

**VILLAGE OF RED HOOK
PLANNING BOARD MEETING
February 12, 2026**

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

Chair Pagano opened the February 12, 2026 Village of Red Hook Planning Board Meeting at 6:31pm with the Pledge of Allegiance

Chair Pagano announced members present, and that there is a quorum.

Chair Pagano made a motion to approve the Planning Board Minutes dated January 8, 2026. Motion seconded by Member Markusen-Weiss. All in favor. Motion approved.

Agenda Item #1

Timely Signs

Owner: Knollwood Commons (consent on file)

35 Firehouse Lane

Tenant: Hudson Valley Chiropractic

Tax Parcel ID 6272-10-365508

PRESENT: Dr. Emily Bobson, D.C.

Chair Pagano announced that applicant was present this evening for signage approval for façade signage.

Applicant advised signage is going on front of the building and is 48x36 on vinyl with satin over laminate – 3 ¼ inch thick PVC with beveled edges. Chair Pagano asked if no other signs on the building. Dr. Bobson said no other signs. Chair Pagano said proposal is 48x36 = 3x4 which equals 12 square feet and Code permits up to 25 square feet so they comply with Zoning.

Chair Pagano asked Board for comments.

Member Avella asked how the sign would be affixed. Applicant advised it was hardy plank siding and will be attached by 4 small screws.

Member Zacharzuk asked if it was where you turn in for Knollwood. Applicant said it is where you drive by not where you turn in. Member Pujol asked where the insurance company used

to be. Applicant said yes. Applicant advised they will be right next it on the south side facing the fire department. Member Zacharzuk asked is that east or west end. Applicant advised it would be the west side and when turning in you would be looking right at it.

Member Avella asked if there was any lighting. Applicant advised no.

No other Board comments.

Chair Pagano advised for the record that the Zoning Officer did a site visit and no other façade signage on the building location.

Chair Pagano made a motion to classify the signage application as a TYPE II Action requiring no further environmental review. Motion seconded by Member Zacharzuk. All in favor. Motion approved.

Chair Pagano made a motion to waive a public hearing for this signage application. Motion seconded by Member Markusen-Weiss. All in favor. Motion approved.

Chair Pagano advised as a condition to approval signage shall not exceed the square footage as provided by the Code of the Village of Red Hook, and that the sign is within the limits allowed and conforms to all provisions of Section 200-38 of the Code of the Village of Red Hook.

Chair Pagano made a motion to approve the proposed 12 square foot façade signage for property located at 35 Firehouse Lane listed under Tax Parcel ID 6272-10-365508. Motion seconded by Member Zacharzuk. All in favor. Motion approved.

Chair Pagano advised that the applicant has already submitted the required building permit to the building department.

Agenda Item #2

Kristina Dousharm Architecture, PLLC

Owner: Red Hook Commons, LLC

87 E. Market Street

Tax Parcel ID: 6272-11-646717

Chair Pagano announced that this is a continuation of site plan application from 11/13/2025.

Chair Pagano advised no amended plans or requested escrow for Engineer stormwater review have been received and that Kristina Dousharm Architect advised on 2/5/2026 that the project is “on hold”.

Chair Pagano mentioned the DOT Comment received asking if any work will be done in the right-of-way and advised that since this application is on hold this can be discussed when back on the agenda.

Chair Pagano said this was subject to public hearing so this Board will need to temporarily open hearing.

Chair Pagano made a motion to open the public hearing for site plan application for 87 E. Market Street at 6:41pm. Motion seconded by Member Markusen-Weiss. All in favor. Motion approved.

Chair Pagano asked if anyone was present to speak. No person present.

Chair Pagano asked if any other comments have been received. Secretary Hart advised no.

Chair Pagano asked Attorney Polidoro how long the Board had to keep hearing open since currently on hold.

