

Town of Deerpark Planning Board Minutes – March 25, 2015

The Deerpark Planning Board met for their bi-monthly meeting on Wednesday, March 25, 2015 at 7:00 p.m. at the Deerpark Town Hall, 420 Route 209, Huguenot, NY. The following were present:

BOARD MEMBERS

Robert Vicaretti, Sr., Chairman
Craig Wagner, Vice-Chairman
Theresa Santiago
Tom Faggione
Willard Schadt
Steven Weiner
Michael Hunter (arrived at 7:06 p.m.)

OTHERS

Glen Plotsky, Town Attorney
Al Fusco, III, Town Engineer
Johnny Zhou, Applicant
Kaijin Liang, P.E., Consulting Engineer
David Dean, Town Board Liaison
Deborah Natalizio, Town Assessor

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Bob Vicaretti said the first order of business would be the Public Hearing on the Dragon Springs Request to convert a meditation hall to a residence hall and also an addition to the existing rehearsal hall.

Glen Plotsky stated before the Public Hearing that he had compared the adjoiners list with the proofs of mailing slips submitted and they appear to be in order.

SEE ATTACHED PUBLIC HEARING RECORD – DRAGON SPRINGS BUDDHIST, INC.

Motion to Keep the Public Hearing Open for Written Comments Until April 8, 2015

Motion by Theresa Santiago, 2nd by Tom Faggione to keep the public hearing on Dragon Springs Buddhist, Inc. open for written comments until April 8, 2015.

VOTE: 7 AYES: Theresa Santiago, Tom Faggione, Craig Wagner, Steven Weiner, Willard Schadt, Michael Hunter, Bob Vicaretti

MOTION CARRIED

Concluding comments on the Public Hearing by Darryl Ward, Cuddebackville Fire District Commissioner was that he should have a letter by April 8th for the Board and Glen Plotsky, Town Attorney said that they will need the frequency of the their inspections to make a part of the approval conditions.

LANDS OF GIBSON – 2 Lot Subdivision
Application: Nancy Gibson for Caretaker's House
Engineer: John Fuller
Zone: Rural Residential
SBL: 37-1-27 & 28

Bob Vicaretti clarified this is for the subdivision and John Fuller confirmed it was.

John Fuller, Engineer stated he had been in front of the board several times to represent this property. He had a map and explained how lots 27 and 28 were originally one piece back in 2011. They had a subdivision by that board where 27 was broken off to be 28 and 28 would remain the parcel that eventually became the animal manor site and special use permit was granted by this board. Lot 27 was to remain residential for Ms. Gibson to build her home, which she is occupying. Last year, they presented a site plan approval for her to add a guest house, which was a second home on Lot 27. This was permitted within the ordinance which didn't involve a subdivision. The only thing was the site plan required demonstration that a future subdivision could be developed. It was approved and the guest house was built last year and is currently occupied. In the course of the last few months, he didn't know the specifics of it, but Ms. Gibson was advised it would benefit her to subdivide the property for tax reasons. Essentially, Lot 27 would need to be subdivided into two individual parcels. They are proposing having a shared driveway, that is the existing driveway and it is permitted in a shared subdivision for two lots only. The complicated part is that the original site plan for the animal manor required a stream crossing to access off of Peenpack Trail to the animal manor. That stream crossing permit hit a snag because of the rattlesnakes on the ridge and the study done last year and completed, but DEC has not yet released the report. That is still pending. He understands that nothing will but allowed to be built above the cat structure on her property because of the rattlesnake travel patterns. Any other buildings they want to add will need to be below this area. So, the site plan approved for the Guest House last year, they are now ready to execute a full subdivision. The criteria was that no further subdivision could be executed until the stream crossing permit was accessed. He is asking for reconsideration of the subdivision of that to allow for continued access with a common driveway to the animal manor while at the same time allowing a subdivision for both Ms. Gibson's residence and the Guest House. His understanding is that she has been advised to put the Guest House in a trust and its purpose is for onsite support in the maintenance of the animal manor facility. With that he would invite their questions.

