

**ANCRAM PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
October 2nd 2014**

Board Members Present: Erin Robertson, Ann Rader (alt), Dennis Sigler, Joseph Crocco, James Stickles, Colleen Lutz (clerk)

Board Member(s) Absent: Bob Roche (alt), John Ingram, Jamie Purinton, Terry Boyles

Additional Present: Bonnie Hundt, Linda Chernewsky, Steve Olyha

On October 2nd, 2014 the monthly meeting of the Town of Ancram Planning Board was called to order at 7:00 PM by Vice Chair Dennis Sigler.

Joseph Crocco made a motion to accept the minutes. Erin Robertson seconded the motion and the Board unanimously agreed.

The clerk stated she had added a memo on the subdivision application about site visits. She stated that the memo will added on the other applications when it is approved.

Mr. Stickles asked who was liable if Board members are injured on the site visit.

The clerk stated she would send the memo to John Lyons Esq. and have him check to see if the wording is okay and find out about the liability issue.

There was no other correspondence to the Board.

Agenda Items:

OLD BUSINESS

Sally Brody and Mel Hertzberg

Lot Line Adjustment

Parcel # 220.-1-26.11

The Chair requested that the public hearing be set for October 2nd, 2014 at 7:00pm. All notifications to the abutting property owners had been sent out according to the 10 day noticing requirements. The papers had also been notified. The Brody's had not contacted the board or submitted the plans prior to the 10 day submission requirement. The Chair opened the public hearing.

Joseph Crocco made a motion to continue the public hearing to the November 6th meeting. The motion was seconded by James Stickle. The members present were unanimously in agreement.

NEW BUSINESS
Steve and Nancy Olyha
ZBA referral-Area Variance
Parcel # 197.3.-1-42

The Steve and Nancy Olyha application came to the board as a referral from the ZBA. The applicants wish to make an addition to their property on Lake Shore Drive. The lot and building are non-conforming, preexisting and undersized. The applicant needs a variance in the front and rear yard setbacks. They are also building within the 100FT setback to a DEC wetland.

Linda Chernewsky, from Morris Associates representing the applicant, explained the plans and showed the area of the new addition.

The Vice Chair asked if there would be any new bathrooms.

Ms. Chernewsky stated that an additional full bathroom, plus a half bath.

Mr. Crocco asked if the building was fee simple and if there was a HOA (homeowners association)

Steve Olyha, owner of the property, stated that there was no HOA but there is an organization called friends of Rhoda Lake.

The Vice Chair asked if the rear property boundary is at the edge of the water.

Mr. Stickle stated that sometimes the property boundary extends into the lake.

Mr. Olyha stated that he believed the property line was at the water edge and that the lake was owned by Long Lake Associates.

Ms. Chernewsky stated that the side where the addition will be placed still conforms to the side yard setback for nonconforming uses, buildings and lots.

Mr. Crocco asked what the percentage of lot coverage was for this parcel.

The Vice Chair stated that the lot coverage in this district is 75%. The applicant has not reached this yet.

The Vice Chair asked how the neighbor(s) felt about the addition. He suggested that a letter from the neighbor in support of the project might help their case in front of the ZBA.

The Vice Chair and Mr. Crocco asked where the leach fields were.

Mr. Olyha indicated on the map where he believed they were.

Ms. Chernewsky stated that the bonus room was for storage and it will have a great view of the lake. The addition will also help to increase the size of the bedrooms.

Overall thoughts and recommendations:

Mr. Crocco stated although the lots are very small, the percentage of coverage is within the allowed limits.

Ms. Robertson asked about the association and stated that they might have an interest in the type of fertilizer used on the lawn.

Ms. Chernewsky went over the project and stated that the area of disturbance is very small. There will be very little reseeding involved in the project and the slope of the property is not conducive to erosion.

Ms. Robertson asked how the wet crawlspace will be handled.

Linda Chernewsky stated that the footings will be placed 38 inches down and there will be no curtain drains.

Mr. Crocco asked if the roof will be raised. He wondered why they were not going up instead of going over with the addition.

Mr. Olyha affirmed that the roof will be raised. He stated that he would like to retire to this house and would rather not have more stairs to maneuver as he ages.

Mr. Stickle stated that he did not have a problem with the variance and that the overall character will not be changed as a result of granting the variance.

The Vice Chair stated that he is concerned with the septic and that the bonus room could potentially be used as a bedroom, therefore increasing the load on the septic. He was also concerned with its proximity to the lake. He felt it should be checked to make sure it is working order. He also suggested that the CCDOH might review it and file a letter certifying the design of the septic.

Ms. Chernewsky stated that they will not do that if no bedrooms are added to the building. However, she stated that she could have the company that pumped and checked the system last year; submit a letter to the board.

Mr. Stickles stated that the 1000 gallon septic will suffice.

Ms. Robertson was also concerned about the condition of the septic and its proximity to the lake. She also suggested the landowner could add a small buffer strip from the lawn and the lake. The strip could be planted with low growing natural grasses to help filter runoff from construction activities as well as deter geese from entering the lawn.

Overall, the Planning Board made the following recommendations:

1. Septic condition needs to be adequate as the bonus room could occasionally be used as a bedroom increasing overall occupancy.
2. A buffer in between the lawn and lake of low growing grasses would help filter out runoff into the lake as well as deter geese.
3. No negative effect on the overall character on the neighborhood.

A letter will be submitted to the ZBA clearly stating these recommendations.

INFORMATIONAL

Don Hoysradt (Donna Peck)

Parcel # 198.-1-18.2

Donna Peck presented a copy of the survey for the above noted 32.61 acre property. She is in contract to buy the parcel and would like some information about the crossing through the wetland. Mr. Hoysradt had obtained a DEC permit to upgrade the preexisting farm crossing when he purchased the property. He replaced the culvert and improved the driveway. Ms. Peck wanted to know if she subdivided the property would she need to upgrade the access point and driveway and would she need additional permits?

The Vice chair stated that if additional home sites were created, the driveway/ road would need to be updated and the crossing would need to be improved.

Mr. Crocco stated that the driveway access must be improved and would need to follow state and local guidelines for fire and emergency equipment access. If it exceeds 500ft, then fire apparatus turnouts must be included.

Ms. Robertson stated that any changes to or work in the DEC wetland would need to be approved and permitted by the DEC.

Ms. Peck asked if the current crossing was sufficient for one house.

The Vice Chair and Mr. Stickle stated it might be possible.

Mr. Crocco asked if the access point could be moved out of the wetland buffer.

Ms. Peck asked how far out of the buffer would the driveway need to be.

Mr. Crocco stated it just needed to be out of the buffer.

Ms. Robertson stated that the wetland in that area has many important environmental areas such as fens. The DEC might want to really review this carefully.

Ms. Peck asked if it would prevent subdivision of the property.

Ms. Peck asked if the electrical lines will need to be buried.

The Vice Chair stated that the lines don't need to be buried.

The overall opinion is that the current driveway is okay for one driveway, but would need to be upgraded if it were to be subdivided.

Ms. Peck asked if deed restrictions are scrutinized by the town.

The Vice Chair stated they were not. The only way the town knows of restrictions is if the applicant discloses them during the application process. The town does not have the resources to maintain such a database however they are maintained at the county level in the deeds for each property.

The clerk noted that there is an area on the application to disclose this information.

There being no more business to attend to, a motion to adjourn was made by James Stickles and seconded by Erin Robertson. The Board unanimously voted in favor and the meeting was adjourned at 8:30 PM.

Respectfully Submitted
Colleen Lutz
Planning Clerk
Town of Ancram