



## Planning Board Minutes 1/17/22

Members Present:: Barbara Olsen Pascale, Chairperson, John Avenia, Mark Barbato, Richard Freiman, Bud Gardner, Patti Rohrlich  
Elizabeth Sheer, Planning Board Secretary, recorded the minutes  
The meeting was held over Zoom

Others attending: Barbara and David Thomas, Wendy Johnson, Chuck Schnell, Mark Bearak, Brad Rappelyea, Daniel Levy, David Lewis, Gretchen Stevens, Brandon Lentine

Acceptance of the minutes of 12/13/21 were moved by Patti, seconded by Richard

**Aye: 5 No: 0**

**Decision: motion carried to accept the December minutes**

The meeting opened at 7:34

---

### Site Plan Review

**Property: 632 County Route 21**

**Applicant : Barbara and David Thomas represented by architect Wendy Johnson and landscape architect Chuck Schnell**

Wendy Thomas, shared three color samples of the proposed extension. She also showed pictures of the light reflecting glass, which has an 11% reflectivity. The proposed roof is bronze, and also has a reflectivity of 11%. As far as exterior lighting is concerned, she also shared pictures of the sconces which will be at each door, downward lit. There will be deck lights at 18", which will not light the area around it. There will be no exterior of façade lighting and anything on the new addition will be blocked by the road.

Richard asked whether the roof of the extension faces the road. Wendy replied that it does not.

Patti said that she liked the second color choice offered.  
Richard agreed that he also preferred the second color choice.  
Barbara then asked for a motion to approve.  
The motion to approve the site plan with the second color choice was made by Patti, and approved by Richard.

Aye: 5 No: 0

**Decision: The site plan is approved with selected colors, windows in accordance with reflectivity rules ,and downward facing lighting.**

---

### **Introduction: Site Plan Review**

**Property: Lockwood Road (no address yet)**

**Applicant: Timothy Bean represented by architect Mark and contractor Brad Rappelyea.**

The applicant is seeking to build a house on a property on Lockwood Road, and is seeking guidance and feedback for going forward with the project. Architect Mark Bearak presented survey maps of the property. This is at the north end of Lockwood, with a small hill. A survey has been commissioned. The elevations peak at the southeast corner of the property, and the driveway is attached to Lockwood. The top of the hill would be the house site. The applicant wishes to make as little impact on the property as possible.

There is a portion where the grade of the driveway is more than 10%.

Richard asked about the length of the driveway, and Mark said it was about 600 feet.

A general question was asked about how often turnarounds need to occur. Patti thought that it might be every 500 feet.

Richard asked how much of the proposed driveway was more than 10% grade. Brad Rappelyea said that about 200 feet of the driveway is steeper than 10%, and thought it might be 14-15%. He asked whether it could be improved or would it have to be re-done completely.

Barbara said that she did not see this as an impediment, and that there is precedent of the Board approving driveways of over 10%. The Fire Department, she said, need to weigh in on where the turn outs need to be.

Richard added that the Board usually prefers to walk the property, and added that the Board understand that the contractors would prefer to use what is already there, although the potential for disturbance needs to be weighed against the regulations.

Barbara suggested that an engineer could do a report on the modifications necessary. It seems that some portions are too steep for the Board's guidelines. Mark Barbato said that it would be useful to walk the property, and asked whether there is electricity on the property.

Brad responded that there is no electricity yet.

Barbara said that next steps would include determining whether parts of the driveway are too steep, and said the Board could coordinate a group meeting at the site.

John said that he would like to see a map with the slope shown.

Mark Bearak said that they could do an overlay with the slope indicated.

**Decision: The Board will coordinate a site visit, and Brad will discuss the project with the Craryville Fire Department**

---

**Informational Meeting**

**Property: Route 23 in the hamlet (no address yet)**

**Applicant: Daniel Levy**

Mr. Levy presented this project as a mixed use site on 2.5 acres, with two buildings at the front containing several apartments, each with retail on the first floor. Potentially, there would also be a third building in the back, with gardens and a greenhouse. He introduced himself as a builder of energy efficient buildings, with net zero energy, and described the product he would like to use, called autoclaved aerated concrete, which has been used in Europe for decades, but this would be the first certified mixed use project in the US.

He would, he said, like to create a community.

Richard asked whether he would be doing this project in stages.

Daniel replied that he had funding for part of the project but was looking for more, so that it could all be done at once.

Richard asked about the set-back from the street and Daniel responded that it is about 40'.

Barbara wanted to know how many units were planned.

Mr. Levy said that there would be 25 units and a shared vegetable garden.

John asked about the town rules on density. Barbara said that our density rules called for 11 units in this size (5 units per acre) space in a clustered develop with municipal sewers. However a variance could be applied for if more units were desired. She then asked about water, because according to the NRI, there is no mapped aquifer.

Gretchen pointed out that there needs to be a test done to see whether there is a source of water that will not deplete it for others.

Barbara then asked about the adequacy of the town sewer to handle this kind of density, and Daniel replied that it seemed that there would be adequate capacity.

Barbara said that there might be some issue with the adequacy of the sewer, which Daniel said would seemingly be adequate.

Mark said that most buildings there are entered because of surface water, and Barbara said that there was definitely an issue with surface water.

Daniel responded that things can be done to funnel water to one place. He envisions a retention pond, swales and a rain garden. He added that there would be no basements, and no mechanicals that need to be below grade.

The first order of business, Barbara said is to see whether there would be enough water.

Daniel asked whether he could build a well and was told that he could.

Daniel said that he questions what he might be able to do immediately, since there are hold-ups all along the way due to the fact that there is address. There is also no curb cut. It would be nice to put one in and a gravel construction drive.

Rich said that he could get that from the DOT, and Daniel responded that he needed first to get a SEQR from the Planning Board in order to get a driveway permit.

At our next meeting the Board can take up a limited issue of whether the proposed curb cut meets SEQR, Barbara said.

Daniel has already had an informal meeting with the DOT, was told that the only place they would approve is where it is drawn on the plans.

Richard asked how the Board could issue a negative SEQR if it does not yet know the scope of the project.

Mark said that this would be a direct to DOT question.

Barbara said that she would be able to find out prior to the next meeting.

Patti said that there might be an issue with maximum heights.

The maximum height is 35 feet, and Daniel said that these would be below that. The Board's position, stated by both Richard and John is that this kind of density is a good thing for the town, and that the idea having more commercial outlets that are walkable within the town is also a good thing. However, that depends on whether the commercial spaces invite traffic.

Patti said that she believed that the only guideline, from the Board's point of view, was that there be adequate parking for the amount of business that a commercial venture was likely to incur.

David Lewis, mentioned that the apartments in the initial drawing are quite small, and asked whether there was a possibility of making a greater mix of sizes.

Daniel said that he is already contemplating a mix of sizes, which would mean less parking would be required. He also questioned whether the two car per apartment requirement was a necessity, or if it could be waived.

Barbara asked for other comments, and there were none. Before the next meeting, however, Mr. Levy should get whatever information he could about the water situation and see whether that informs the plans at all.

---

Richard made a motion to adjourn, which was seconded by Patti  
The meeting adjourned at 9:38