Item #3

Kristina Dousharm (Dousharm Architecture, PLLC)

Owner: Red Hook Commons, LLC

87 East Market Street

Tax Parcel ID: 6272-11-646717

Present: Kristina Dousharm, Architect

Chair Pagano advised that this is a continuation of site plan application from 10/30/2025.

Chair Pagano advised that public hearing notice was published as legal notice; added to Village website and notices mailed to all adjacent property owners.

Chair Pagano advised that the 239m Referral was submitted to Dutchess County Department of Planning and Development and no response has been received.

Ms. Dousharm came forward and said she had nothing new to present.

Attorney Polidoro said we have a public hearing and asked if Ms. Dousharm wanted to give a summary to the public.

Ms. Dousharm gave a brief summary of the project and said in terms of what the public could weigh in on for this property is a big deal because how do we connect the neighborhood that exists to the sidewalk that then blends into the Village.

Ms. Dousharm said they are expanding the office building and adding another little piece off to the side with parking and draining with a buffer all the way around with the landscaping that exists and they are not going to disturb the buffer around the property and are looking to connect Blue Echo Road to the Village and their proposal is to improve the sidewalk and make it wider.

Ms. Dousharm said they feel what matters for this property is kind of like the piece that connects the village to the suburban development that exists beyond that.

Ms. Dousharm said she thought about it a lot and that she runs this road and when you are on the actual road, the cars go from Baxter Road so when Baxter Road ends the mentality of the driver is to hit the gas and go so from that point, as a pedestrian you are vulnerable from that point onward, so the key is in the entirety of the site plan is the building is expanding, but very minor, parking lot is expanding, but minor, moving a buffer between building and neighborhood of all the trees and vegetation that exists around that area, and we are working with the County to evaluate the septic and how that connects to the building.

Ms. Dousharm said essentially the key of how they are going to connect Blue Echo Road to the Village and that this is kind of a property that connects all of that together, so when you get to the property line of this property and the other one there is a little path that exists on the western side that goes through bushes and onto this property to the west and there is little property to the east and in terms of a public hearing we are expanding this building all within building, expanding the parking and as someone who uses this path she feels there are two issues for the public and wants to hear what people have to say but their motivation in designing the project was to make sure that this pedestrian path continues and that it is blending the network of sidewalks in the Village with the neighbors that exist to the east and then preserving the entirety of the buffer around the edge of the property to acknowledge that there is commercial property adjacent to a residential neighborhood.

Chair Pagano made a motion to open the public hearing for the site plan for 87 E. Market Street listed under Tax Parcel ID 6272-11-656717 at 7:10pm. Motion seconded by Member Markusen-Weiss. All in favor. Motion approved.

Chair Pagano had the sign-in sheet and advised that each person will have 3 minutes to speak.

#1. Carolyn Ryan – 7 Tower Street, Red Hook.

Mrs. Ryan said she is an abutting property owner and advised she did not received a letter in the mail but is signed up and received the text notice. Secretary Hart confirmed address and advised that a notice of public hearing was mailed to homeowner. Mrs. Ryan advised she mailed in her comments. Secretary Hart said they were not received as of today.

Mrs. Ryan's letter dated November 10, 2025 attached:



CarolynRyanletterP
H87EMarketSt.pdf

#2. Jim Truitt – 24 Bird Street, Red Hook

Mr. Truitt came forward and advised he has lives at this residence with his family for 21 years and that about 15 years ago they added an addition to their house of a great room, large windows which is currently now nature with zero lights and feels with this light proposal it will be light pollution and the parking proposal will create all the headlight glare to go right into their backyard and effect the enjoyment of their backyard. Mr. Truitt spoke about the proposed accessory building which would be in the right of way that him and the property owner had an agreement on stating that Mr. Janelli granted that access to him and feels owner should have to allow him access that he granted to him which he has been using continuously. Mr. Truitt said with this new building he would no longer have access to that part of his property. Mr. Truitt said this new building is about 60 yards from his property line and the view from his backyard would be a privacy invasion and a serious concern as well as vast amount of proposed lighting.

