



TOWN OF PLATTEKILL
PLANNING BOARD
P.O BOX 45, MODENA, NY, 12548

Minutes of: Tuesday, March 24th, 2026

SALUTE TO THE FLAG (7:00 P.M.)

Chairman Ernie VanDeMark called the meeting to order, led those present in the Pledge of Allegiance, and conducted roll call of the board members.

ROLL CALL: Nathaniel Baum, Joseph LaFiandra, Eric Merritt, Ernie VanDeMark

ALSO PRESENT: Town Engineer, Patrick Hines *MHE Engineering*

EXCUSED: Darlene Eisenhardt, Richard Dmytry, Richard Gorres

PUBLIC HEARING:

Orin Zelenak of 44 Old East Road (SBL 108.3-2-8.1 & 8.2)

Proposing: Four-Lot Subdivision

- Applicant Orin Zelenak present
- Proposed subdivision creating four (4) single-family lots; includes private road improvements and culvert replacement
- Located within DEC adjacent area; permit required; highway superintendent sign-off received; below Ulster County referral threshold
- Short-form EAF reviewed; no significant environmental impacts; disturbance <1 acre
- Outstanding items: DEC permit, easements, and legal agreements prior to final approval

MOTIONS:

- Close Public Hearing **EV/NB/Aye**
- SEQRA Negative Declaration **EV/NB/Aye**

NEW BUSINESS:

TEG Federal Credit Union of 1981 Rte. 32 (SBL 101.31-1-8.2)

Proposing: Two-Lot Subdivision

- Assistant Engineer Jesse Campo present
- Minor subdivision of 9.6-acre parcel; no development or site improvements proposed
- Classified as Unlisted SEQRA action; requires public hearing and agency circulation
- Future development restricted pending site plan approval and DOH review

MOTIONS:

- Intent for Lead Agency **EV/NB/Aye**
- Public Hearing scheduled 4/28 **EV/NB/Aye**

OLD BUSINESS:

The Ridgeward of 2021 Rte. 44/55 (SBL 94.3-1-14.1)

Proposed: Self Storage Facility Site-Plan

- Engineer Joseph Berger and Applicant Gary Baright present
- Site plan application for self-storage facility; revisions include addition of sidewalk; overall layout unchanged
- Traffic report submitted; minor revisions discussed; DOT requiring updated entrance detail per current standards
- SWPPP and infiltration testing completed; wetlands delineation revalidated with DEC
- Awaiting DOT and agency comments prior to SEQRA determination

MOTIONS:

- Public Hearing scheduled 4/28 **EV/NB/Aye**

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: March 10th, 2026 **TABLED** **EV/JL/Aye**

DISCUSSION: *Jacobowitz & Associates LLP* Letter, re: Brune Subdivision

VOUCHERS: Two (2)

\$310.70	MHE Engineering (Workshop Storage LLC)	EV/JL/Aye
\$71.40	MHE Engineering (Workshop Storage LLC)	EV/JL/Aye

ADJOURNMENT: **7:42 p.m.** **EV/EM/Aye**

PUBLIC HEARING:

Orin Zelenak of 44 Old East Road (SBL 108.3-2-8.1 & 8.2)

Proposing: Four-Lot Subdivision

E. VanDeMark:

First order of business is a public hearing. Okay. I'll read the notice.

Public hearing notice. Notice is hereby given that a public hearing will be held by the planning board Town of Plattekill County of Ulster on Tuesday, March 24th, 2026, at 7 p.m. or as soon thereafter as may be heard at the Plattekill Town Hall, 1915 Route 4455, Modena, New York, 12548. At this time, the planning board will be conducting a public hearing on the application of Orin Zelenak for a four-lot subdivision proposing four single-family dwelling units. The property is located on 44 Old East Road and is designated on the town Plattekill tax map as section 108.3, block 2, lot 8.1, and 8.2. All interested parties will be given an opportunity to be heard with respect to this application. For further information, please direct all inquiries to Elizabeth Ackerley, planning board clerk, at 845-883-7331, extension 18, or via email, plattekillplan.yahoo.com.

Okay, so we'll open Mr. Zelenak's project first. Do you have your engineer here ready to describe the project?