Attorney Polidoro advised that she would not consider this application abandoned so the Board could adjourn the public hearing indefinitely so you would not have to keep opening every month, but when applicant is ready to come back it would have to be re-noticed in the paper or continue it for one month.

Board discussed and agreed to keep open and continue public hearing one more month.

Public hearing discussions ended at 6:42PM.

Chair Pagano made a motion to table/continue the public hearing for the site plan for 87 E. Market Street to March 12, 2026 at 6:30pm. Motion seconded by Member Zacharzuk. All in favor. Motion approved.

Chair Pagano made a motion to table the site plan application for 87 E. Market Street to March 12, 2026 at 6:30pm. Motion seconded by Member Markusen-Weiss. All in favor. Motion approved.

Agenda Item #3

Connor & Liam O'Farrell

31 East Markert Street

Tax Parcel ID: 6272-10-482721

Present: Connor O'Farrell; Liam O'Farrell & Martin J. Willms, P.E.

Applicants/P.E. submitted amended plans; copy of survey; copy of license agreement; copy of filed deed and building material/lighting plan at meeting. All members and Attorney were provided copies.

Liam spoke on the issue of the deeded driveway with the Henke property and felt it was addressed with their new submission.

Chair Pagano said none of this new submission has been reviewed and asked to leave discussions to next month after review by Board members and Attorney.

Mr. Willms explained that the deed has a very brief description. Attorney Polidoro advised they handed members a license agreement that could be revoked at any time. Attorney Polidoro asked if they could get something more permanent. Mr. Willms said conversation around that document is the parking issue. Attorney Polidoro said she understands but that a license agreement is an agreement that is very temporary in nature and does not run with the land and can be revoked.

Mr. Willms said that is use of the driveway and the difference is right now they show 6 parking spots and owners have an agreement with Mr. Henke (next door) for additional parking spots to try to meet the Village's requirement of 1.5 spaces per dwelling unit. Connor advised they have 5 apartments with 6 spots behind. Mr. Willms said right now they provide 6 spots and this non-binding agreement with give additional spots but is not for access and that the access is deeded. Attorney Polidoro said then it is for 2 spots. Mr. Willms said correct to bring them to 8. Liam stated the direct right-of-way in is deeded.

Chair Pagano said it's one sentence on the deed and asked Victoria for comment.

Mr. Willms said there is a building on either side and very well defined. Liam said yes this licenses 2 spots additionally, but anytime Mr. Henke's people are doing anything there they are crossing their property line as well, so this is a communal thing when they approached Mr. Henke that everyone is using each other's properties so to come up with a full agreement on who is going to maintain this, pave and drainage.

Connor said there are two subjects on this:

Access parking which they have a deed and Board asked for that

Parking – they spoke to Mr. Henke and have an agreement with Mr. Henke and that agreement is showing 6 spots plus additional 2 on Henke property and he has agreed to this as a base line.

Member Zacharzuk asked if 2 spaces will be in the deed. Liam said it is in the licensing agreement. Member Zacharzuk said and could be revoked at any time. Liam said yes.

Member Markusen-Weiss asked how many additional spaces are needed. Chair Pagano said 1.5 per dwelling unit. Mr. Willms said street parking is ok but only for the commercial space. Chair Pagano said but not for residential and referenced Village's seasonal parking regulation. Mr. Willms said there is 6 and they basically have a spot for every bedroom. Chair Pagano referenced this recent snow and said if they have 6 spots and 2 licensed spots where would all the snow go. Liam explained they haul it all out – not small storms – just big storms.

Attorney Polidoro asked if the 6 spots were navigable and if cars could pull in and out and that the plans should demonstrate a turn path. Mr. Willms said they could do that. Attorney Polidoro recommended that the Board look at this and that applicant may need a variance for parking.

Connor said it was already discussed with Henke that people would be coming after work to park and Henke only uses the lot during his business hours and a big overlap of empty space.

Member Markusen Weiss asked Attorney Polidoro with agreement being able to be revoked at any time this Board would be in position that they do not have enough parking spots.