Attorney Polidoro asked if there was a formal document for the right-of-way. Mr. Truitt said no and just a condition from word of mouth that he has been continuously using that property, as the property owner knows, as well as multiple people in this area using that access. Attorney Polidoro said we should pull records to search if there was a condition of the last approval, otherwise it would just be something neighbors allow other neighbors to do. Mr. Truitt said he believes as far as land use if it is over a period of time that it actually becomes a legal right-of-way. Attorney Polidoro said not unless it is hostile. Mr. Truitt said never hostile and always allowed. Mr. Truitt said over the summer he spoke with Mr. Janelli about project and said that Mr. Janellie pointed to other property line indicating opposite side and no conversation about this proposal. Mr. Truitt said his biggest concern is the invasion of privacy and that their great room looks right over that property area and the lighting constantly intrudes into their direction and they are elevated on top which makes it even worse which will be like overlooking something like an airport.

#3. Tony Rohrmeier – 23 Bird Street, Red Hook.

Mr. Rohrmeier said he echoed Mr. Truitt's concerns about the impact of lighting and additional building right near their yard.

Mr. Rohrmeier said he did not see any additional landscaping proposal, and when that property was originally developed he put in big pine trees in his yard to block visual impact.

Mr. Rohrmeier said he had concerns with light pollution from buildings and extension of parking and that if this continues he would like some landscaping done for privacy.

CONTINUING PUBLIC COMMENT:

Mr. Truitt asked about SDS field and how far does an SDS field have to be from a property line. Ms. Dousharm said there is 100% reserve so that is not build out, and the County requires 100%.

Mr. Truitt said from the picture the size scale looks almost about 6 feet from property line where SDS field is going and has concerns about that and the impact of that.

Ms. Dousharm asked if she could address the public. Board said yes.

Ms. Dousharm said the concerns are heard and we are looking at an existing building which is allowed to expand per Zoning to a certain size which requires parking and they are looking at leaving a buffer between this building and all the neighbors that is the intention and if they need to discuss ok but they cannot landscape the woods.

Mr. Truitt said this looks nice on paper but feels it is an illusion and almost transparent from their backyard stating is a good diagram but not what the reality is.

Ms. Dousharm said that is fair and heard but from her point of view as a designer feels it is ridiculous that there is planted spruces between the parking lot - Mr. Truitt said they are insufficient – Ms. Dousharm said totally insufficient so the question would be how do we accommodate everyone in the neighborhood because this building is being expanded based on what is allowed in that area. Ms. Dousharm said this is a weird property and why she talks so much about the path between Blue Echo and sidewalk. Ms. Dousharm said she thought about it a lot and how to connect A to B.

Carolyn Ryan said but you are not. Ms. Dousharm said you are right. Ms. Ryan said you would be building a sidewalk to nowhere. Ms. Dousharm asked so how do I deal with that as a designed – how do you accommodate that because you are correct that we don't have control over the property to the east or west and the little connectors that have organically come on line.

Mr. Rohrmeier asked if the outbuilding was really a necessity. Ms. Dousharm said it is. Mr. Rohrmeier said really. Ms. Dousharm said that is allowed by the Zoning Code and if you have an issue with your Zoning Code than you have to return to your Municipality. Mr. Rohrmeier asked about property values.

Attorney Polidoro suggested maybe a fence to stop headlights. Mr. Rohrmeier said that would take care of the headlights but what about other ambient lighting. Ms. Dousharm said with parking lot lighting they are totally willing to minimize it. Mr. Rohrmeier asked isn't that required. Ms. Dousharm said County has standards and what they did is design to County lighting standards and no one is pushing lighting.

Attorney Polidoro asked how many footcandles was the average for the site. Ms. Dousharm said she did not have exact numbers but said they did a first pass and then reduced it, but can reduce further but had concerns about providing safety for people.

Attorney Polidoro said there are things you can do with lights and that you have to have lights in a parking lot because it gets dark by 4-5o'clock. Ms. Dousharm said correct and you are allowed to have an office building so start there then you have to have parking for the people in the office building and have to have lighting to provide safety of those people and said they can tone it down. Attorney Polidoro said there are spec shields and to take a look at the fixtures in the back and maybe have shields in the back. Ms. Dousharm said they are already doing that and cut off. Ms. Dousharm said at that point we are really splitting hairs and the lighting is cut off along the back.

