

**PLEASANT VALLEY PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**

**MARCH 16, 2017**

A regular meeting of the Town of Pleasant Valley Planning Board that was supposed to be held on March 14, 2017 was held on March 16, 2017 – due blizzard - at the Pleasant Valley Town Hall, located at 1554, Main Street, Pleasant Valley, New York 12569.

Present:	Chairperson:	Rebecca Seaman
	Boardmembers Present:	Trish Prunty Norman Mackay Michael Gordon Joy Dyson
	Board Members Absent:	Robert Fracchia Heather Patterson
	Staff:	Michael White Sonia James
	Consultants:	Pete Satero, PB Engineer Jim Nelson, PB Attorney

Chairperson Ms. Rebecca Seaman called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. First item on the agenda was:

**Urgent Care**

Mr. Michael Berta presented the application on his client's behalf. He stated that this will be a two phase project. The first phase would be to open an Urgent Care Facility at the former Pizza Place. Second Phase would be to re-do the whole Saw Mill Plaza giving it a face lift. This phase will be started in spring. For now, they are looking to open up the Urgent Care. It will consist of 5 exam rooms plus a waiting area.

The Chair stated that the Board would deal with the 2<sup>nd</sup> Phase of the project later, for now they will deal with the Urgent Care Unit.

Mr. Gordon questioned if the applicant would be seeking an approval tonight so they can start operation.

Mr. Setaro stated that no SEQR is required as this is just a Change of Occupancy. Water and sewer would be sufficient as it was previously a restaurant.

Mr. Nelson stated that there were 65 parking spots which are sufficient.

The Chair made a motion to approve the Minor Modification Site Plan as submitted on March 10<sup>th</sup> 2017. It was seconded by Mr. Gordon and was approved 5-0.

The Chair instructed the applicant to bring in the minor modification site plan with the signature block added for the Chairs signature.

### **Chase – Sign**

Ms. Jennifer Beichert of Timely Signs represented her client Chase Bank. She stated that her client wants to move the existing sign on the west side of the building towards the outer drive-through. The applicant is also requesting the addition of another sign at the south entrance.

The Chair invited Mr. White to share his comments.

Following were Mr. White comments:

1. Chase bank wants to relocate the existing wall sign on the westerly side of the building to the outer drive through also on the westerly side of the building. Existing sign is code compliant, and according to code may continue to be used as is.

2. They also propose to install a new wall sign on the southerly side of the building where the wall sign does not presently exist. The sign is code compliant but the Bank is requesting an internally illumined sign.
3. Chase bank is desirous of keeping the existing front wall sign and the westerly wall sign in addition to having the new signs on the southerly side of the building.
4. The existing monument sign would remain unchanged.

Based on the above facts, the Bank will have to seek variance request from the Zoning Board of Appeals for following reasons:

1. The code prohibits internally illuminated signs, although the existing front wall sign and the westerly side wall sign are both currently internally illuminated, however these signs are existing.
2. The Town code does not seem to provide for one additional wall sign therefore a variance is needed for additional third sign.

A motion was made by the Chair to approve the movement of the wall sign it was seconded by Ms. Prunty and approved 5-0.

A motion was made by the Chair to give positive referral to the ZBA for the additional sign, it was seconded by Mr. Mackay and approved 5-0.

A motion was made by the Chair to give Negative referral to the ZBA for the internal illumination of the additional sign. This is a new sign and internal illumination is prohibited by the code. It was seconded by Ms. Dyson and approved 5-0.

### **Camp Nooteming – Welcome Center**

Mr. Mark Fellenzer represented his client Camp Nooteming and explained that they are proposing a 2100 sq. ft. welcome center consisting of administration offices,

camp store, kitchen, bunk room and great room on upper level and comfort station with toilets and showers on lower level.