O. Zelenak:

I can describe the project.

E. VanDeMark:

So, if you want to address the group, tell them what you're doing.

O. Zelenak:

I'm not sure if you're familiar where this is, but head down past Cherry Top, take East Road, about a mile and a quarter. There's a small road off that, Old East Road, which would be down here. So East Road would run this way, Old East Road. We've owned 50 acres for 27 years and fixed up an old barn and renovated this house, and I've lived there and worked here since that time. There's a right-of-way that goes back in here, and there was a road that Lamellas, the gardening company, had built up and had some landfill back in here. And so about 18 years ago, we built a home here, which is 30 Old East Road. Subsequent to that, I built two more. These are all rentals, single-family. I'd like to right now, there's this is a tax lot, where I live, and this home, and this is a tax lot with this home and this home on it. And what I'm proposing to do is split it into four separate tax lots with black lines here. In order to do that, I need road frontage conveyed by a private road. And so, what I'm proposing to do is improve the existing driveway, which is essentially between two rock walls. They run here and here for about 700 feet, kind of due north like this. There's, you know, minor grading to bring it up to spec as far as, of course, you know, we're starting with a good roadbed, which is great. We have some widening and cutting into a bit of a hill here and some fill on here. But my engineer, John Nosek, has prepared this, and we've submitted it for comments. And we need at this point to just upgrade a culvert here to a 15-inch in diameter so that any water that's flowing down this way would not spill out to the street but head toward this area. We have surveyed the property, submitted it to the DEC, had their certified map that we've used. That's what this is based on. We've been in front of the planning board. And because we would be creating these new lots, even though we're not building, because my existing house has a shed and an old garage that I repaired, they were noncompliant with what you would do today. So, we had the zoning board determine that they were

preexisting and sort of not in violation. We've submitted, and I think it's been passed on, it's in Newburgh. Ulster County has come back, as far as I understand, saying that it's exempt from whatever their process of considerations. We're working now with a lawyer to work out common access for the driveway, private road, and driveways. And, I mean, it's sort of there now, and it's going to be improved. And, of course, it has these other technical and legal meanings that it's conveying, but once we have this, then I will be able to essentially have these as four separate tax lots.

E. VanDeMark:

Any comment from the audience? Going once, going twice.

J. LaFiandra:

Ernie, I have one question. You said you wanted to possibly subdivide two of the lots in the future?

O. Zelenak:

Well, I mean, it's possible that they would be subdivided, I guess, based on whatever the rules are for what that private road would be. They're really large.

J. LaFiandra:

Yeah, which two lots would they be?

O. Zelenak:

Well, possibly this one. Possibly this one, but I haven't done any work to identify that. You know, we're going to have to take a bunch of trees down. We're going to have to do some grading. You know, if I want to sell these, I want that to look like it looks now, which is beautiful and like it's always been there. And, you know, it takes years for that to get back together, so I'd like to get into a position where, you know, that's, you know, not ugly like it is when you cut in and move things around. So, I'd like to get it done now, and, you know, if something happened in the future, then that'd be interesting.

MOTION:

E. VanDeMark:

Okay. Thank you. Anyone else? Okay, I'll make a motion to close the public hearing. Do I have a second?

E. Merritt:

I'll second.

E. VanDeMark:

All in favor?

All:

Aye.

E. VanDeMark:

Okay, carried.

O. Zelenak:

John asked if you would consider a negative declaration under SEQRA.

E. VanDeMark:

Can we do that yet, or should we go through these first?

P. Hines:

No, let's go through the comments here. Okay.

E. VanDeMark:

We're going to go through these comments here first.

O. Zelenak:

It's all right, I'll go through them. Thanks. Thanks.

E. VanDeMark:

Come on up here in a hot seat. Just push this stuff out of the way. So, did you get a copy of Pat's latest comments?

O. Zelenak:

Yes.

P. Hines:

So, our first comment was a sign-off from the highway superintendent regarding the replacement of the culvert and the access drive where it touches Old East Road.

O. Zelenak:

Yes. And Bob Wager emailed that he had no, he said, I think, what he would be commenting on, like specifying his scope, and saying that he had no issues with that. Okay.