Bob Vicaretti said he remembered when they did the original subdivision, they granted access from the driveway to the sanctuary property through that first piece of property. He asked if there was a right of way through that deed. John Fuller said that was correct.

Bob Vicaretti asked how to access to all three of those properties.

John Fuller said that as it stands now, there is a site plan approved for the guest house and both properties access the same driveway. (He referred to the map.)

Glen Plotsky thought the concept was that there would be a two year restriction on the use of the existing road so it would service all three lots but it would be for two years, or until the gravel drive to the cat structure was obtained with the bridge. John Fuller said that was correct.

John Fuller said the special use permit was to get stream crossing, and when they applied for the stream crossing, that's when the rattlesnake situation arose.

Glen Plotsky said they have been doing this for a long time and presuming the Planning Board consider this application, what would stop someone from coming in with his previously approved site plan with a note on it that said no further subdivision and wanting a modification because his tax planner told him they'd do better if they subdivided and put half of it in a trust. He said he was concerned for the residential lot.

John Fuller said the stream crossing permit would have been received and the bridge built had it not been for the rattlesnake situation. She can't go forward with that until they get a permit from the DEC which they cannot control the time on. That's the issue. They recognize that was part of the site plan approval. That application for the animal manor will be back in front of this board when that two year window is up. He thought it was the middle of this year.

Glen Plotsky said it was July 9th of 2014, so it will be up in July 2016. He has on his note that additional approval was granted. Now, that may not be correct.

John Fuller said he thought it was 2013.

Glen Plotsky said his site plan revision date for approval was June 25, 2014. He doesn't think it was approved in 2013.

John Fuller asked if that was the plan for the guest house site plan, not the animal manor. The animal manor and special permit for two years was approved January 31, 2013.

Glen Plotsky said it was expired. He pointed out number 9, no special use permit granted for the operation of a kennel January 31, 2013. He asked if they were talking about the same special use permit and asked if there was more than one.

John Fuller replied that was it.

Glen Plotsky said they would probably have to review that as well.

John Fuller was in agreement saying it was a two year approval. He didn't know how the town handled their special use permits. Was it up to the town to send notice or on the applicants to come back before the board.

Glen Plotsky assured him they would not terminate the permit, given the circumstance that no one followed up.

John Fuller didn't know if the protocol was for the applicant to come back to the board at the end of the two years or if it was the town's responsibility.

Glen Plotsky thought the answer to that was yes. There are some circumstances where the applicant contacts the town and some where the town contacts them. In this circumstance, with the board's permission, they'll incorporate the entire review to include an extension of the special use permit as it apparently was no fault of their client they can't currently provide that separate access to the cat structure. That's really the issue.

John Fuller agreed the issue was that they cannot get alternative access to the other property until a permit is obtained from DEC and they can't get it until they submit their ruling on the rattlesnake study.

Bob Viacaretti expressed his concern regarding the code and if those three pieces of property be serviced by a common driveway. It becomes a flag lot issue. He asked if it should be tabled and reviewed.

Glen Plotsky said they didn't know rattlesnakes would be an issue when the original special use permit was granted. Clearly, no one expected a substantial delay. Once the rattlesnakes are involved and DEC is involved, you can take what he would call judicial notice of the fact it will take forever.

John Fuller said they received verbal through their consultant employed by Ms. Gibson, that in terms of her property, nothing will be able to be built above the cat structure going forward.

Glen Plotsky replied that wouldn't be an issue because the bridge would be going in.

John Fuller said relative to the permit for the stream crossing that won't be an issue at all. It does impact her plans going forward.

Bob Viacaretti asked if they could extend the special use permit and Glen Plotsky thought they could and even at a later time, extend again if need be. They need the engineer to look at whether or not the road is legal to service all three lots forever or for a short time. Perhaps they could get a handle on things in the next meeting or two as to when they would hear from DEC.

John Fuller has made a few calls.

Glen Plotsky asked if that works for him. His concern was modifying the note.

Steven Weiner asked whether another application for a special use permit was not necessary.

Glen Plotsky answered they could entertain that issue as part of this application.