Attorney Polidoro said correct and thinks the agreement is great but this Board cannot rely on that because of being revoked so let the applicants figure it out how many spaces could fit back there, and it maybe needs to be referred for a variance.

Chair Pagano referenced a past experience with two uses next to each other where one used during the day and the other, which primarily would have cars there during the evening hours and they had some kind of agreement that office could use parking during the day, but at certain hour the parking lot had to be empty giving them the evening use. Victoria said that would be great having a shared parking agreement but it needs to run with the land.

Liam said their attorney had the time frame in at 8am-4pm , but Henke doesn't need 2 additional spots and why they took away the even split.

Member Pujol said for planning purposes they are looking for the 1.5 and real access, and second purpose is that it does not expire so with those things, is it better to go back to see the max that applicants can get for spaces and then time in terms of contract.

Member Markusen-Weiss said they would have to get it deeded in, in order for this Board to consider, which is probably a big ask. Member Pujol said it is, and probably impossible.

Member Markusen-Weiss said so as Victoria stated they could go for a variance.

Member Pujol said assume they are going to need a variance, and not get the deed, isn't better and helpful to everyone to make a decision later if they can go back and say can we get 3 spots and a contract for 5 years.

Member Markusen-Weiss said that would be great for them but not for us. Attorney Polidoro said it might be good for them to get the variance.

Mr. Willms said they will start with showing how many spots they can have there that are navigable.

Attorney Polidoro asked if spots were 9x18. Mr. Willms advised 8.5 x 18. Attorney Polidoro said Code indicates 9x18. Attorney Polidoro said you have to comply with Code or get a variance for that as well.

Member Zacharzuk had concerns and felt they could sign contracts for 5 years but what if Henke sells and with that building what if they decided to add apartments, that would affect their parking. Chair Pagano felt that is why Mr. Henke did a licensing agreement and not deeded, because it would limit what he could do with his property.

Liam said they will explore turn radius and speak to Mr. Henke again.

Mr. Willms said they tried to address Board's concerns from last time with new plans.

Chair Pagano asked about fire access. Attorney Polidoro said it was for emergency access and to ask the building inspector for his review. Secretary Hart said a memo was sent to board members that Mr. Keith felt emergency vehicles do not access and use ladder trucks and sees no emergency access issue.

Chair Pagano said Attorney Polidoro asked for the extent of right-of-way to be added to the plans. Attorney Polidoro said yes - the driveway right-of-way, but they came back and there is no extent and just says use of the driveway and there isn't any width so if they enter into an agreement with Henke and establish a width and a maintenance agreement it's probably in their best interest.

Attorney Polidoro asked if the sewer easement goes under the building. Easement/path was discussed and shown on plans. Chair Pagano asked where it comes in from. Mr. Willms said from the back from fore main. Chair Pagano said a sewer/water review will be done by Delaware Engineering.

Chair Pagano asked are you adding drywells/catch basins. Liam said catch basins. Mr. Willms said they will be directing any roof drainage to gutters which will go to leader to catch basins to drywells. Mr. Willms showed locations on the plans and advised there was 3 catch basins. Attorney Polidoro asked but one drywell and will need Engineering review. Chair Pagano said yes.

Attorney Polidoro asked if you are taking stormwater off Henke's property then you would need to give him an easement. Mr. Willms asked a drainage easement. Attorney Polidoro said yes and if you are designing your parking lot so that all the water is crossing his lot Mr. Willms said it does that now and by nature of the layout of the land and without designing anything it is doing that. Attorney Polidoro asked about his roof liters- where do they go. Mr. Willms said they are not concerned about it and its an existing building. They are taking his roof area into account but just saying his roof liter goes somewhere right now and not causing a problem and they will provide infiltration.

Chair Pagano asked about the survey. Mr. Willms gave a copy of survey from John Decker. Secretary Hart made copies for all Board members and attorney.

