

Town of Red Hook Planning Board
Approved Minutes / Monday May 18, 2026

6:30 PM CALL TO ORDER / DETERMINATION OF QUORUM/ BUSINESS SESSION Chairperson Sam Phelan, began the meeting at 6:35pm. The board members present at the Town Hall were Arthur Salman, Jay Quaintance, and Nancy Low-Hogan. Board member Ariadne Montare was present at 6:45. Planning Board Clerk Katie Khakhar was present in person. Planning Board consultants Ted Fink and Brandee Nelson were present via Zoom. Attorney Jennifer Gray with Keane and Beane was present via zoom.

Jay Quaintance made a motion to approve the minutes of the May 4, 2026, Planning Board meeting. Arthur Salman seconded and all members voted in favor.

Chairman Sam Phelan stated that the Old Rhinebeck Aerodrome was on the agenda tonight to review the Part 3 EAF and once the board finished their review, comments would be heard.

OLD BUSINESS-

Schmidt - Garage/ Cottage Special Use Permit –Applicants Erik Schmidt and Sequoia Neuro
Continued discussion for an application to construct a 1,497 sq ft mixed use accessory structure on parcel 810466 located at 230 Rokeby Road

Applicants Erik Schmidt and Sequoia Neuro were present in person. They reviewed the renderings and materials list that was submitted May 7, 2026. The board members discussed the proposed siding materials and parking areas and asked for clarification regarding the proposed lighting. The applicants reviewed the proposed lighting locations and confirmed the lighting specs had been previously submitted.

The board members discussed the location of the proposed accessory building and how it would be viewed from the road. The applicants explained that the building will be partially screened by trees and other landscaping.

Town Planner Ted Fink noted that the applicants submitted two EAF forms that do not match. The board members requested the applicants update the EAF.

Town Engineer Brandee Nelson noted that the applicant's lighting specification sheets proposed 4000K fixtures, while zoning requires outdoor lighting below 3000K. The board requested that the applicants revise the lighting plan to comply with the zoning requirements.

Nancy Low-Hogan made a motion to set a Public Hearing for June 1, 2026. Jay Quaintance seconded the motion, and all members voted in favor.

NEW BUSINESS-

3974 Route 9G- Rolin Fields Exterior Fields - Site Plan – Applicants 3974 Route 9G LLC-

Presentation of an application to install exterior fields with lights and netting on parcel 504105 located at 3974 Route 9G in the RD3 zoning district.

The applicants were present in person and reviewed their submitted site plan showing one exterior soccer field and one concrete pickleball court, both on the north side of the parcel. The board members discussed the proposed lighting and the applicants responded that they are proposing four 25-foot-high shrouded exterior lights to be installed 45 feet from each corner of the soccer field. They plan to submit the photometric drawings once they become available.

The board members further discussed if the proposed lighting would create glare on Route 9G. The applicants clarified that they are proposing lights with specific dimensions to be installed at these locations to ensure they will not light anything beyond the field.

The board members asked how far the proposed fields edge was from the road. The applicants responded that the field was set 30 feet from the road. They added that the field was set further back from the Dutchess County setback requirement of 30 feet from the center of the road. The board members asked what safety measures the applicants plan to take to prevent soccer balls entering the roadway. The applicants explained they were also proposing a 20-foot-high netting system. The board members questioned whether the fields could be moved further away from the road, and closer to the building. The applicants responded that the septic system was located in front of the building.

The board members explained that this zoning area requires a 60-foot front yard setback and a 35-foot side yard setback for structures and the fence and lights are considered structures as per the Town's zoning codes. Town engineer Brandee Nelson recommended that the applicant add the zoning setbacks on the site plan for clarity and added that a variance would also be needed for the lights as the zoning codes only allow for 20ft high poles. The board members suggested the applicant go to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance for the front and side setbacks and for the heights of the fencing and lights.

The applicants questioned how the previous owner was allowed to install a miniature golf course with fencing approximately 4 feet from the side yard and had 40-foot-high lights.