Mr. Rohrmeier asked about cut off at a certain time period. Ms. Dousharm said they agreed to a time period and cutting off at 10pm.

Mr. Truitt asked about the charging stations and if open to the public 24/7. Ms. Dousharm said no and that it is Code and no one wants that and they are being putting in because of Code. Mr. Truitt asked what kind of lighting would be put in for the public for those charging stations.

Attorney Polidoro said they are not required for the public and required for people using the facility.

Carolyn Ryan asked if they are networked anyone can charge there. Attorney Polidoro said that would be up to the owner and that Ms. Dousharm can go back and talk to the owner about if open to the public. Ms. Dousharm felt this was a great issue and heard their concerns and they don't want them but are required to put them in based on size of parking lot and what they are able to build.

Ms. Dousharm said the whole project is to expand office building based on what is allowed and she hears everyone's concerns and if you have suggestions on how they can better accommodate the buffer between parking lot and neighborhood 100% heard.

Carolyn Ryan spoke on their concern about drainage because they have a little stream in their backyard and their backyard floods all the time because it does not outlet properly and they have upstream wetlands and now with adding more impervious you will be having more drainage to that already compromised system that needs to be evaluated. Ms. Ryan said you also need to submit a highway work permit with NYSDOT for the additional expansion of the property and change in use and the drainage outlets under that property, and the sidewalk is on the State highway property.

Ms. Dousharm said that is heard so there is two drainage locations in the existing parking area and what they are doing is expanding them – asking how is it going to drain – showing on the plans what parts that will drain – but based on geometry of the parking lot you cannot put more drainage and it will drain to that middle and that middle and it doesn't outlet because there is no daylight so what it does is there are multiple tanks underground that feed it back into the drywells.

Attorney Polidoro asked the Board if they wanted to refer to Village Engineer for review. Board said yes.

Attorney Polidoro asked about SEQR. It was discussed that the application was classified as an unlisted with coordinated review last month.

Attorney Polidoro asked if it was sent to the DOT. Ms. Dousharm said no. Attorney Polidoro recommending sending to DOT for comments. Ms. Dousharm said they may have comments on the footpath. Ms. Dousharm said no and that the footpath is not in the right-of-way. Mr. Ryan (Note: but not listed on sheet for public hearing) said it shows on the plans that it is. Ms. Dousharm said the question is if somebody owns this property and they are allowed to expand their building and adding an addition to their building that triggers extra parking..... the footpath is definitely a big part of this, but do we want to put up by the road, no – because someone could get run over by a car.

Mr. Rohrmeier asked if building could be brought closer to the road. Ms. Dousharm said that is what the intention of the Code and the reason this building is back there is because this district is wanting it to be built like a house and why it looks like a house and they are trying to improve aesthetics of the facade and asked why you want that pushed forward.

Attorney Polidoro asked if this was a shed or will people be in there. Ms. Dousharm said people will be in there.

Mr. Truitt said it will be right on top of his backyard. Ms. Dousharm said she hears you but the Code allows you to build it in an area, and the point of this public hearing is to ask how do we make it better for you but if you don't like the Code that is an entirely different process.

Mr. Truitt spoke on Code and State requirements too and not a stand alone to do whatever you want and that just because you can doesn't mean you should and concerns of how it impacts

negatively. Ms. Dousharm said that is why we have site plan review asking how can I make this better for you when the Code allows it.

Mr. Truitt said proposed accessory building is 20 feet high and concerned with lighting.

Ms. Dousharm said their intent is to leave a buffer between this property and the residential district. Mr. Truitt said there is not a buffer and virtually nothing.

Attorney Polidoro asked the Board if they wanted to schedule a site walk. Mr. Truitt said the Board is welcome to his property and look off his back deck too. Ms. Dousharm felt that was not necessary, asking what is the heart of the issue - and we all live and we all know the property and all have been there – so yes there is a thin band of woods between properties...