Following were Mr. Setaro's comments:

1. The site is in the RA (Rural Agricultural) district, therefore following should be documented on the plan:
  - a. Clarify whether the zoning table C101 pertains to entire site
  - b. Add the supplement lot area and set back requirement in addition to the zoning district lot area and bulk requirement.
2. Calculate the proposed disturbance area, which appears to be close to 1 acre. One acre would require a storm water pollution prevention plan.
3. Check the proposed elevations and grade for access to the building from handicapped parking spaces
4. Label the dimension of a typical parking space and the width of parking aisle
5. It is recommended that a storm water diversion swale should be provided between the east side of the building and the eastern parking area.
6. Show any wall mounted and pole mounted lighting
7. The short EAF is acceptable but following is noted:
  - a. Revise the response on item 3.b. as it appears from the plans and that more than 0.5 acres of land will be physically distributed.
  - b. The response to short EAF item 12.b. regarding archaeological sensitivity should be marked "yes", yet it was noted that the existing site is substantially developed already with buildings, driveways and parking areas.
  - c. It was also noted that the site is contiguous to the "Taconic State Parkway", which is listed on the National and State Registers of Historic Places.
8. In regard to SEQR review, this is an unlisted action and Morris Associates recommends an uncoordinated review of the proposed action. The Planning Board should designate themselves as a Lead Agency.

9. The submittal appears to be adequate for the purpose of setting a public hearing
10. The project will require a 239M review from the Dutchess County Planning Department.

Mr. Nelson stated that as per SEQR guidelines if the building is not visible and is not substantially contiguous with the Parkway a SEQR is not required.

A motion was made by the Chair to waive the Public Hearing, as the proposed building is not visible from any road and is not visible to adjacent properties. It was seconded by Ms. Prunty and approved 5-0.

### **Public Hearings – Continued**

#### **Snyders Sub-Division, 71 Ruskey Lane**

Mr. Brian Franks represented his client and stated that his clients have decided not to dedicate the land for the road to the town, plus they were willing to move the stone wall further back as per the Highway Superintendents wishes. A letter will be issued by the Highway Superintend stating his satisfaction re the relocation of the stone wall.

The Chair invited Mr. Setaro for his comments. Following are his comments:

1. Since last Planning Board meeting, there have been discussions between the Highway Superintendent and the Town officials regarding the stone wall
2. Planning Board should review the easement language as a condition of approval.

A motion was made by the Chair to re-open the Public Hearing it was seconded by Mr. Gordon and was approved 5-0.

No one from the public spoke, therefore a motion to close the Public Hearing was made by the Chair it was seconded by Mr. Mackay and was approved 5-0.

A motion was made by the Chair to approve the Preliminary and the Final approval of the Site Plan, motion was seconded by Ms. Dyson and approved 5-0.

### **Public Hearing - Pleasant Valley Free Library**

Ms. Dyson recused herself for this agenda item.

Mr. Dave Kruger, Chair Library Board, stated that the last renovation that was done to the Library building was done in 1974. He stated that at present the building is not ADA compliant, they are increasing the floor space, and will add an elevator. Once approved the Library can begin Fund raising.

Mr. Tinkleman, architect, explained that the library is in need to be updated, as it is such an important resource in any community. This serves as a community center. Following additions are proposed/needed:

1. Outdoor seating area
2. Parking lot needs to be repainted
3. Sidewalks will be made around the building making it ADA accessible
4. New Landscaping and lighting will be added
5. Move Bathrooms
6. Upgrade Septic
7. Storm water plan will be addressed
8. Install Elevator – as children's room is on the second floor, it will be ADA acceptable
9. New organization center
10. New media/computer room
11. More seating
12. Wrap around Porch
13. Cathedral ceiling with sky lights
14. Wall between the porch and library will be glass
15. Metal roof – gray color

16. Flush sidings
17. Sidewalk on east entrance
18. Rainwater to be diverted to the dry well
19. East side – building will be built right up to the property line
20. Working on getting additional parking spaces in agreement with the Catholic Church

Mr. Setaro commented that most of the questions raised by him were answered. He stated that there are no code provisions in the town for parking ratios.

Mr. Nelson stated that discussions were held amongst the Church and the Library Boards re the parking issues. There will be a plat presented that will show the parking the applicant proposes. Applicant should get a consent from Presbyterian Church to do all this. Also there should be owners consent to show the use of property not included in the library lease on the plan.