Chair Pagano said the Board needs tables for zoning and parking added to the plans. Mr. Willms said they will provide that. Attorney Polidoro asked if they meet lot coverage. Mr. Willms said yes. Attorney Polidoro asked if they knew their lot coverage. Mr. Willms said lot coverage is 65% and they are at 48%.

Chair Pagano said tables will show parking, zoning & lot coverage.

Chair Pagano said next month we will discuss elevations.

Chair Pagano asked about lighting and that cut sheets were provided. Chair Pagano said we like 3000 – Mr. Willms said 3000 ok. Chair Pagano said they submitted siding pictures, roof pictures.

Mr. Willms said they were shooting for an average of 1 foot candle in the rear parking area and not have more than .02 foot candle spill over to the neighboring lot. At the N end of parking area LED light on pole mounted shining into the parking area and that 1 foot candle boundary does cross Henke property line, but it's a combined parking area so feel it would be welcomed.

Rear of property was discussed towards Baright property (storage) and Mr. Willms said he was not sure how to show luminosity diagram but there will be a 3 sided shade on the LED's to limit spill over.

Member Pujol asked for neighbor perspective could lights be on a timer/sensors. Chair Pagano said this was lot for apartments. Mr. Pujol said yes but would like sensors for motion. Mr. Willms said ok to 2700K and not stay on for hours. Member Pujol spoke on sensor location Recommendations and Mr. Willms said they will work with their lighting rep. **Chair Pagano said a condition on approval will be that sensors pick up from both directions.**

Member Zacharzuk asked with revised drawings could you expand the legend to include the condensers. Mr. Willms said yes.

Mr. Willms spoke about septic tank, drywells and water service with condenser units and won't be seen from the street.

Member Zacharzuk asked if it was a roll-out dumpster. Mr. Willms said yes. Attorney Polidoro asked if it was screened. Mr. Willms said there is a gate across.

Chair Pagano asked if we need to approve the sign on the gate of the dumpster. Board discussed and decided no.

Attorney Polidoro asked if there was a curb cut and looks like the sidewalk stops. Connor advised curb cut was in wrong place on the plans. Mr. Willms advised it will be corrected and paved and applicants/owners will remove snow.

Member Zacharzuk asked about east side and the stockade fence asking if it comes up besides their property. Mr. Willms advised there is an exiting stockade fence. Liam said overgrown trees no fence – but found posts deep in brush. Mr. Willms said it was a debunked fence and stops at property line corner.

Member Zacharzuk asked on east side of parking lot will you put evergreen to kill the headlights. Mr. Willms said they can add a stockade fence with details.

Member Zacharzuk asked if they informed their neighbor that a dumpster would be right next to them. Liam said no.

Chair Pagano asked the Board if they were good for this month.

Attorney Polidoro asked how many units. Liam advised 5. Attorney Polidoro asked if they knew the 600 habitable square footage required by Zoning. Liam said yes.

Attorney Polidoro asked to provide a basic floor plan.

Chair Pagano asked Attorney Polidoro about SEQR. Attorney Polidoro said not a type II due to being 5 units and would be an unlisted action and can be done at the next meeting.

Attorney Polidoro asked if Board felt it was ready to submit to County for comments. Mr. Willims said not now and asked to wait.

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 March 12, 2026 at 6:30pm. Motion seconded by Member Markusen-Weiss. All in favor.

Attorney Polidoro asked if the Board wanted her to stay for the next application. Chair Pagano said yes.

Agenda Item #4

Erin Hayes, Superintendent - RHCS D

65 W. Market Street & Linden Ave. Rear

Tax Parcel ID's: 6272-06-319834; 6272-06-266873; 6272-05-215857 & 6272-05-215893

Present: Dr. Erin Hayes, Superintendent, Thomas Cassata, Athletic Director & James Selinka, Architect.

Chair Pagano announced application is for site plan for proposed field lighting for the Football/Track fields at Red Hook Central School District.

