

**Town of Ancram Planning Board
Meeting Minutes – July 3, 2008**

Present:

Jamie Purinton, Chair
Barbara Docktor
Madeleine Israel
Colleen Lutz
Terry Boyles

Absent:

James Stickle
Donald MacLean
Dennis Sigler

Also Present:

Mark Graminski
Eric Weiner
Lorraine Weiner
Town Engineer Paul McCreary
Tad Higgins
James and Emily Wright

The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:33 PM, and Board members reviewed the previous meeting's minutes and discussed changes. Mr. Boyles made a motion to approve the minutes subject to agreed-upon adjustments. Ms. Docktor seconded the motion and the minutes were thus conditionally approved.

Old Business

Matthews – The Chair said she spoke with Chair Wilcox of the ZBA, and both agree it is too early in any process for either Board to have something to consider regarding the potentially proposed subdivision.

Weiner	Lot Line Adjustment	3399 Route 82
Three parcels:	214.-1-32.100; 214.-1-32.210;	220.-1-1.200

The lots are situated on six acres with one house on the property. The Weiners would like to combine their lots to make them one single lot. The Chair advised them to submit their revised deed to the County Department of Real Property and file it with the Board, before or at the next meeting. The Board can then approve the proposed adjustment, upon examination of the sketch plan submitted this meeting.

Westfall Road LLC	Sketch Plan Minor Subdivision	196.00-01-59
--------------------------	--------------------------------------	---------------------

Paul McCreary, Town Engineer, and Senior Engineer at Morris Associates Engineering Consultants PLLC, presented his professional recommendations for changes to the Westfall proposal before it can be considered.

The Chair and other board members reviewed the physical site in conjunction with the new and detailed drawings, after submission of the minor subdivision application.

The following is a near reprinting of Mr. McCreary's letter to the Board, which outlines his recommendations:

"On behalf of the Ancram Planning Board, Morris Associates has performed a preliminary review of the information submitted by the Applicant regarding the above action before you. The information received from the Applicant consists of the following:

- *One set of plans titled Preliminary Plan, dated June 18, 2008, and consisting of two (2) sheets; and,*
- *A copy of Part 1 of the Full Environmental Assessment Form.*

Based upon our research, a site visit and our review of the information provided, we offer the following as information and comments to the Ancram Planning Board (APB) for use in your deliberations, discussions and actions on this application. Information has been bulleted and comments have been enumerated.

Background Research

To provide evaluation and comments regarding the environmental characteristics of the site, Morris Associates has utilized various resources to preliminarily investigate archeological, environmental resources and relevant site conditions. The resources used were websites of the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, the New York State Historic Preservation Office, the New York State GIS Clearinghouse, the Army Corps of Engineers and the U. S. Department of Agriculture. Our research results in the following information:

- There are hydric soils on the site and Federal and State wetlands nearby.*
- The site appears to be in an area where the NYSDEC feels that rare animals may exist.*
- There are no State or Nationally registered historic sites on or near this site.*
- There are no archeo-sensitive areas identified on or near the site.*
- The soils on the site will likely not sustain a conventional on-site septic system.*
- The stream through the site is a Class C, Standard C and is a tributary to the Roeliff-Jansen Kill (RJK). The RJK in the location where the site stream joins the RJK is a Class C, Standard C (TS) – a trout spawning stream. Also at that location is NYSDEC Wetland CO-18 (a class 2 wetland).*

Site Visit

On July 2, 2008 a site visit was performed. From that site visit we offer the following information:

- There does appear to be wetlands on the site. They are likely along the floodplain of the stream and may be at the proposed stream crossing location.*
- Westfall Road is a narrow travelway with evidence that weather conditions, primarily stormwater runoff, can cause an adverse effect. In the vicinity of the proposed stream crossing, there is a small stream on the west side of Westfall Road. It is likely that this general area becomes saturated to the extent that the roadway will deteriorate when used.*
- The site, while steep in many areas, appears to have more than sufficient areas to place on-site septic systems (areas large enough to support a very large leach field on a slope less than 15% in grade).*
- While the entire site was not traversed in this visit, a rock outcrop was noted.*

Prepared Plans

- 1. An evaluation of the expected area of disturbance yields an area just under 3 acres. This size of disturbance will require a Basic SWPPP (soil erosion and sedimentation prevention) under the current NYSDEC regulations. The Applicant has provided some information and practices with regard to this but we believe that further clarification is needed. Given this extent of disturbance, any future subdivision contemplated would likely increase the area of disturbance to over the 5 acre limit that would trigger a Full SWPPP (collection, treatment and detention). A complete discussion of the intent of the Applicant should be had to completely evaluate the SWPPP need.*
- 2. The plan shows no wetlands [Planning Board Clerk's note: please see later minutes that indicate the plan does indeed show wetlands]. In the Applicant's Full Environmental Assessment Form, it is stated that there 5.25 acres of wetlands. A site visit and research also indicates wetlands are likely. We recommend that the site be evaluated by a*

- qualified person/firm for freshwater wetlands, and flagged and mapped if found. Additionally, the rare animal possibility should be investigated by the Applicant.*
- 3. The bridge proposed by the Applicant will easily span the stream channel. The unknown information is what will happen to the stream when large storms occur. It is typical for a bridge design to allow the passage of a 100-year storm event and have no impacts upstream or downstream of the bridge. We recommend that Applicant prove this with their proposed bridge. This is key to bridge opening size, the possibility of overtopping of the driveway by stormwater, and the potential for overtopping of Westfall Road resulting from backwater or high velocities downstream.*
 - 4. The plans note that the bridge will carry an HS-20 loading. The Applicant should provide computations to demonstrate this.*
 - 5. Utilities that would be utilized by the home sites are not shown on the plans and we recommend that that be shown.*
 - 6. Given the nature of Westfall Road, it would seem prudent to protect this travelway to the best practical extent. Developing these sites will require clearing and the transport of materials into and out of the site. The APB could entertain limiting the time of year when heavy traffic would be using the roadway for site actions and have the Applicant put up a bond to repair the roadway should it be adversely affected by their actions.*

Based upon the above, we believe there to be more information needed to make a determination on potential impacts and to have the required information for subdivision approval. Our remaining recommendation is to have the Applicant address the above, assuming the APB is in agreement, and all additional comments of the Planning Board. Once that is complete the Planning Board should have sufficient information to evaluate the application.”