Town Planner, Ted Fink discussed the SEQR process, noting this application would be an unlisted action as proposed with one soccer field. Ted Fink requested the applicants update the EAF as there was a mistake with question 12A, as this parcel is contiguous with the National Historic Landmark District. The EAF will need to be updated before the board can circulate for lead agency. He added that this parcel also borders a State Scenic District.

Claykill LLC - Amended Subdivision- Applicant: Sarah Sweeney

Presentation of an application to amend a building envelope to accommodate a septic system on parcel 739369 located on Stonybrook Road in the Water Conservation and Agricultural Business Zoning Districts.

Sarah Sweeney, present in person, reviewed the proposed changes to a building envelope. She explained she is attempting to sell the property and would like it to have Board of Health Approval. Increasing the building envelope would allow the space for a septic system with a leech field to be constructed.

Ted Fink explained that this application is considered a re-subdivision. An updated signed map will need to be filed with Dutchess County. The board members waived the need for a Public Hearing as the proposed change was a minor modification. They requested the Town Engineer, Brandee Nelson, draft a letter of authorization before Sam Plelan can sign the maps.

OLD BUSINESS-

Old Rhinebeck Aerodrome Master Plan- Special Use Permit- Applicant Representative Kelly Libolt of KARC

Continued discussion for a Special Use Permit Application for a Master Plan for Rhinebeck Aerodrome Museum on parcel 820860 located at 9 Norton Road in the RD3 District.

Sam Phelan stated that the purpose of the meeting was to review the Part 3 EAF. Project details will be discussed more fully as each phase moves closer to completion. He added that the Zoning Enforcement Officer has determined the parcel to be an Airport Facility, and that the Planning Board's role is to follow the ZEO's direction and ensure compliance with the laws. He also noted that a formal public hearing on the project will be held on June 1, 2026.

Town planner, Ted Fink, reviewed the updated Part 2 EAF which included the following updates:

- 1a, 1b, 1c, 3d, 3h, 3k, 4a, 4f: Changed from "no, or small impact may occur" to "moderate to large impact may occur"
- 7 Changed from no to yes

- 7a through 7j now answered “no, or small impact may occur”
- 9 Changed from no to yes
- 9a now answered “moderate to large impact may occur”
- 9b through 9f now answered “no, or small impact may occur”
- 18 Changed from no to yes
- 18a through 18f now answered “no, or small impact may occur”
- 18g now answered: the proposed action will help preserve an important facility to the community

Kelly Libolt reviewed the reasons behind some of the changes. She explained the change to question 7 was due to the amphibian crossings in the area and the change to question 18 was because the design of the buildings warranted a narrative in the Part 3 EAF.

Kelly Libolt began her review of the Part 3 EAF narrative by explaining that the proposed cabins and walking path have been removed from the Master Plan. She then reviewed clarified sections of the Master Plan. Those clarifications include:

- **Parking.** There is NO additional parking being created. Currently, there are over 500 parking spaces that are being used. Approximately 20 of those spaces are paved. The Master Plan proposed to stripe the grass spaces and have 80 spaces paved and striped. That will yield a DECREASE in over 52 parking spaces.
- **Additional Square Footage.** The Master Plan does NOT intend to expand the existing use nor create a new destination, but to ensure the existing aviation equipment is properly stored and maintained. The new building spaces will provide safety, efficient central utilization of tools and equipment, and sufficient space between and around planes. Kelly Libolt stated that the Aerodrome currently houses over 70 airplanes, 40 vehicles, over 100 engines and multiple spare parts and components. She explained that the recommended square footage needed for storage of two planes is approximately 80 ft x 70 ft, or 5600 sq ft.
- **Trees/ Winnakee Land Trust.** There are no significant areas of tree removal being proposed. Kelly Libolt explained that currently there are no trees anticipated for removal as the proposed improvements are in areas which are already developed and utilized for the airport facility. Kelly Libolt further explained the Winnakee Land Trust owns a conservation easement covering a small area around the Becht Barn at the north end of the runway. The conservation easement is in place on a parcel where no improvements are proposed.
- **Events:** There are NO CHANGES to the events that are currently held at the Aerodrome. The Aerodrome would like to open only the proposed facility from January 1 through

December 31, 7 days a week from 10 am – 5 pm (weather dependent), if it is financially attainable.