Mr. Truitt said with this addition and SDS field more hard woods would have to be eliminated = Ms. Dousharm asked what would make it better a fence. Mr. Truitt said a fence wouldn't because his property is elevated above that and have to be 6 feet tall to block it in. Ms. Dousharm said she hears but as a designer she is trying to make it the best she can, and your Zoning/Village allows this building to exist and help her to make her understand how to better exist. Mr. Truitt said if it is the intent of the Code to building that accessory building basically feet away from his property he does not understand the logic and who would want that. Ms. Dousharm said she cannot answer that question and she proposes a site plan that responds to Code and if you have an issue with Code -she understands and it can be valid but – Mr. Truitt said issue with aesthetics and light pollution and water drainage is huge and will impact their property value even further and they already have issues as is and now adding more.

Ms. Dousharm said the Code allows this, and truly understands concerns, but the last solution to this problem was to plant a bunch of lollipop trees along the edge which didn't help you at all so what is the actual practical solution to buffering your house, which she understands is valid but she can't plant another forest.

Mr. Truitt spoke on current structure and not having that much light pollution with no intrusion and the trees there did what they were intended to do and that it is quiet but the accessory dwelling lighting and addition of parking space will be an issue so maybe adding a 6 foot fence will block but certainly not the 20 foot all lighting fixtures on plan and it will look like an airport. Ms. Dousharm said they dialed back lighting to minimum of what County recommends and cutting off at 10pm.

Chair Pagano said what this Board will do is continue public hearing to next month and this Board has some things we need to do and applicant has heard public comments and applicant can discuss with property owner. Chair Pagano said we will hold over public hearing and be open next month and in the meantime things will be referred to Village Engineer.

Secretary Hart advised we will need escrow.

Ms. Dousharm asked if we could talk about that because the geometry of the parking lot is draining to two points, putting in catch basins to accommodate the volume of water going to those two points with multiple underground vessels to let the water go back into the ground from those points.

Attorney Polidoro asked the Board if they wanted to refer to Engineer for a formal review. Ms. Dousharm said technical review of the stormwater. Chair Pagano said the Board has asked for that.

Ms. Dousharm said her only frustration is that they proposed stormwater two meetings ago so could have done technical review already so that is frustrating. Chair Pagano said we also have additional items we have not heard. Ms. Dousharm said stormwater details were discussed at the last meeting so to hear that now, and understands concerns from the public, and knows there is concern with stormwater, but told at last meeting that the path that goes from Blue Echo to the Village is swampy and building up and pitching back towards drainage. Chair Pagano said yes correct, and the Board in addition to you has heard comments from the public and we as a Board have made the decision based upon that and feels there is enough concern for Village Engineer review.

Chair Pagano made a motion to collect escrow in the amount of \$500.00 for referral of site plan for stormwater review to the Village Engineer. Motion seconded by member Markusen-Weiss. All in favor. Motion approved.

Mr. Truitt asked septic could be evaluated with that too. Attorney Polidoro said that gets approved by the County. Chair Pagano said right it is County Board of Health approval. Mr. Truitt said that is something this Board will review too. Ms. Dousharm said yes and is contingent upon their approval.

Carolyn Ryan asked if the drainage plans are in this plan and available on the website and if note (Sheet 1.1) ...“catch basin to be confirmed on site and will be modified as required for the new demand for parking lot and gutters”... was the extent of it. Ms. Dousharm said yes but since this Board asked for technical review they will need to provide more information.

Chair Pagano made a motion at 7:49pm to table and continue the public hearing for the site plan application for 87 E. Market Street listed under Tax Parcel ID 6272-11-646717 to December 11, 2025 at 6:30pm. Motion seconded by Member Markusen-Weiss. All in favor. Motion approved.

Chair Pagano made a motion to schedule a site visit for Board Members for property at 87 E. Market Street. Motion seconded by Member Markusen-Weiss. All in favor. Motion approved.

Attorney Polidoro said this Board will wait on comments from the County but for the next meeting the Board should discuss headlights and a possible proposal.

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

Chair Pagano advised that the Village of Red Hook Water Department consented by Lead Agency response dated November 13, 2025 that the Village of Red Hook Planning Board serve as lead agency.

Ms. Dousharm asked in terms of the technical review and if they are looking solely for drainage of stormwater. Chair Pagano said correct with contingency of Board of Health approval.

