

**PLEASANT VALLEY PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**  
**MAY 10, 2016**

A regular meeting of the Town of Pleasant Valley Planning Board took place on May 10, 2016 at the Pleasant Valley Town Hall, located at 1554, Main Street, Pleasant Valley, New York 12569.

|          |                       |  |
|----------|-----------------------|--|
| Present: | Chairperson:          | Rebecca Seaman   |
|          | Boardmembers Present: | Robert Fracchia<br>Heather Patterson<br>Trish Prunty<br>Joy Dyson<br>Norman Mackay |
|          | Board Members Absent: | Michael Gordon   |
|          | Staff:                | Michael White, Zoning Administrator<br>Sonia James, Secretary                      |
|          | Consultants:          | Jim Nelson, PB/ZBA Attorney<br>Peter Setaro, PB Engineer                           |

Chairperson Ms. Rebecca Seaman called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. The Chair informed all present that at the court stenographer's request Central Hudson 'G' line public hearing was the first one to be addressed.

**Central Hudson – 'G' Line North Transmission Lines Rebuild Project**  
**Public Hearing**

The Chair reminded all present that this was a continuation of last month's public hearing. She stated that the Applicant will not respond to any comments made by the public at tonight's continuation of the public hearing. The Chair further added that the Public Hearing will be re-opened tonight and then adjourned until June 14, 2016 Planning Board meeting. Notice for the public hearing will not be re-circulated as the Public Hearing was never closed.

A Motion was made by the Chair to open the public hearing, it was seconded by Ms. Prunty and was approved 6-0.

The Chair invited the Public to offer their comments. No one spoke, therefore a Motion was made to adjourn the Public hearing till June 14, 2016 @ 6:30 p.m. it was seconded by Mr. Mackay and was approved 6-0.

Next item was:

**Health Quest – Sign Permit - Located At: 2510, Route 44, Salt Point**

No one was there to represent the application, therefore the Board moved on to the next item on the agenda.

**Traditional Okinawan Karate – Sign Permit- Located at: 13-17 Milestone Plaza**

Mr. Steve Borland owner of Traditional Okinawan Karate presented his application for the sign permit. He stated that presently he has his business at the Pleasant Valley Shopping Center but he is moving the business to the Milestone Plaza, thus needs to apply for the wall sign as the business is situated on the second floor of the plaza. The applicant proposed a 39 sq. ft. sign as well as 24 sq. ft. sign, for comparison.

The Chair invited the Board for their comments.

The Board members were in favor of the 24 sq. ft. sign. The Chair explained to the applicant that he would have to go before the Zoning Board of Appeals for 39 sq. ft. sign as this size is in excess of that permitted by the Zoning Code. A discussion was held among the Planning Board members which indicated that the members did not feel the increase in size was necessary to attract business traffic and that a limitation to the allowed 24 sq. ft. would not be detrimental to the business, as the renderings presented did not show a significant difference in visibility of the sign. Therefore the Planning Board will give a Negative Referral to the ZBA.

Mr. White, suggested that if the applicant is okay with the 24 sq. ft. sign he can get the approval and would not have to go before the ZBA.

Applicant Mr. Borland requested to withdraw his ZBA area variance application and asked for the approval for 24 sq. ft. sign.

A motion was made by the Chair to approve 24 sq. ft. sign with white lettering, the motion was seconded by Mr. Fracchia and was approved 6-0.

**Camp Nooteming – Sign Permit - Located at: 116 Scout Road, Salt Point**

Mr. Raymond VanVoorhis, represented Camp Nooteming and notified the Board that the sign will be, hanging, from a permanent wooden structure free standing entrance structure. It will be high enough (15 feet) enabling

emergency vehicles to pass. This will be a gateway to the rest of the renovations.

The Chair explained to the Board that this entrance structure could be treated as a structure without walls. Therefore, the sign could be treated as a sign placed on a structure, therefore it will not need a variance.

Mr. White comments:

- The applicant proposes to construct a new trestle with hanging sign.
- The proposed height of the trestle is 22 ft. which is less than the maximum height requirement of 35 ft.
- The distance from the ground to the underside of proposed sign will be 15'. This exceeds the minimum clearance of 14' recommended by the FAB.
- Sign is proposed to be 2' wide by 12" long
- It can possibly be classified as a monument sign but with two bases.

The Chair stated that this will be treated as a minor site plan amendment.

Ms. Patterson wanted to know, how the sign will be illuminated.

Mr. VanVoorhis stated that the sign will be lit by an indirect lights.

Mr. Setaro commented that a Planning Board Signature Block as well as the Owner's Consent Block should be added to the map. The applicant will be applying for a building permit.

A Motion was made by the Chair to waive the public hearing it was seconded by Ms. Prunty and was approved 6-0.

A Motion was made by the Chair to recognize the application as type 2, not requiring SEQRA review. The specifications of the structure will be subject to Planning Board Engineers approval. Motion was seconded by Mr. Fracchia and was approved 6-0.

A Motion was made by the Chair to grant approval for the hanging sign, it was seconded by Mr. Mackay and was approved 6-0.

Next item on agenda was:

**Melissa Bertolozzi – Sign Permit**

The Chair stated that the applicant was before the Zoning Board of Appeals and has received an approval for an area variance.

A Motion was made by the Chair for the approval of the sign permit, it was seconded by Ms. Dyson and was approved 6-0.

**Humming Bird Ranch/Valley Market - Sign Permit**

The Chair stated that the applicant was before the Zoning Board of Appeals and has been granted an approval for an area variance.

A Motion was made by the Chair for the approval of the sign permit for Salt Point Deli/Humming Bird Ranch to be incorporated into the Fire House Monument sign. With note that actual colors must match existing fire company sign, with lights on the bottom middle 1 on each side. The Motion was seconded by Mr. Mackay and was approved 6-0.