- Liquor License: The Aerodrome is NOT seeking a liquor license for regular distribution of alcohol on site. The Aerodrome currently contracts with outside vendors for special events. The vendors that contract with the Aerodrome will continue to be responsible for obtaining their own TEMPORARY liquor license for the purpose of a special event only.
- Wetlands: The wetlands on site were flagged and validated by NYSDEC on May 27, 2025, after the updated regulations were put in place.

Town Engineer, Brandee Nelson, noted that the delineated wetlands map shows a stream, wetlands, and the wetlands buffer areas. She suggested that the applicants clarify the reason for constructing the proposed buildings in the chosen locations.

Kelly Libolt said an alternative site for the History of Flight Building, closer to the existing bleachers, was considered. That site was not chosen due to the bedrock, the size limitations caused by the runway, and greater difficulty in maneuvering the planes. Kelly Libolt added that there is an existing hanger that was built in the wetland buffer and to mitigate further intrusion to the wetland buffer, they are planning to use helical piles for all new construction. She further added that this construction would need to be approved by the DEC.

Brandee Nelson suggested the applicant clarify in the Part 3 EAF how the size or operation of the runway adds a constraint to the placement of the buildings. Tara Grieg, of the Old Rhinebeck Aerodrome stated that visitors are prevented from crossing the runway due to safety concerns.

Brandee Nelson noted that the Master Plan does indicate stormwater management areas, however, more detailed stormwater management plans and erosion and sediment control plans will be required during future site plan reviews. She added that the Master Plans noted the locations of the proposed septic system that meets regulatory setbacks and would also require more details during future site plan reviews.

Brandee Nelson suggested the applicants provide more details as to how the grass parking areas would be striped. Brandee added that there are vegetative buffers that will be preserved, and suggested the applicants submit a simple viewshed of the buildings from the road.

Sam Phelan compared the buildings to be removed with the proposed new buildings, noting that the area to be disturbed is in the already developed part of the facility. Tara Grieg added

that they would like to replace the wooden seating with new bleachers in the same area. Kelly Libolt explained that one barn near the parking area on Norton Road is intended to be repurposed as the new covered walkway and the second barn in the same area would remain. Kelly Libolt added that the buildings on the hill currently used for storage would remain as storage. Tara Grieb added that those buildings may need to come down in the future due to their poor conditions, but there are no plans to remove them at this time.

The board members discussed the setback requirements. Kelly Libolt noted that there were no areas outside of the setback requirements apart from approximately three ADA parking spaces. She added that they might seek a variance from the ZBA if they were not able to reconfigure the parking spaces.

Jay Quaintance addressed the pedestrian areas within the parking lots and asked for clarity regarding the flow of pedestrians from the parking areas, across the road, and into the facility. They asked the applicant to better clarify the direction of flow through those areas in the Part 3 EAF. Tara Grieb stated that the Aerodrome currently employees parking attendants on air show days.

The board members asked if there were any way-finding signage proposed. Kelly Libolt clarified that information regarding way-finding signage was provided, but they would add that to the Part 3 EAF.

Arthur Salman discussed the anticipated traffic after the project is completed and asked if the Aerodrome's goal was to increase tourism. Kelly Libolt responded that the goal of the project is not to increase the numbers of visitors, but rather to protect the planes and create spaces to preserve and maintain the planes for the air shows. The applicants understand that by improving the site it could potentially increase the number of visitors, but it is not the intention of the Aerodrome. Kelly Libolt added that these planes require 13 hours of maintenance for each hour of flight, and these buildings will allow the space to work on the planes safely. Tara Grieb explained that historically the Aerodrome would see 1500 visitors on a Saturday and 3000 visitors on a Sunday. As destination interests have changed, the Aerodrome visitation has down trended to today's average of approximately 240 visitors at each air show. Tara Grieb added that on weekdays without special events or air shows, the Aerodrome typically receives about 10-20 visitors and expects similar attendance if it opens the facility during winter hours.