P. Hines:

And you will require a DEC permit for reconstruction of the road because you're in the adjacent area? And you may be in the wetlands in a couple spots even.

O. Zelenak:

We're in the adjacent area, but they said that they're considering the total, if we're touching the driveway in this way, the biologist said that you're in a, not just the adjacent, but I don't know, whatever the next tier up. But they have said that we're processing this and going forward.

P. Hines:

So, you're going to need that permit. As you mentioned, there's two, there's common driveway access and maintenance agreements for the shared driveways on the lots, and then there needs to be a private road access and maintenance agreement for the private roadway. I requested that your surveyors send a copy of the easement across tax lot 1.1. Okay, I have that. Which is the, so that, whoever's doing your easements can send those to Dominic Cordisco, the planning board's attorney. We noted that you had ZBA approval. The project was submitted to county planning. They said that it's below their threshold for review being four lots. I know Newburgh received the referral. They did not address it at any of their meetings yet, but I work for Newburgh as well, and they did receive a packet from Liz. And we did receive the revised plans after I did these comments. So those are

completed. So, we have those couple of items. The applicant did submit an EAF, which I'd like to review with the board. So, the applicant did submit a short-form EAF for the project. It did identify that there are DEC wetlands on the site. There were no other significant environmental impacts. The project will disturb less than one acre for the reconstruction converting the private road to the common driveway. Based on the information provided, we would recommend the board issue a negative declaration for the project. That'll be needed prior to the DEC taking any action. No other agency can take action until you as lead agency do that. So, a negative declaration would be in order.

MOTION:

E. VanDeMark:

Okay. I'll make a motion that we declare a negative declaration on the Orin Zelenak project.

N. Baum:

I'll second.

E. VanDeMark:

On the vote?

P. Hines:

Aye.

E. VanDeMark:

Carried.

P. Hines:

I will follow that up with a written negative declaration that you can provide at the DEC.

O. Zelenak:

Thank you.

P. Hines:

Yeah, I don't know if the board's comfortable with this in any conditions. There would be quite a few conditions, or if you want to check some off prior to any other approvals. He's got a bunch of legal stuff to do with Dominic. He's got the agency permit to pursue. I think once you work through those, you can come on back to the board and address any conditional finals.

O. Zelenak:

Okay. But this is basically my...

P. Hines:

That's your worksheet. Yep.

O. Zelenak:

Okay. That's it?

P. Hines:

Yes. For tonight. That's all we can do tonight.

O. Zelenak:

Thank you for your efficiency. Thank you.

NEW BUSINESS:

TEG Federal Credit Union of 1981 Rte. 32 (SBL 101.31-1-8.2)

Proposing: Two-Lot Subdivision

E. VanDeMark:

TEG, Federal Credit Union. All set? Good evening. How are you? So, explain to us what you proposed.

J. Campo:

Good. So, we're just proposing a minor two lot subdivision. Total acreage is 5.58. They're going to sell off the remainder. This is the new long line we're proposing. New lot area will be about 3.65 acres. No access or any entries proposed. No proposed use or development at this time either.

E. Ackerly (Clerk):

Can you state your name for the record, please?

J. Campo:

Jesse Campo, Engineering and Surveying Properties.

P. Hines:

So, there's not a whole bunch of heavy lifting here. As was mentioned, it's an existing 9.6 plus or minus acre parcel of property in the BD40 zone. They're looking to subdivide off 3.65 plus or minus acres of it. They do have a note on the plan that no construction or note without site plan approval from the Town of Plattekill and Ulster County Department of Health. So, it's simply a subdivision of the land at this time. There are no proposed developments. So, it's just a commercial subdivision. It does require a public hearing. And the board should declare its intent for lead agency.

J. LaFiandra:

I just want to point out a couple of administrative details. Your application listed as a BD60 zoning district?

J. Campo:

Yeah, I mean, that's what we came up with, but it's 40.

J. LaFiandra:

I believe it is. I looked on the map, it was 40.

P. Hines:

It is 40. That's what I had it as, too.

J. LaFiandra:

And Section 7, your Environmental and SEQRA Review, you put it in Type 2. It's going to be an unlisted action?

P. Hines:

It is an unlisted action, correct. Declare your intent for lead agency for this unlisted action.