Chair Pagano advised that on 12/4/2026 there was a preliminary meeting held with Mayor Karen Smythe, Zoning Officer Thomas Keith, myself Beth Pagano, PB Chair, Erin Hayes, Superintendent, Janet Warden, Superintendent, and Lara Hart, Building Clerk in attendance and at that meeting proposed applicants were advised they would need site plan approval and 239m referral to Dutchess County Planning & Development.

Dr. Erin Hayes advised that last May voters approved a proposition to reconstruct the athletic field that sit between middle school and high school as well as the athletic track and part of that proposition was to include adding lights that would light the field and track separately. Dr. Hayes indicated the lights would be LED lights as proposed in plans and similar to the Kingston-Rhinecliff bridge lights in that the light pollution is not normal and would light directly what is under it. Dr. Hayes advised they would like to use the lights during the academic year September – June; but likely not in June because it stays light out.

Ms. Hayes advised that Tom Cassata, athletic director was present and architect to answer questions.

Dr. Hayes advised that they have a limited number of athletic events that play on the field at night so really it would be more for track lighting.

Chair Pagano said this is a lovely presentation but very difficult to read and asked architect to run through the presentation.

Cover Sheet – pictures

Second Sheet – indicates # of light poles they would have, being a total of 5: 2 - 70ft poles

Third Sheet: has the lighting illumination levels and from the bleachers with 2 - 80ft poles from the side of the bleachers and a 50ft pole to the right (near the jump pit).

Chair Pagano asked for total number of fixtures for 5 big poles.

Architect advised a total of 50. Chair Pagano asked a total of 50 lights – 45 of what kind of light and 5 of the poles. Architect advised they are all on the poles.

Member Pujol said there are 5 poles – 4 on the main field and 1 on the side. Member Avella asking if each pole has 10 lights. Architect said in a sense yes and multiple fixtures.

Chair Pagano asked if there was a light down at the 16-foot level. Architect said yes, and on the taller poles (the F1, F2, F3 & F4) there is lighting at the top and additional illumination at 15 foot to help light the balls as they are playing – which will be similar to the 80 foot poles.

Member Zacharzuk asked for a diagram of the pole and where they are located. Architect advised they will provide that with cut sheets. Attorney Polidoro said pole with fixtures.

Chair Pagano asked why 2 poles are 70 feet and 2 poles are 80 feet. Architect said he thinks higher at the bleachers and no seating there. Chair Pagano said that is also the side where a lot of the houses are – behind the bleachers.

Architect said the reason they are high is if you think about it as an auditorium - at the back is the spot light and that provides focus of what you are looking at, where at the front of the stage are the flood lights that illuminate everything so the idea is to get the poles up high enough so you can use them as floodlights so you can clip off the end so it doesn't have as much light trespass.

Member Pujol asked about hours lighting will be on. Dr. Hayes advised 10pm. Member Pujol asked if that was for games or practices. Dr. Hayes said for practices as well. Chair Pagano said plans indicate 9 & 10 and why both. Dr. Hayes said they need a later time for sport events but not for track.

Member Pujol asked if track lights would stay on. Dr. Hayes said if community were to walk on the track. Member Pujol said so every day. Dr. Hayes said yes but not during lighter hours in the summer and in the winter they do not have the track because it is not walkable. Member Pujol said so for track it will be on every day until 9pm and if a game it will be upwards to 10. Dr. Hayes said yes. Mr. Cassata said additionally if there is an athletic event they will have all the lights on. Member Pujol asked about walking track and if it would be every day including weekends. Dr. Hayes advised they do not have staff on the weekend so just weekdays. Dr. Hayes advised they are not on automatically and will have on & off switches for staff to turn on & off. Member Pujol asked if they could be on & off with an automatic switch. Dr. Hayes said they did not build that in and want it to be manual but could explore that.