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 asked Attorney Polidoro if this Board can give approval without Board of Health approval. Attorney Polidoro said just need permission to file. Marie said yes she would get permission to file and that they already submitted subdivision drawings to the Board. Attorney Polidoro advised the Board that she cannot file until the Department of Health gives permission to file. Marie said she can do that anytime and was going to do it as sheets 1, 2 & 3. Attorney Polidoro said then you would have to renumber. Marie said she will take that off with a different stamp.

Attorney Polidoro advised the Board that the question Marie is asking is that normally you do not approve a lot unless its been proven out that it can support water, sewer, etc. and if it is more than 5 lots you always have to get County approval so when someone buys a lot it is BOH approved, but for smaller subdivisions you are not required to get County approval but the County has to sign the map saying they allow it to be filed, and sometimes if you are unsure about soils or something you can require soil tests, water tests to prove out, but there is actually enough room on this lot to fit septic because you do not want to create a lot that cannot be built.

Marie said it will take 2-3 months for the health department so she cannot even have this Board sign it if she is required to have that approval, but if does not have to have that approval this Board can sign it and she can file it. Attorney Polidoro said if this Board is confident there is room here for septic you could approve it.

Marie said the County only needs a letter form the Village water department that they will provide water to the lots.

Chair Pagano asked Marie to send Secretary Hart a letter requesting that letter. Marie said she will.

Chair Pagano advised this was a continuation of a minor subdivision application for 15 Maizeland Road and that public hearing notice was published as legal notice and added to Village website & Village bulletin board.

Chair Pagano made a motion to classify the minor subdivision for 15 Maizeland Road as an unlisted action with the Village of Red Hook Planning Board to act as lead agency with no outside interested agency involvement. Motion seconded by Member Markusen-Weiss.

Member Markusen-Weiss completed PART II of SEQR.

Chair Pagano asked Marie why it indicated YES for #13 – contain wetlands or other waterbodies regulated by federal, state or local agency. Marie advised one of the adjoining lands may which could be school and could have come from the EAF mapper but there are no wetlands on this particular site. Chair Pagano added a note to #13 that no wetlands and could possibly be an adjacent property.

Member Markusen-Weiss read aloud that it has been determined that based on the information and analysis above, and any supporting documentation, that the proposed action will not result in any significant adverse environmental impacts.

Chair Pagano made a motion to declare a negative declaration for the minor subdivision for 15 Maizeland Road. Motion seconded by Member Markusen-Weiss. All in favor. Motion approved.

Chair Pagano made a motion to open the public hearing for the minor subdivision for 15 Maizeland Road at 8:02pm. Motion seconded by member Markusen-Weiss. All in favor.

Chair Pagano advised that no emails or written responses have been received by Secretary Hart.

Chair Pagano advised that no people were present for the public hearing.

Marie asked if the Board understood her request and what she was asking of Attorney Polidoro, that in rather than waiting for Board of Health approval that this Board sign and because less than 5 lots and have plans done for septic design that she can change be removing stamp that approved by the Health Department and add a “permission to file” stamp and once this Board approved she can get Chair’s signature and file. All Board members agreed to proceed this way.

Chair Pagano made a motion to close the public hearing for the minor subdivision for 15 Maizeland Road at 8:05pm. Motion seconded by Member Markusen-Weiss. All in favor.

Chair Pagano asked if Board had any comments. No comments.

Chair Pagano made a motion to approve the minor subdivision application for 15 Maizeland Road listed under Tax Parcel ID 6272-06-280945 with the following conditions:

Permission to file without Board of Health approval.

Driveway permit applications to be submitted to the Village of Red Hook Building Department when ready to build.

Letter from the Village of Red Hook Water Department for approval to provide water service to all lots.

Motion seconded by Member Markusen-Weiss.

VOTE:

Chair Pagano: YES

Member Zacharzuk: YES

Member David Markusen-Weiss: YES

Member Laura Avella: YES

All in favor. Motion approved.

Chair Pagano made a motion to adjourn the November 13, 2025 planning board meeting at 8:07pm. Motion seconded by Member Zacharzuk. All in favor. Motion approved.

Lara Hart
Secretary to the Planning Board