E. VanDeMark:

But not scheduled yet.

P. Hines:

I think you can if you schedule it out. You would need 30 days for any other agencies, because the parent parcel fronts on the state highway. We'd have to circulate to them.

MOTION:

E. VanDeMark:

Okay, so I'll make a motion that we declare our intent for lead agency on the TEG Federal Credit Union 2-Lot Subdivision.

N. Baum:

Second.

E. VanDeMark:

On the vote?

All:

Aye.

E. VanDeMark:

Carried. And we can schedule a public hearing, but it's got to be pushed out for a while. At least six weeks, I guess. Okay?

E. Ackerly (Clerk):

We have National Great Pyrenees tentatively for the 28th, so we can do it then as well, or the next one would be May 12th.

E. VanDeMark:

So, we'll do April 28th? April 28th for a public hearing.

J. Campo:

Okay.

E. Ackerly (Clerk):

Are we doing a motion for that?

P. Hines:

We should, yes.

MOTION:

E. VanDeMark:

All right, I'll make a motion we hold public hearing for the TEG Federal Credit Union on April 28th.

N. Baum:
Second.

E. VanDeMark:
On the vote?

All:
Aye.

E. VanDeMark:
Carried. The mailings, they have to go out. Get with Liz. She'll get you the list and the process and all that. Thank you.

E. Ackerly (Clerk):
Thanks, Jesse. We'll be in touch.

J. Campo:
All right, awesome.

E. Ackerly (Clerk):
Thank you.

OLD BUSINESS:

The Ridgeward of 2021 Rte. 44/55 (SBL 94.3-1-14.1)
Proposed: Self Storage Facility Site-Plan

J. Berger:
Joseph Berger, the engineer.

G. Baright:
Gary Baright.

J. Berger:
We've acted for you for consideration, hopefully moving forward with the process. That means the biggest change we made, we've had a sidewalk along the front that we requested. Pretty much the rest was what we submitted before. We have submitted it to the Ulster County Health Department. They were out there reviewing soils, so they're reviewing it. And we have submitted it to DOT for review, but they're waiting for your SEQRA before they go forward. So, we're hoping to continue with the SEQRA, and hopefully schedule a public hearing after our discussion tonight, if that's possible.

J. LaFiandra:
Is this the traffic report you're going to submit to the DOT?

J. Berger:
That was submitted, yes.

J. LaFiandra:

Oh, it has been already. Because there were a couple of things I noticed. Section 5, the traffic gaps, refers to multiple driveways. So, I was wondering what that was about, because I see on the plan it's just one.

J. Berger:

It's just one driveway. That's a typo.

J. LaFiandra:

I thought it was a typo, except it was in 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6.

J. Berger:

Well, because what happens is you type it, and then you go to automatic AI spell check. I hate that. It changes things, and you don't catch it.

J. LaFiandra:

And the travel speeds, I know the big sign right after the Modena Firehouse is 55. I think shortly after that it's 45.

J. Berger:

Yes.

J. LaFiandra:

And I know going the other way is 45, because there was a trooper following me, and I checked. So, yeah, I don't know if the DOT is going to come back and comment about the speed limit. But anyway, I just wanted to see that this was the report that you did submit to them.

P. Hines:

Where are you at with the DOT?

J. Berger:

We submitted, but they need a SEQRA number.

P. Hines:

So, we circulated for Lead Agency.

J. Berger:

I know. So hopefully they're going to move forward with it.

P. Hines:

Yeah, that should have had them—they never responded.

J. Berger:

Other agencies did. Typically, we get response on other projects. We've submitted at the same time. We've received our response already, but who knows.

P. Hines:

So, I'd be interested to know their status of this. And I think the—I know they had notes of the previous study from when this was going to be the large warehouse project. We just want to make sure the Board has that.

J. Berger:

And we submitted it. On our first application, we actually submitted that, and the comment was, please do a narrative of our own. So, we did submit the original one in our first submission, and we followed up with the narrative for these.

P. Hines:

I'd be interested in DOT's comments is the only response. The roadway's under their jurisdiction.

J. Berger:

Yeah, I'm doing three of these type of projects already. We've submitted warehouses, all three on state highways. They really, all they care about is the site distance.