Bob Viacaretti said the special use permit expired and if they act as if this other map didn't exist, John is in front of them just to extend the special use permit. He then asked if there was an arbitrary time of 90 days or forever. He wondered how they came up with two years.

Glen Plotsky said it was standard and that normally they would be able to complete a project within two years. More discussion followed on the time necessary but it all depended on the DEC response.

Bob Viacaretti just wanted to make sure they weren't having to come back every 90 days.

Glen Plotsky said the special use permit is riding along with the other applications. He'll be back in 90 days to subdivide the property. They need to figure out if the Board was going to allow him to do that. There was a note on the map that says they can't do it. If the Board's position was they can't subdivide, then they're extending this special use permit for two years because by then they'll have this other stuff in place. He assumed John would prefer to come back to get the subdivision, then it made sense to have the shorter time.

Willard Schadt had no problem with extending the permit, but asked if there should be a review before the decision to make sure there were no violations.

Glen Plotsky asked John Fuller if they could extend for 30 days contingent on an inspection and then extend it for 90 or 120 days, or whatever it might be.

John Fuller said he would be happy to come back in 30 days.

Motion to Extend the Special Use Permit for 30 Days the Gibson Property

Motion by Tom Faggione, 2nd by Mike Hunter to extend the Special Use Permit for 30 days for the Gibson Property.

VOTE: 7 AYES: Theresa Santiago, Tom Faggione, Craig Wagner, Steven Weiner, Willard Schadt, Michael Hunter, Bob Vicaretti

MOTION CARRIED

THIBODEAU – Lot Line Change

Applicant: John Thibodeau – Cuddebackville Service Center, Inc.

Zone: HMU

SBL: 22-1-38.1, 22-1-84, 22-1-85

John Thibodeau stated he had been there a long time ago for a lot line approval and he bought a piece of property next to the Neversink Valley Museum and had approval from the State Attorney General for them to sell their property and it was a 'catch 22.' He doesn't have a closing on the property yet or a site plan, but believes they have a way to do it. He can't dig up someone else's property until he gets a closing. He thought Glen Plotsky had the answer to it.

Glen Plotsky confirmed just about everything he said. There was a problem with the other lawyer representing the Neversink Valley Museum and they straightened that out. They allowed his office to be involved, which is a matter of disclosure. They had to go to the Attorney General because Neversink Valley Museum is not-for-profit. The Attorney General had given their blessing on the transfer of property and there's a window—a fairly short window. He explained that John wants to incorporate the land he wants to buy into a single lot incorporating the current lot his business is on and the lot next door, which he already owns and this small piece that is on the side the Neversink Valley Museum is on. Then he'll have one lot, all of which will be commercial and then generate a site plan. The difficulty is that you cannot buy a piece of somebody else's lot. So, effectively, in order to do the closing, they need the board to approve a subdivision or lot line change shifting one of John's lot lines over to encompass the Neversink Valley Museum land. He'll then do a lot consolidation and site plan. Procedurally, what they need the Planning Board to do, is approve a subdivision of the Neversink Valley Museum land so that small piece is available for purchase.

Willard Schadt asked if there was any way of doing this if it doesn't close.

Glen Plotsky said it's a *Catch 22* ... they can't consolidate somebody else's land into his and they can't close. Glen Plotsky said procedurally they need the Planning Board to ...so that parcel is available for purchase. Willard is there any way of doing this if it never closes. It would be a financial risk.

Glen Plotsky said they need a subdivision approved. Again it is a *Catch 22*...they can't consolidate somebody else's land into his...they can't close if it is not broken off from the rest of the parcel on Neversink Valley Museum...and he can't do a site plan involving property that doesn't belong to him and he can't consolidate until he owns it. The first thing he needs, is for the Planning Board to approve the subdivision just so that little piece comes together. Once that is done, effectively John will own three parcels. Immediately, he will come back and do the lot consolidations to it but then he owns one parcel, and then he'll be in a position to present a site plan for consideration by the board. It is his understanding that the only thing he needs to finish the site plan submission so it's ready for engineer review is a prevention plan. Everything else is in place and good to go. It's just a matter of figuring how to do this.