At the meeting, Mr. McCreary spoke to the issue of the applicant’s intent, and said he examined past meeting minutes of the Planning Board as they addressed the Westfall proposal. He suggested that if the intent of the applicant is to further subdivide, the Board will need to know basically what that subdivision will look like. He expressed concern about the earlier proposal involving a greater number of lots and the current proposal involving fewer, and whether or not that occurrence hints at future segmentation.

Mr. McCreary also said the applicant should provide velocities regarding the SWPPPs.

Mr. Graminski explained that the boundaries of the wetlands are indicated on the plan and stated that the bounds are based on aerial photography flown in 2005. The Chair asked for that information to be submitted to Mr. McCreary for review. Mr. Graminski also said Mike Nowicki, the biologist on this project, had flagged the sites.

Mr. Boyles asked if there would be appropriate emergency vehicle access across the proposed bridge, and pointed out that if the widths for access are not coordinated properly on both sides, vehicle clustering issues may arise -- particularly during emergencies.

The Chair commented to Mr. Graminski that if there is a long term plan in existence to create more development, not digging into the hill would make a big difference in terms of limiting erosion.

Mr. Graminski said the LLC states it won’t subdivide in the future, but that it’s hard to predict what may happen. The Chair says there is a limit on this site because of its issues,

and that perhaps it should be stated that there are qualifications to consider due to SWPPP, and some notification on the project plan showing the Board has considered and is concerned about it.

Mr. Graminski also responded to Mr. McCreary's comments regarding water quality treatment, stating there is water quality treatment in the plan, through check dams and ditches. The Chair suggested Mr. Graminski more completely fill out the long form application so all the nuances are indicated, and said there should be some reflection on engineering aspects articulated in a note for future reference.

The Chair and Mr. McCreary agreed the language would note that SWPPP actions and permits would be reviewed should further subdivision occur, so that the Board would then have the vehicle to introduce any necessary actions.

Mr. Graminski asked that Mr. McCreary recognize Westfall's use of water quality treatment mechanisms through the existence of swails and check dams at the site. Mr. McCreary said he didn't see a problem with that as long as the computations supporting that capability were clearly shown in the plan.

The Chair asked Mr. Graminski to do the following:

- Accommodate the stated engineering recommendations to Mr. McCreary's satisfaction;
- Complete the long form of the application;
- Reflect the disturbance of tree cutting and other site alterations in the plan to give an accurate picture of the result of action there;
- Note that, according to the Town Engineer, there is a habitat there that potentially supports rare species;
- Address the implications for this very widely used and loved community road as construction and construction time are concerned, to give a more realistic picture of what should be expected for the road;
- Address any potential flooding issues; and
- Fill out any items previously marked "N/A" on the SEQR form.

Mr. Graminski said he would satisfy the Chair's request, accommodate Mr. McCreary's recommendations, and resubmit the application and any other pertinent material for further review.

The Chair expressed a greater level of comfort with the plan now that the Town Engineer has reviewed its details. Mr. McCreary said he has seen Mr. Graminski's work with planning boards in different towns before, and he is comfortable with his level of professionalism and detail.

Mr. McCreary summed up that Mr. Graminski will ensure that wetlands are flagged where they are critical and at crossings.

Mr. Graminski agreed to inform Andy Dangler (the Board's Army Corps of Engineers wetland issues contact) regarding Federal wetlands and the stream, and that if it is determined that there is no impact to the wetlands, the Corps may write a letter stating so. He agreed to keep Mr. McCreary and the Board posted on the Corps' reply.

Mr. Graminski said Central Hudson will be the utility company for Westfall Road and that the next step is for Westfall LLC to submit an application and have Central Hudson conduct a survey at the site. Currently, Central Hudson provides service from Route 7 to the first house site, with the rest of the road's service coming from the town of Taghkanic. Mr. Graminski added that he has tried to contact the Town of Taghkanic for the past two weeks to no avail.

The Chair said the next step will be that Mr. Graminski will submit a new long form application with added information, including some missing SEQR information. She asked that Mr. McCreary review the new form and advise the Board of his recommendations after such review. She asked that Mr. Graminski next appear before the Board with the new submission having met Mr. McCreary's approval. She stated that then a public hearing could be set for the next Board meeting in August.

**Wright and Sartor Minor subdivision 297 Wiltsie Bridge Road
197.000-001.019**

The Chair then recused herself and the Vice Chair, Ms. Israel, opened a public meeting regarding the minor subdivision of land by James Wright and Emily Sartor.

This proposal was first submitted at the Board's May meeting. Sketch plans were reviewed at the current meeting. All approvals required were obtained since May.

Mr. Boyles motioned to accept and approve the plans. The motion was seconded by Ms. Lutz and approved unanimously. Final maps were stamped by Vice Chair Israel.

Mr. Boyles made a motion to adjourn the meeting and Ms. Lutz seconded it. The meeting was adjourned at 8:59 PM.

Suzanne Bressler, Clerk