P. Hines:

Yeah, they're not big traffic generators.

J. Berger:

No, all they care about is the detail. As you probably realize, the DOT Region 8 has recently changed their entrance detail. Region 8 used to have their own detail, and then the new people came in or at the main office have decided to go to the statewide detail, which is slightly different. So, on our original plan, we did have their Region 8 detail. The difference is in a Region 8 detail, you create a 10-foot kind of a shoulder, you wrap the curb, and the statewide one, your curb goes right up to the edge of the road. That's what they want now.

P. Hines:

Instead of the radius.

J. Berger:

Well, it's still radius. It's still the same radius, but the radius ends at the edge of pavement, the edge of where the existing pavement is. And I've changed two other jobs already based on the recent, so we changed this one to match what they made us do on the other two. We actually asked them all the way up to the Regional Director, why are we changing, and we were told because they are.

J. LaFiandra:

Was that one of the revisions on the latest set of drawings? I was going to ask you what would change.

J. Berger:

Yes. So, what you see here is just Region 8 drawing. That's been changed down on here because your submission was a month ago. That's the revision back from DOT. DOT comments have made a change in the drawings that you haven't seen yet because it's deadlines. Drawings are fluid, you know, they change based on reviews.

E. VanDeMark:

And you added the sidewalk in.

J. Berger:

The sidewalk was added in, even to the DOT. But the only change we have here on the DOT, they don't want this, they want it straight through. So, I changed that for the DOT.

P. Hines:

What were you indicating? I can't see that.

J. Berger:

There's a pole there with the guide wire. And one of the previous DOTs, they didn't want it under the guy wire, so in anticipation that they would ask for that, I went around it. They said, no, we want it under because the guy wire is big enough.

P. Hines:

And they wanted them in their right-of-way, right?

J. Berger:

They don't care. They want it in their right-of-way, but it wasn't that this was going inside here, they just wanted it straight. But yes, they do want it in the state right-of-way now.

P. Hines:

That's a complete 180. Ten years ago, they would have told you no way.

J. Berger:

That's exactly, not only ten, six months ago. I did one on Route 9G in Hyde Park, and they had us put it inside the property line. Just six months ago.

P. Hines:

Yeah, wow. I haven't seen them requiring a right-of-way for a couple years.

J. Berger:

So, it's kind of moved over to Dutchess County then. That was one of the changes along with their entrance plan is different.

P. Hines:

So, one of the things my office had for the traffic reporters is just to put something, if that ITE has Saturday numbers, because self-storage facilities are... Just because they're probably busier on a Saturday when people are moving their stuff around.

J. Berger:

The thing is, the DOT doesn't ask for that, and that's why I didn't do it. Not too much more, it's about a 50% increase. I checked the numbers. It goes up to about 12. So, we'll add that. The reason we didn't have that in the report was because that's an error because the DOT and the two last many warehouses we did, DOT didn't care about Saturday. But for you, I guess that's not a problem adding, I'm just explaining.

P. Hines:

So, we did issue separate SWPPP reports, so I know that you have those.

J. Berger:

Yeah, I got those copies. Those are all, I consider them to be just minor.

P. Hines:

So, we'll be looking for that to be revised. Was there some additional testing required?

J. Berger:

I'm going to talk about that. I personally did the testing. That's two full days out there.

P. Hines:

I'm good. We're not going to redo those.

J. Berger:

Okay, good. Thank you.

P. Hines:

That's a standard comment from some of the other municipalities.

J. Berger:

Just so I can tell you, as a professional engineer, I did it myself.

P. Hines:

I'm perfectly good with that.

J. Berger:

We brought out so much water.

P. Hines:

We have some municipalities that require that.

J. Berger:

I understand that. This is not one of them. We brought so much water out for those infiltration tests. That guy kept coming back with 1,000-gallon containers three or four times. We were pouring, I think we used over 5,000 gallons. So, we made sure those tested. We tested. What we did was dug them one day, put the pipes in, pre-soaked. The trouble is the pre-soaked didn't do anything because it's gravel.

P. Hines:

It was a gravel pit.