Steve Weiner said they would be then approving ahead of the sale of a subdivision.

Glen Plotsky said correct. Which means that the Neversink Valley Museum would temporarily own two parcels. They've consented for him to represent them here. They signed off as the owners endorsement on an earlier application.

Steve Weiner asked about doing a contingent on completion of that deal. He didn't think they could do that otherwise.

Bob Vicaretti said he heard it said that this could be done before actually you buy the property.

John Thibodeau said the parcel would be separated so he could buy it...and he' representing the Neversink Valley Museum. He's paying the bill.

Willard Schadt asked what the time line (how many days) was after approval with the county. It was said 60 days. So, he continued, you could approve the subdivision for the Museum and not file the maps until the site plan is done, and then do everything together.

Glen Plotsky said they would probably do the maps and filing at the time of purchase, then do a consolidation thereafter with a separate recording of maps and deeds. He understands Steve Weiner's concern, and essentially the Museum would own two parcels between the approval and the sale.

Willard Schadt recalled it would be an illegal lot. How could they create that little sliver.

Glen Plotsky said that was right, they would be approving a non-conforming lot.

John Thibodeau said when you get done, you have a conforming lot.

Willard Schadt said they agreed but have to figure out the steps to get there.

Steve Weiner said his concern was the board would be approving somebody else's property and they haven't applied for that.

Glen Plotsky said this requires a leap of faith somewhere along the line because he can't buy it until it was subdivided, and he can't subdivide it unless he buys it ... he explained to the applicant that the concern was creating this sliver of land that by approving it would create an illegal lot because it was too small. Once it was transferred to Mr. Thibodeau, they could immediately consolidate it. For that moment in time between the subdivision and consolidation it was a non-conforming lot.

Steve Weiner asked if there was an option to do this contingent upon the following act.

John Thibodeau said he can never buy the property then.

Willard Schadt proposed not filing the maps, so if it falls apart the maps aren't filed...it was not a subdivision.

Glen Plotsky said the board could approve subdivision of the Neversink Valley Museum lot and the lot consolidation into the land of Thibodeau as one approval or condition of one another. Because then, the resulting lot would not be non-conforming. It would effectively be the subdivision contingent upon the consolidation but there was no way for him to do the purchase unless the subdivision was essentially done. They could do it as long as all the maps were submitted at the same time, that shouldn't be a problem.

Discussion about the maps continued. Glen Plotsky was certain the County wouldn't reject the map for non-conformity; they had 60 days and the Neversink Valley Museum letter existed approving John Thibodeau to represent them.

Motion to Approved Subdivision for John Thibodeau

Motion by Mike Hunter, 2nd by Theresa to approve the subdivision of the Neversink Valley Museum parcel and three (3) lot consolidation which would then be lands of Thibodeau, conditioned upon a note being placed on the map that says that the subdivision parcel cannot be recorded independently of a deed and map recording resulting in the consolidation. (Beginning 60 days from tonight.)

VOTE: 7 AYES: Theresa Santiago, Tom Faggione, Craig Wagner, Steven Weiner, Willard Schadt, Michael Hunter, Bob Vicaretti

MOTION CARRIED

Glen Plotsky then said that immediately they would move forward with the sale and lot consolidation. They'll have the maps brought in so Mr. Vicaretti can sign them and file them in 60 days; then in that time frame Mr. Thibodeau will come back with a pro-bono site plan application for one lot.

Bob Vicaretti asked if they needed a mailing regarding the subdivision of the property.

Glen Plotsky answered no, it was basically a lot line change.

John Thibodeau asked if he needed to notify people within so many feet.

Glen Plotsky answered that's for the site plan and some time he will need to do that.

MESSIAH CHAI – SITE PLAN REVIEW

APPLICANT: Represented by Bathsheba Elkaslasi 672-0325 672-3228

Septic Plan

Zone NR Zone SBL: 53-1-96.1

Bob Vicaretti invited the Messiah Chai applicant, Batsheva Elkeslasi, to present why she was there and what she has done.