Member Zacharzuk asked if the track is closed on the weekends. Dr. Hayes said no she thinks people use on the weekends during the daylight. Member Zacharzuk said the lights will be on until 9pm during the week and during the weekend they are off. Dr. Hayes said yes.

Architect said the plans show different lighting options and referenced the sheet that shows 58 in green – that is what the lighting levels would be for the football field – so you see the greater than 50-foot footcandles - so that specific lighting is just for a football game.

Architect referenced next page – for lacrosse field with different lighting levels. Next one is for the track which only shows the lighting around the track, and those levels would be for when there is a track event which range from 9-30.

Chair Pagano asked so if there was a track event would only the 16 foot lights be on. Architect said no.

Next is for walking track and that has lower levels and still some in 16-17's but a lower-level lighting with less fixtures on.

Member Zacharzuk asked to number the pages and list sport, i.e. football.

Chair Pagano said she is always confused when it comes to footcandles because it can say zero but where it says zero there is still light flooding into the area referencing a prior site plan for CVS so doesn't know how to interpret this.

Attorney Polidoro said with zero you can still see light but it means it is not lighting the ground in that area.

Member Pujol said .1 is like moonlight so you will see but should not be disturbing to the eye.

Architect asked to look at another page – referencing page that lists zeros and shows where the lighting level reaches zero so you can see where it trespasses and the page before shows the footcandles at the property line of the district so that varies from zero to a high of about 3.6 (by F2).

Attorney Polidoro asked if CVS were LED's because the new LEDs are different and cut off more. Chair Pagano felt it could have been pre-LED days.

Member Pujol said hours of operation during the week is just the track, unless there is a game, 9pm or to be done manually, but always be by 10. Mr. Cassata said unless they run into overtime with a game. Chair Pagano said and only during the school year. Dr. Hayes said during school year and not in the winter months. Mr. Cassata said the fact that it is a grass field really limits how much they can use – so in the Fall it will be football and in the spring Lacrosse, but they cannot play Lacrosse in the “twilight” period due to being dangerous seeing the ball. Member Pujol asked so they don't have a light. Dr. Hayes said only if it is completely dark. Mr. Cassata said they hardly ever play night lacrosse games and it is hard to determine number of events, but track can say one night track invitational, but a lot of kids come for track and safety is tricky. Mr. Cassata said there are some events that are not in the lighted area so those would be omitted from an event which is challenging when trying to run events, but not say they would not run some practices because it could be hot during the day and not at night.

Dr. Hayes said in reality you are talking about 5 sports events, but they do not really want to give an exact number in case that changes. Mr. Cassata said 15-20 would be on the high side.

Member Pujol asked if all the lights would be dark sky compliant and asked what color. Architect said he thinks 5700k which is standard but could reach out to them and talk about that. Mr. Cassata said he know this is hard to conceptualize but when he goes to other schools that have these lights, i.e. FDR – as you are walking down the field is lit up but you are walking in darkness and knows it is hard to explain but this is a different field, and referenced Rondout field – very remote but as your drive in all you see is this box of lights and that is how these lights will be.

Chair Pagano said Red Hook is different because it is sandwiched in a residential neighborhood, so everyone's concern is that we don't have the luxury of lots of space around the high school and it is surrounded by a residential neighborhood.

Attorney Polidoro said it would be helpful to have standards on how fields have to be lit to be safe to include color temperatures.

Member Pujol and Board felt 5600 was bright.

Chair Pagano said one thing talked about at the December meeting was if lights would be on during practices. Dr. Hayes said they have a separate practice field. Mr. Cassata said since this is a natural grass field he or someone in position will limit the use on that field, and will there be days they are on it – yes but does not see that happening a lot at night and limited to a few different sports only.

Attorney Polidoro asked reason why cannot have soccer games. Mr. Cassata explained small size track and spoke about sidelines. Ms. Hayes advised not enough space to do grass runoff. Mr. Cassata advised that this field could not be built totally flat due to drain issues so not ideal for soccer.