The Chair stated that the parking is difficult as this is shared property. We have to make sure it is agreeable to both sides.

Ms. Prunty stated that this was a very well thought out plan.

The Chair commented that the Board is very pleased with the design, plus all comments/concerns have to be addressed.

A Motion was made by the Chair to re-open the Public Hearing, it was seconded by Mr. Gordon and approved 4-0.

Denny Smith spoke for the Presbyterian Church, he stated that the members of the church are mostly in favor of this project but when an issue of parking arises, we are uncomfortable, as there are only 9 shared parking spaces which are assigned to

the Library. On Thursdays evening the church has choir practice and can never find parking, most of the choir members are seniors and have to park farther from the church and walk to the church. He admitted that parking was a problem for the whole town.

Richard Murray, 50 Drake Road, stated that adding 40% space to the library building would certainly increase the parking issues. A study should be done in this matter. The library entrance should be moved to the Catholic Church side - East.

Mr. Kruger wanted to reply, but Chair Ms. Seaman informed them that no debate can be held amongst the public, all comments and concerns should be directed towards the Board.

Sarah Casa acknowledged that the Board is very responsible, but in her opinion the Library is the heart of the Pleasant valley. The Present building is an embarrassment to the Town. Town has to meet with the requirements of the growing community. Parking has got to be done as it is required.

The Chair stated that it is the job of the Board to decide on parking issues.

Mary De Gennaro, of 16 Masten Road, stated that she hopes and wishes that both parties come to a conclusion. More people are needed to come into the Town of Pleasant Valley.

Linda Morrow, 101 View Drive, stated that she and her family decided to move to Pleasant valley for 2 main reasons (i) Arlington School district and (ii) library. This renovation is very important for the Town. The Town looks run down, the Library renovation will give the town a face lift.



Mary Ellen Cowles, 169 Pleasant View Road, emphasized that an elevator was much needed. She stated that she works as volunteer with the “Friends of Library”, and they are responsible for holding book sales and generate around \$20,000 a year for the Library. They have to carry heavy loads of books up and down the stairs each time a sale is held.

Judith Graddis, 33 Parksville Road stated that she has lived in the Town for last 40 years, in 70’s she was introduced to the library. It would be great to have a handicap access to the library.

Pauline Herr, 14 Thorn Hill Drive, stated that this was a shared parking, there shouldn’t be more stress on one side than the other.

Richard Murray commented that the parking should be put in as a condition.

Danielle Pulice, Library Director, stated that we are not adding too much space rather the meeting room from 2<sup>nd</sup> floor will be moved to the first floor, we are trying to make town as walkable as possible. Elevator will also take away some of the additional space. Books will be placed in the new space. Side entrance on the west side will be closed. Additional parking spaces will be added to the front of the building on Rt. 44. Side entrance will be on the East side towards the Catholic Church. She further stressed on the fact that the library was trying to satisfy all concerned regarding the parking issues.

A motion was made by the Chair to adjourn the Public Hearing till April 10, 2017, it was seconded by Ms. Prunty and approved 4-0.

### **Solar Codes**

A discussion was held amongst the Board member, after reviewing of the draft amendment to the Zoning Code regarding Solar Energy Systems and a motion was

made by the Chair to give a positive referral to the Town Board, for the adoption of the proposed amendment with the following comment. The Planning Board requests the Town Board to consider whether additional language of clarification is needed in Paragraph G, in the phrase "for placement over the parking lots", with respect to the fact that the term 'over' is intended to mean a structure to be constructed *above* the parking lot. The motion was seconded by Ms. Dyson and approved 5-0.

### **Minutes of Planning Board Meeting**

A Motion was made by the Chair to approve the Minutes of November 15, 2017, Minutes of the Planning Board Meeting as emailed motion was seconded by Mr. Mackay and approved 5-0.

A Motion was made by the Chair to approve the Minutes of February 14, 2017, Minutes of the Planning Board Meeting as emailed motion was seconded by Ms. Dyson and approved 4-0.

A Motion was made by the Chair to Close the March 16, 2017 Planning Board Meeting, motion was seconded by Mr. Gordon and approved 5-0.