Batsheva Elkeslasi had plans from Fellenzer Engineering showing the septic design for the additional building and another site plan that includes all the other details that were requested.

Bob Vicaretti asked if she was there the last time in March of 2014, because of the dates on her site plan.

Glen said, said the applicant came to the board with a lot of issues with the engineering. At some point, the Building Inspector or Code Enforcement Officer brought an enforcement application in the local court which has been pending for a good amount of time with the goal to obtain compliance. So, essentially it was his understanding that the Town Engineer provided a list of specifics as to what they needed on the plan. The applicant located and hired an engineer and surveyor. Though initially there was a lot of conflict between the parties, the applicant has been exceedingly cooperative the past 8 months. It is not her fault it has taken this long to get back here, but the professionals she was dealing with, specifically one professional. The goal was to do the review here, set a public hearing and hopefully have her obtain approval at which point she'll go to Town Board and be resolved there as well. The whole goal was to obtain compliance.

Ms. Elkeslasi said they had a public hearing already and are past that.

Glen Plotsky said he would look at that and said depending on the changes made, they may need another one.

Bob Vicaretti indicated he didn't think the public hearing was closed.

Ms. Elkeslasi said the public hearing was closed after allowing a month for written comments.

Bob Vicaretti asked the engineer if he had written comments on this.

Al Fusco, Town Engineer said in light of the new submission, they had technical comments regarding the Fellenzer Engineering submission. He read through his comments in this regard as follows in regards to Fellenzer Engineering submission. (Intermittent questions and clarification between the Mr. Fusco and Ms. Elkeslasi took place.)

1. Provide zoning district along with a bulk table and setbacks for the existing dwelling and the proposed dwelling.
2. Provide the size of the proposed building and the intended use.
3. The plan provides a curtain drain along the top of the septic field, the deep soil testing does not indicate high ground water or mottling, we would ask the design engineer explain the need for the proposed curtain drain. The deep soil tests indicate good soils to a depth of 72". If the curtain drain is to remain then provide inverts on the curtain drain. The invert of the curtain drain is to be 4.5' deep opposite the last lateral of the expansion area and this is to drain to daylight. Provide additional topography that will indicate that the drain can drain to daylight.
4. If the curtain is removed then provide a drainage swale.

5. Provide invert of the DB-9 distribution box.
6. Provide invert of septic tank.
7. Provide first floor elevation of the proposed building.
8. Provide lowest sewerable elevation of the proposed dwelling.
9. Provide the use of the existing frame building.
10. Show extension of the existing driveway to the proposed dormitory.

Al Fusco mentioned Mr. Weeden's map shows the handicap space, he is not entirely sure of the driveway being extended to the proposed dormitory building. He asked the applicant to show everything on the map.

Glen Plotsky explained that when Al says one map, he means one submission. It can have three pages. If there was something on an earlier submission that was deleted for some reason, but you still want it, it needs to be on the most recent submission. The idea is that there was one set of documents, not necessarily just one page. So they can refer to one set of documents to see what it was supposed to be. The concern about additions was if one map shows a driveway that is no longer there, and the current map doesn't show it, it would be a problem to attach the earlier map.

Bob Vicaretti clarified there were two different maps and they can't add to the survey and bring it back saying it was on the map. What was on the survey needs to be on the site plan, as the site plan map was for the Planning Board's approval.

Glen Plotsky further stated that for this applicant, the site plan was prepared by the surveyor and it was fine. He explained that all the engineer has done on this was the septic system and they have a site plan with a septic plan attached.

Bob Vicaretti asked if the applicant should have Fellenzer add to the site plan. Al Fusco said it could be done that way. Willard Schadt said if they were filed together and there were no inconsistencies, they can be treated as one file.

Bob Vicaretti recommended the applicant come back with something shown on one and not on the other, again just to lead to another delay in the approval. It would be so much easier if it was all on one.

Bob said the problem even now was the engineer says he wants something taken off the survey and included on the site plan.