The board members discussed how the Aerodrome handles the volume of cars and visitors on its busiest days, such as Father's Day weekend when the Aerodrome could see 700 visitors. Tara

Grieb responded that the Aerodrome regularly uses two large lots and they keep two large overflow lots ready for overflow parking for the occasional busy days.

Nancy Low-Hogan asked the applicants to clarify their response regarding ingress and egress, noting that the EAF had a contradiction. She added that on page 46, it stated that the expansion of the Aerodrome would allow for the programming of more air shows and events per year. Kelly Libolt responded that it was a typo and clarified that no more air shows are planned. She agreed to make these corrections to the Part 3 EAF.

Nancy Low-Hogan asked the applicants to explain how the number of special events is not anticipated to increase when they would be open an additional 5 months of the year. Tara Grieb clarified that anything that was not an air show was called a special event and noted that currently some of the educational programs do meet in the winter months. The board asked if the Aerodrome would hold more events with access to a heated building. Tara Grieb responded that if they could afford to heat the building, they might hold an event inside in the colder months. She added that because the Aerodrome is not equipped to operate in the dark they are limited to holding special events in daylight hours only. The board members requested the applicants update the EAF Part 3 to clarify that special events have a daylight operation limitation.

PUBLIC COMMENTS-

Attorney Ken Stenger, representing Tomas Wise, a neighbor of the Aerodrome, made a comment regarding the Zoning Enforcement Officer's determination. He asked if the current ZEO only used the determination from 2020 to make his determination in 2025. He suggested that if the current ZEO had the determination from 2019, which classified this facility as a museum, it might have changed the determination from 2025. He asked the board to consider not casting any votes until a new determination is made.

Sam Phelan responded that the Planning Board has clear direction from the ZEO with a clear set of rules they must follow. He added that it is not the position of the Planning Board to rebut the decision of the ZEO.

Attorney for the Planning Board, Jennifer Gray, responded that there are no legal impediments for the Planning Board to proceed. The board has a written determination, and they will move forward with that.

Jonathon Becker asked for clarity regarding the language "maximize other site uses" on the Master Plan.

The Aerodrome representatives responded that the language appeared in an earlier version of the Master Plan and has since been removed.

Jonathon Becker asked for clarity regarding the phrase “varied air performances and times” and asked how you can add a 28,000 sq ft building and a 25,000 sq ft buildings without changing the scale or character of the area.

The board members responded that there is clearly an impact from the scale of the buildings and added that the applicants have clearly explained the reasons why the facility would require that much space.

Tomas Wise raised concerns about the scale of the buildings, and whether the Aerodrome will change into an event space and large-scale tourist destination. He voiced concerns regarding traffic patterns, and added that the infrastructure is not available to support that amount of traffic. He believes there are currently only approximately 50 parking spaces and that the Aerodrome intends to create 500 new parking spaces. He agreed with his legal representative, Ken Stenger, that the 2019 ZEO determination should stand and suggested a new determination was made to push the application through the Planning Board review process with little to no public scrutiny.

Sam Phelan responded that the 2019 determination is not relevant as there is a current ZEO who made a determination that this is an airport facility. The board members added that the dominant activity is an airport as the main activity that occurs are air shows and biplane rides.

Tomas Wise suggested that the Planning Board was operating under two conflicting determinations as the one from 2019 was not reversed.

Jennifer Gray clarified that the 2019 determination was reversed with the determination made in 2020 by the same Zoning Enforcement Officer. A ZEO has the authority to change his mind, and he did so in 2020. Further, the current ZEO reviewed the application in 2025 and made his own determination that this facility is an airport facility.

Jonathon Becker asked how this facility can justify having as many parking spaces as the Fisher Center at Bard College and not anticipate additional visitation.

Sam Phelan clarified that the Aerodrome currently has over 500 parking spaces on grass with approximately 20 of those spaces paved. The Master Plan proposes paving 80 parking spaces for ADA compliance and striping the grass spaces which will reduce the total number of parking spaces by approximately 50 spaces.

Dan Ravo, associate of attorney Ken Stenger asked how the board can classify this facility as an airport from November through May when there are no air shows during those times.