**Public Hearing**

**Sub-Division Application, Gloria Deutsch Living Trust, Located at: 64 Ward Road, Salt Point NY 12578**

The Chair invited Mr. Setaro for his comments.

Mr. Setaro's comments:

- The short Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) was properly revise
- Proposed subdivision is an unlisted action under SEQRA. Planning Board is the only involved agency
- All prior comments have been addressed by the applicant

Mr. Craig Wallace, Applicant's Attorney represented his client and replied that the easement is the present driveway, the history behind it is that the owner had horses and this was used as a horse carriage road. There is no plan to sub-divide that particular parcel.

A motion was made by the Chair to open the Public Hearing for Gloria Deutsch, it was seconded by Mr. Mackay and was approved 6-0.

**Ms. Susan Ball, 85 Ward Road**

She wanted to know all about what was going on with the property, and why the applicant was before the Planning Board.

The Chair explained that this is a large 80+ acre parcel, and the applicant wants to divide 5 acre parcel which has a house on it and sell it. Nothing else is before the Board just a sub-division of the lot.

Mr. Wallace explained that, Gloria Deutsch owned the property and converted it into a trust that went to the University of Albany, as she was an Alumni. Her wish was to subdivide 5 acres of land with the existing house and sell that home to use that money for the University. The 5 acre parcel that needs to be sub- divided has a house on it, which is rented out. The larger parcel will still be owned by the trust.

**Ms. Meta Plotnik - Conservation Advisory Counsel**

She wanted the Board to know that the property has two streams that are the origin to the stream in the Pleasant Valley.

Mr. Wallace stated that all the wet lands are marked on the map.

**Teresa Thayer, Contour Lane**

She wanted to know if there will be any issues with the pond water/sewage.

The Chair, stated that there is already an existing house.

**Henry Bialosuknia, 17 Contour Lane**

Mr. Bialosuknia wanted to know if the said parcel borders with the Contour Lane.

The Chair invited him and the public to take a look at the proposed map. She confirmed that the Contour Lane does border with the Gloria Deutsch's property.

A motion was made by the Chair to close the Public Hearing portion of the meeting, it was seconded by Mr. Mackay and was approved 6-0.

Mr. Nelson wanted Board to consider 30' wide easement on the property.

The Chair stated this should remain an access easement and not be converted in the future to a public road or private access to other dwellings that might

exist in the future on the rest of the property. The Chair stated that the Board does not want to encourage Town to have a road through private properties.

Mr. Setaro suggested that it can be a recreational access and not a primary access. He further stated that there was no negative impact on the environment it was a simple sub-division.

A Motion was made by the Chair for the Town Board to access rec fee for 1 new lot, it was seconded by Ms. Patterson and was approved 6-0.

A Motion was made by the Chair to approve Negative Declaration, it was seconded by Mr. Mackay and was approved 6-0.

A Motion was made by the Chair to grant Preliminary approval, it was seconded by Ms. Prunty and was approved 6-0.

A Motion was made by the Chair to grant Final approval, it was seconded by Ms. Prunty and was approved 6-0.

The Chair stated that the Minutes of the April 20, 2016 meeting will be approved on June 14, 2016 Planning Board meeting.

A Motion was made by the Chair to close the Planning Board meeting, it was seconded by Ms. Dyson and was approved 6-0.

Mr. Richard Barret of 151 Pleasant View Road, raised his hand to talk to the Board. He said he was here for the Central Hudson Public Hearing.

The Chair recognized Mr. Barrett and allowed him to speak. Although the meeting is closed his comments will be treated as submitted to the Planning Board. The Chair explained that the Central Hudson public hearing was moved to the front upon the court stenographer's request, so he had missed the hearing. She further informed him that the Public hearing for central Hudson is still open it was adjourned to June 14, 2016.

Mr. Barrett was concerned about the pole heights, placement of pole, cleaning debris. He was also concerned why no one from the Central Hudson met with him regarding the placement of the pole on his property.

Following are Mr. Barrett's comments as of May 10, 2016 Planning Board Meeting:

1. Has Central Hudson submitted any more answers to the public's questions?
2. Is it his (Mr. Barrett's) responsibility to attend LaGrange's meetings? Will he be given time to respond to LaGrange?
3. With respect to the PV public hearing (on May 10<sup>th</sup>) his understanding was that Central Hudson was to be last on the agenda, not first, and so he didn't show up at 6:30 pm, but rather at 7 pm. He didn't know this in advance.
4. Has LaGrange been brought up to speed regarding Pleasant Valley meetings and office information?
5. Central Hudson is presenting the project as a 69 Kv line, but if it really is a 115 Kv, doesn't this change the permit and SEQR?
6. Central Hudson is still not presenting drawings which would show the actual design of the lines and poles.
7. It's a big difference if Central Hudson builds a 115 Kv line instead of building a 69 Kv line. What then?
8. Affects the height of the poles, design, building it (somewhat of an unclear comment).
9. Why is Central Hudson moving the line, making it higher, placing the line away from trees, moving the line 25 ft into their ROW?
10. Wetlands on his property has been ignored by Central Hudson. No one responds to him from either town.
11. Central Hudson has contacted other affected property owners, but has not contact him.
12. When is Central Hudson going to come back with all of the answers?
13. Wants it explained again to LaGrange that his concern is Central Hudson is actually designing an 115Kv line and not a 69Kv line.

The Chair, stated that the Pleasant Valley Planning Board has limited jurisdiction, as Town of LaGrange are the Lead Agency. She added that the pole height was a State matter, plus the Board still did not have a final site plan submitted by the central Hudson. Once the Board was in receipt of the final site plan they would be in a position to comments on it.