Al Fusco said he would like the proposed dormitory building to be on the septic plan as it was on the survey by Mr. Weeden. It was a little cumbersome to do it this way, it helps if it is all on one.

Glen Plotsky told the applicant they need to take the comments to the one or two professionals and have them make the changes that are requested and bring back to be submitted together.

Al Fusco offered her to have the professionals call them as well.

11. Provide additional topography, the septic disposal plan does not indicate topography of the expansion area.
12. Provide handicap access to the proposed building. (Al suggested showing a walkway/sidewalk.)
13. Sheet one of the site plan prepared by Howard Weeden indicates on the plan view that the proposed dormitory is 22' X 45', note 3 under the existing building uses states that the building will be 20' X 50'. Please verify.

14. Provide a landscaping plan that provides a vegetative buffer behind the proposed dormitory building, this plan should also include a vegetative buffer between the lands of Noriega and the proposed driveway.
15. Provide speed limit on Shinhollow Road and driveway site distance for the proposed secondary driveway.
16. The site plan prepared Mr. Weeden indicates lighting & landscaping, the plan should indicate what type of landscaping is to be provided and also indicate the lighting that is to be provided.

Steve Weiner questioned the potential driving over the septic system and the second driveway.

Al Fusco agreed it wasn't a good idea, but he wasn't sure where it was on the map.

Discussion about the parking lot continued. Bob Vicaretti recommended they clarify with the handicap parking spot and perhaps list it as a walkway, rather than a driveway.

Glen Plotsky stated he would contact the court and they could come back April 8th with these changes. He said he has looked through his paperwork and Ms. Elkaslasi was correct, there was a public hearing. It appears that no substantial changes were made to the plan, and once it satisfies the engineer's concerns and those of the board, it could go directly to approval.

Ms. Elkaslasi expressed that she did not think the new septic system was a substantial change.

Glen Plotsky said that the second septic system was added in this new plan because at the Public Hearing it was mentioned that there was a dormitory and the engineer indicated that a septic would be required. So, in that context it was all conditional.

Bob Vicaretti concluded they don't need a public hearing then, and the attorney agreed. He then said the topic of the bus they own with lettering on it, required a parking space for that.

Al Fusco remembered the board commenting and that they had a place for it down below.

Ms. Elkaslasi said she remembered that and they would have a secondary driveway. It is referred to as Tank.

Bob Vicaretti wondered if the site plan needed a stamp and Al Fusco confirmed it did need a stamp but needed to check on who needed to stamp what.

Tom Faggione asked for an explanation of "Tank" and Ms. Elkaslasi explained Tank is used for Mobil Education Outreach.

Bob Vicaretti asked if there was a bulk table for water useage, well capacity.

Al Fusco said the septic design is for septic, not so much for water and that would be more for Department of Health.

Bob Vicaretti mentioned the lighting and the importance of low type lighting with a shield around it so it doesn't bother the neighbors.

Glen Plotsky told Ms. Elklaski to call his office to let him know of her plans. They will meet again April 8, and again April 22.

The HUB – Site Plan Revision
Contact: John Fuller 856-1536

Bob Vicaretti thought they did it last time with the change in the zoning.

Glen Plotsky thought someone must have given them that information. He said he put it on the agenda by mistake. He thought it was for the thought New York State License overflow parking.

John Fuller said there was a pending use agreement with NYS DOT for parking on the side.

Glen Plotsky said they had said that would be okay, but no one ever showed them a map.

Bob Vicaretti said they approved the plan minus the parking lot.

Glen Plotsky asked if anyone saw the math.

Much discussion continued to figure out where they were at. They need to check the fees paid and the Planning Board minutes.

Willard Schadt remembered the discussion that Dominick Alfieri and his attorney were thinking they would resubmit it without showing the parking lot for overflow parking since it is not required for the purpose of simplification. Maybe that's what the second app is.

Bob Vicaretti said he had the map back in his office.

John Fuller said he came with him for the DOT application and he came back a couple months after that.

Dave Dean mentioned they made a presentation when they were here.

Willard Schadt mentioned it was never removed from the Vicinity Map.

