

**ANCRAM PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
March 6th 2014**

Board Members Present: John Ingram (Chair), Dennis Sigler, Ann Rader (Alt), Joseph Bob Roche (Alt), James Stickles, Jamie Purinton, Erin Robertson, Colleen Lutz (clerk)

Board Member(s) Absent: Joe Crocco

Additional Present: Wesley Chase, Ann Simons, Don Maclean, Shelton Waldorf, Elizabeth Slotnick

On March 6th, 2014 the monthly meeting of the Town of Ancram Planning Board was called to order at 7:20 PM by Chair John Ingram.

The Chair stated that the meeting time change suggested at the previous meeting be added to the minutes. Erin Robertson made a motion to accept the minutes. Terry Boyles seconded the motion and all of the Board members were in favor.

No correspondence to the Board.

Agenda Items:

OLD BUSINESS

Don Maclean/Matt Barberi

Parcel # 208.-1-18

Mr. Maclean submitted a letter of authorization to the Board.

Mr. Don Maclean, Robert Barberi, and Wesley Chase presented a minor subdivision to the Board of parcel 208.-1-18 located on Wiltsie Bridge Road. The original parcel is 208.8 acres. The applicants wish to subdivide 7 acres off of the original parcel which will create two parcels, one approximately 7 acres and the second 201.8 acres.

Mr. Chase described the notes on the plan and stated that a 3.5 acre space of lot 1 will be added to the overall open space of lot 2 to maintain 60% open space on the parcel.

Mr. Maclean asked for a preliminary final approval. He stated that the line of the area of the non-buildable area of the new parcel may shift slightly due to family input. It will not be a change in an exterior line of the parcel; therefore will not substantially alter the plans. He asked if he could bring the plans in to be stamped after this line is solidified.

The Board agreed that it would be possible.

The public hearing was opened by Chair Ingram.

Ms. Purinton asked if it was possible to add the open space on parcel 1 to parcel 2. Mr. Maclean stated it is to the advantage of the applicant to designate the open space at the beginning of the subdivision so each lot created will not have to conform to the 60/40 regulations. It also helps to keep the building envelope clean.

Mr. Chase stated it will help to plan for the future. Mr. Sigler agreed.

Mr. Chase stated it can be difficult to keep track of the amount of subdivisions without a system in place.

Ms. Purinton stated that the note does not show the wetland needing to be mapped.

The Chair stated although the note states the maximum number of lots, the sub divider may not be able to fit all of them.

There were no additional comments from the public.

Dennis Sigler made a motion to close the public hearing, James Stickles seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Dennis Sigler made a motion to declare a negative declaration of the SEQRA. Terry Boyles seconded the motion and the Board agreed unanimously.

Dennis Sigler made a motion to grant conditional final approval with the condition that the maps will not change when the interior line location is determined. Terry Boyles seconded the motion and the Board was in favor.

Sommerhoff

Parcel # 205.-1-18

Lot Line Adjustment

Mr. Sommerhoff was represented by Wesley Chase and Ann Simmons.

The Chair stated that the board needs to determine whether the application is a subdivision or the lot line.

Mr. Chase presented color maps to the Board showing the existing lot arraignment and what lot lines are proposed. No new lots are proposed or will be created.

Ms. Robertson suggested that the applicant might need a BOH permit.

The Chair stated that there are no new lots being created therefore any old permits will be valid. If the applicant were to build a house, then a DOH approval will need to be applied for.

Dennis Sigler made a motion to proceed with the application as a lot line adjustment. Terry Boyles seconded the motion.

The Chair stated the public hearing will be scheduled for April.

Richard Ramdsen
Parcel # 219.-1-76.2
PB-2014-0002

Elizabeth Slotnick, architect and representative for the applicant presented the amended site plan for the board. She stated the owners decided to construct the garage with the accessory apartment in the upstairs. She stated that the apartment is under 40% of the overall structure size. The apartment will replace the need for the guest house.

Mr. Sigler asked where the existing the septic was.

Ms. Slotnick indicated the approximate location on the map.

Mr. Sigler noted that he noticed that the accessory structure may not be placed before the primary structure. The accessory must be placed in rear yard.

Ms. Purinton stated that the garage is well sited for the parcel.

Mr. Boyles stated that this may need some descretion from the Board.

The members of the board reviewed the regulation and determined that the garage is permitted by the regulation.

Terry Boyles made a motion to approve the site plan as designed. James Stickle seconded the motion and the board unanimously carried.

Don Bird
Parcel # 205.3-1-26.12

Mr. Wesley Chase appeared with the applicant Don Bird. Mr. Chase stated that the applicant has chosen to scale back to a total of three lots. He plans to use a shared driveway with a maintenance agreement. The overall distance of the shared driveway is less than 500 ft, should be approximately 400 ft. The arrangement will allow for each lot to have 25 ft of road frontage. Mr. Chase stated that the actual location of the lots will be determined when the septic areas are determined.

Mr. Bird stated that if this was made a private road, might need a fire turnout, which would use up much of the lot space.

Mr. Sigler stated that if there is a driveway easement it must be deed to the property.

Mr. Bird stated that he will check to make sure the bank will accept a driveway easement and that it will not dramatically affect the value of the property. He will check back with the Board keep it informed for the decision he makes.

NEW BUSINESS

Lorrie Snyder **Informational**

Ms. Snyder came to the planning board to gain some information about the options for her property. She stated she might like to subdivide and she might have 2 or 3 driveways accessing Route 82 in Ancramdale.

After looking at the survey maps, Mr. Boyles suggested that a lot line adjustment might work better.

Mr. Sigler suggested she have an engineer make an assessment of the upper access to determine if it can handle an extra access and to access the slope.

Overall, the board suggested that she might do a lot line adjustment and use the lower access which is less steep.

The Chair stated she would need an updated survey showing the lot line adjustment.

Ms. Robertson suggested she look into a conservation easement on the property, to help with taxes.

OPEN DISCUSSION

The Chair asked if the Board members had any inconsistencies in the new revisions. A few suggestions were:

1. The calculations for the steep slopes in the density calculation chart are reversed.
2. Permissibility of flag lots.
3. Is road frontage silent?
4. Maximum 35ft setback may not always work in the hamlets. Mr. Sigler suggested that this was done to preserve the hamlet structure. Mr. Chase stated that it has caused some problems in Pine Plains.
5. Are View tunnel and View Corridor the same? Only view corridor is noted in the definitions.
6. A better index would be helpful for finding things.
7. Permissibility of more than 1 "primary residence" per lot if the proper density and setbacks per zoning district can be maintained.

The Chair also stated that he would speak with the Town Supervisor about the proposed fees this weekend. He stated that the fees that were suggested back in 2011 were

suggested so that there is some compensation for the additional work placed on the planning board as a result of the new zoning.

A brief discussion about the Ridgeline Regulations followed.

Ms. Robertson suggested that what the Ridgeline Regulations require the planning board to look at is unreasonable to do in Abbreviated Site Plan Review (ASPR). She suggested that the Ridgeline Regulations should be subject to Site Plan Review (SPR), which would allow the planning board to do a thorough evaluation.

Mr. Sigler suggested that the submission requirements cannot be vague. They must be clear and precise.

Ms. Purinton stated she felt that the Ridgeline Regulations should not be limited to major subdivisions and might be too narrow in scope.

There being no more business to attend to, a motion to adjourn was made by Terry Boyles and seconded by Erin Robertson. The Board unanimously voted in favor and the meeting was adjourned at 9:30 PM.

Respectfully Submitted
Colleen Lutz
Planning Clerk
Town of Ancram