Member Markusen-Weiss said he notices that light comes out to some neighbor's property and if there were options to baffle that further. Architect said these plans do not take into consideration the trees there and can look into that.

Chair Pagano asked if the Board could get plans that show the houses around it. Architect said sure and will help make area diagram to make more sense. Member Pujol asked with candles and numbers. Chair Pagano said yes. Architect said to show cutoff. Chair Pagano said exactly. Member Zacharzuk said to number the pages.

Chair Pagano asked the Board about retaining Village Planning Board Attorney Victoria Polidoro and requesting escrow. Board members agreed yes. Dr. Hayes asked for clarification. Chair Pagano said this Board will have attorney representation for meetings and will request \$750.00 in escrow. Dr. Hayes asked if District could provide the attorney. Chair Pagano said for this Board no.

Chair Pagano made a motion to request escrow in the amount of \$750.00 to retain the services of Planning Board Attorney Victoria Polidoro.

Dr. Hayes said if the school board declines then they will withdraw the application.

Attorney Polidoro said she will waive escrow being it is a taxpayer issue and she is here on another project anyway.

Chair Pagano put on the record that Attorney Polidoro has waived escrow and doing work Pro Bono and thanked Attorney Polidoro.

Member Pujol said the lighting at the neighbors is the biggest concern and important to this Board and like attorney Polidoro said, we can talk about this in theory, but if there is an issue there needs to be a way of solving it in case all of a sudden we agree that we want this and we

want that – but it becomes something else it is important to have something said or a person to say that wasn't what was agreed to... Attorney Polidoro said like an engineer. Member Pujol said an engineer, or something because this does affect neighbors. Attorney Polidoro said that would be enforcement.

Architect felt enforcement would be NYSED because that is who they submitted to for approval and who approved.

Member Pujol said what he is saying is if something is off or wrong that we would need to figure it out. Dr. Hayes said these plans had to be submitted NYSED so they are approved by the State and asked if what they are saying is if they get turned on and there becomes an issue? Member Pujol said what he is saying is if they get turned on and there is an issue that nobody expected that, i.e. lighting too much on the houses.

Chair Pagano said it is an issue that at some point this Board will approve the installation of these lights with the understanding that it will comply and be in accordance with these plans but they get turned on and there is an issue.

Attorney Polidoro advised if they are in compliance with the plans and approved then that is what it is.

Dr. Hayes asked if there was Code that they are missing that they should know about in terms of the lighting in terms of residential homes.

Attorney Polidoro said they do not want any off-site trespass of light. Dr. Hayes said and if they are at zero in front of a residential structure that does that cover them.

Member Markusen-Weiss said specifically on the north side he is not sure if tree coverage covers a 70-foot pole there.

Architect asked with the mechanicals if there could there be a condition with the light levels after installed. Attorney Polidoro said yes. Chair Pagano said that makes sense and felt answers Member Pujol's concern.

Chair Pagano made a motion to adjourn the site plan application for Red Hook Central School District for Tax Parcel ID No.'s 6272-06-319834; 06-266873; 05-215857; 05-215893 to March 12, 2026 at 6:30pm. Motion seconded by Member Markusen-Weiss. All in favor.

Attorney Polidoro asked what their construction schedule was. Dr. Hayes said they do not have one yet as it has not been put out to bid.

Chair Pagano said they will return next month and it will probably be referred to the County and the next month we will get comments back from the County and then can schedule the public hearing. Attorney Polidoro said we can schedule it in March for April. Chair Pagano said that makes sense.

Architect asked referred to the County for what. Attorney Polidoro advised in NY because you are on a County/State Road it has to go to Dutchess County Planning and Development as referral recommendation.

Chair Pagano made a motion to adjourn the February 12, 2026 planning board meeting at 8:05pm. Motion seconded by Member Markusen-Weiss. All in favor. Motion approved.

Lara Hart
Planning Board Secretary