Glen Plotsky said his note from November 2014 says submissions reviewed, no overflow parking lot required, if seeks overflow parking submit apps. He didn't remember seeing maps. He did remember seeing actual written calculations.

Dave Dean saw the calculations on map parallel with the exit.

John Fuller will find out what the status is. He will talk to Dominick tomorrow.

BELSTEN Lot Line Change
Applicant: Represented by Willard Schadt

Willard Schadt explained the application was submitted and the house was not inspected and it was built over the lot line. He pointed out the old lot line and new lot line to show the change. He then asked the attorney if a public hearing was necessary for a lot line change.

Glen Plotsky answered no mailing or public hearing is necessary. The applicant should be aware of the fact that they need to deal with stream crossing issues if they intend to build on that second lot, but that's for another time.

Theresa Santiago asked if they could waive the public hearing.

Glen Plotsky confirmed they could waive the public hearing and these basically create two conforming lots. There are no setback issues with regard to the existing structure, and even if there were they were pre-existing. He doesn't see anything.

Motion to Waive Public Hearing for Belsten Lot Line Change

Motion by Theresa Santiago, 2nd by Mike Hunter to waive the public hearing for the Belsten Lot Line Change.

VOTE: 6 AYES: Theresa Santiago, Tom Faggione, Craig Wagner, Steven Weiner, Michael Hunter, Bob Vicaretti

1 ABSTENTION: Willard Schadt

MOTION CARRIED

Willard Schadt asked how many copies they would want.

Glen Plotsky said they would need a mylar, a bunch of maps, deeds. Glen mentioned he was representing Mr. Belsten.

Motion to Approve Belsten Site Plan

Motion by Mike Hunter, 2nd by Theresa Santiago to approve the Belsten Site Plan.

VOTE: 6 AYES: Theresa Santiago, Tom Faggione, Craig Wagner, Steven Weiner, Michael Hunter, Bob Vicaretti

1 ABSTENTION: Willard Schadt

MOTION CARRIED

Motion to Approve January 24, 2015 Planning Board Minutes

Motion by Theresa Santiago, 2nd by Mike Hunter to approve the January 24, 2015 Planning Board Minutes.

VOTE: 6 AYES: Theresa Santiago, Craig Wagner, Steven Weiner, Willard Schadt, Michael Hunter, Bob Vicaretti

1 ABSTENTION: Tom Faggione

MOTION CARRIED

Motion to Approve February 11, 2015 Planning Board Minutes

Motion by Mike Hunter, 2nd by Theresa Santiago to approve the February 11, 2015 Planning Board Minutes.

VOTE: 7 AYES: Theresa Santiago, Tom Faggione, Craig Wagner, Steven Weiner, Willard Schadt, Michael Hunter, Bob Vicaretti

MOTION CARRIED

Craig Wagner asked if Dragon Springs was allowed to continue to modify their site plan.

Glen Plotsky said they were filing applications and he was researching that. He would look into different ways to approach it. It may not be something the Planning Board has to deal with.

Willard Schadt mentioned the photographs from Mr. Ketchum and if there was a fire, he said other fire companies would have to respond. He suggested they take other fire companies with them.

Bob Vicaretti thought Cuddebackville Fire District should break the ice and move towards mutual aid. This is unique in our town.

Willard Schadt asked about the Cat House and whether there was anything new with the quarry and the rattlesnakes.

No one seemed to know anything.

Dave Dean said they were in desperate need for a secretary. He asked them to refer any capable applicants. He asked Kathy what amount of time this job would take and she answered it would depend on whether the applicant worked on the three boards Barbara Broilier vacated. The Planning Board could take as much as 20 hours a week in her opinion, at least initially.

Motion to Adjourn at 9:25 p.m.

Motion by Theresa Santiago, 2nd by Mike Hunter to adjourn at 9:25 p.m.

VOTE: 7 AYES: Theresa Santiago, Tom Faggione, Craig Wagner, Steven Weiner, Willard Schadt, Michael Hunter, Bob Vicaretti

MOTION CARRIED

Respectfully submitted,

Kathy Basile
Temporary Secretary