The board members responded that other airport-related activities do occur. They added that the Planning Board's role is not to make a determination, but to review the Old Rhinebeck Aerodrome Master Plan as directed by the ZEO, who has classified the facility as an airport. They further stated that reviewing the application as anything other than an airport facility would be outside the Board's purview.

Philip Williams Jr. spoke in favor of the air shows and the Old Rhinebeck Aerodrome but voiced concerns as he does not want it to become too large or too commercial. He suggested the board place restrictions on the number of special events to address safety concerns.

Philip Williams Sr. voiced concerns about traffic and large buses, as well as the noise from the airplanes. He also voiced his concerns about the design of the proposed buildings as he believes they do not match the character of the area.

Roger Husted asked how these improvements would be paid for if the Aerodrome is not planning any additional revenue.

The Aerodrome responded that the projects have been paid for by a donor.

Marian Power asked if there would be more private planes coming and going and what type of planes they would be.

Tara Grieb responded that 10 privately owned planes belong to pilots who fly in the air shows and would like to store their aircraft at the Aerodrome year-round. She explained that these pilots actively fly in the shows and occasionally conduct practice flights as required by the Federal Aviation Administration. If additional storage space becomes available, the Aerodrome would rent it only to those pilots. She added that the airstrip is marked with a white X, indicating to pilots that it is a private airstrip.

Marian Power voiced concerns with the style of the proposed buildings and with traffic as the roads cannot handle more traffic volumes.

Jessica Becker asked for clarity regarding the language “future rental space for private aircrafts”.

Tara Grieb confirmed that they intend to rent any storage spaces to the pilots who fly for the Aerodrome only.

Jonathon Becker asked how to find the current Master Plan.

Planning Board clerk, Katie Khakhar, clarified that the only Master Plan currently available is the one submitted for the February 2, 2026, public hearing. The changes made that are documented in the Part 3 EAF have not yet been added to a final Master Plan.

The board members discussed the style of the buildings. Nancy Low-Hogan stated that she believed these to be attractive airport hangers and asked if the applicants could discuss ways to make them more compatible with the neighborhood.

Kelly Libolt responded that they are required to comply with zoning regulations and do want to consider the scenic area. They would provide the board with views of the buildings from the road and plan to provide more details on designs and landscaping during future site plan reviews.

Jay Quaintance made a motion to set a Public Hearing for June 1, 2026. Arthur Salman seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

OTHER BUSINESS-

Bard College Temporary Housing Extension Request- Representative: Coleen Alexander

Coleen Alexander, present via zoom, explained that there are three temporary dormitories installed in the summer of 2023 which were intended to be removed in the summer of 2026. However, due to the renovations happening in the older dormitory buildings, they would like to extend the use of the temporary dorms.

The board members asked if there was an anticipated end date for those renovations. Coleen Alexander responded that they expect the renovations, which include deep cleanings, rug replacements, and painting, will be completed within two years.

The board members asked how many students live on campus and how many rooms are available to them. Coleen Alexander responded that Bard College anticipates 1600- 1650 students to live on campus with 1875 beds for those students. Some of those beds are currently offline for those renovations.

The board members asked if there was any additional parking associated with these temporary dorms. Coleen Alexander explained that parking was removed and an overflow parking area was created when installing these dorms. They will restore the parking lot and replant the overflow area when the dorms are removed.

The board members asked if students would be relocated to the older dormitories as the renovations are completed. Coleen Alexander explained that if students are assigned to these temporary dorms in the fall, they will stay in them year-round.

The board members asked about the housing at the Messena Campus. Coleen Alexander clarified that only Bard Students attending Simon's Rock are housed at Messena Campus.

Nancy Low-Hogan made a motion to extend the expiration date by 24 months to June 2028. Jay Quaintance seconded the motion, and all members voted in favor.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the board, Jay Quaintance made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Nancy Low-Hogan seconded the motion, and all members voted in favor.

The next regular meeting of the Town Planning Board will take place on Monday, June 1, 2026. Only new applications received by noon, May 22, 2026, and submissions for continuing applications received by noon, Tuesday May 26, 2026, will be considered at the next meeting.

Respectfully submitted,
Katie Khakhar
Clerk for the Board