J. Berger:

So, the next day when we came back, I still had them pre-soaked in the morning and ran them in the afternoon. Just kept throwing the water in over and over and over as Gary did test it. It was a lot of water. The Board of Health was there also. Yeah, the Board of Health was there looking at the heat test for the soil test. Thank you for that.

P. Hines:

Do you have the DEC validation of the wetlands?

J. Berger:

The original validation is on the survey we provided you. That's in there. And the J.D. said that there's a state wetland which was validated already, but the others are not.

P. Hines:

And that's later than the 2025 changes. January 25, they changed the regulations.

J. Berger:

We have the – well, mine is now clarified with Jim Bates. He did a wetland report stating that the wetland that's out there and been delineated is correct. It was redone and sent to DEC, and they reaccepted it.

P. Hines:

Okay, I just want to make sure it's after 2025.

J. Berger:

Yeah, we just did it like six months ago. We got the map resurveyed by the surveyor. Jim looked at it. It was sent back into DEC, and we got it updated.

P. Hines:

Okay, and we've got the sidewalk issue resolved by placing them in there. We just noted that there was a concept plan that was before the board, so the board had that as kind of an ultimate build-out plan just as we moved through SEQRA. They did provide that with some smaller lots similar to this with some other pretty non-intense uses. But just for the SEQRA purposes, I want to make sure the board had that concept plan before them.

J. Berger:

It was in the packet, but we haven't...

P. Hines:

No, yeah, you gave it to us.

J. Berger:

The first submission was...

J. LaFiandra:

Was that from LaBella, that concept plan?

P. Hines:

Yes. Yeah, they had a couple of more five-acre lots.

G. Baright:

The reason we did that was to show that we weren't going to build a big warehouse. That was the main reason to say, hey, instead of this big warehouse going here... But it was provided for you for consideration, so there's nothing that intrusive.

P. Hines:

So, our next suggestion is that there is sufficient... I believe there's sufficient information for a scheduled public hearing at the next available date. I don't care whichever the board chooses. We are

deferring SEQRA action until we do get public comments and comments from those other outside agencies.

J. LaFiandra:

I've got a question. What's the status of the purchase of the property?

G. Baright:

We're still waiting.

J. LaFiandra:

Have you heard about the litigation? The seller is engaged in some litigation. It looks like with his partners. And I guess they couldn't come up with a clean title for you.

G. Baright:

Yeah, there's some details. Do you know much about it?

J. LaFiandra:

No, because I couldn't access fully. The county clerk's records were...

G. Baright:

We were supposed to close at the end of December. I guess there's some little... There's some little thing for somebody to sign off something. Some old language.

Ridgeyard Associate (no name given):

It's very complicated. Disbarred attorney that had the right to sign off on any sale but really had no... There was no mortgage. It was just collateral. He used it as collateral for a different loan. And then ultimately he's no longer allowed to sign, so then he had an authorized representative that was only allowed to sign for creditors and not this, so we had to take it to court, basically, to allow somebody to sign off on something else. It's ridiculous, but it's going to take about three months. I think we're over halfway through it.

J. LaFiandra:

Okay, so it's going to continue to... proceed.

Unnamed Ridgeyard Associate:

One sentence. It just caused all this headache.

E. VanDeMark:

That's all it takes. So, should we schedule a public hearing?

P. Hines:

I think that other matter is a private matter between... It doesn't affect your review.

E. VanDeMark:

Yeah. No, it does not.

P. Hines:

I don't want to play lawyer here, but it doesn't seem like it's not involving the town. They're proceeding at their own risk if they can't close on the property.

E. Ackerly (Clerk):

I say we keep the pattern and go with the 28th.

MOTION:

E. VanDeMark:

I'll make a motion that we schedule a public hearing for the Ridgeyard project on April 28th. Second.

N. Baum:

Second.

E. VanDeMark:

On the vote.

All:

Aye.

J. Berger:

And I get everything from her office?

E. Ackerly (Clerk):

I'll be in touch.

E. VanDeMark:

All the information you need, you'll get from Liz.

J. Berger:

Okay, thank you very much. Thank you all. Thank you.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: March 10th, 2026

MOTION:

E. VanDeMark:

I'll make a motion that we table approval of the minutes for the... March 10th. The date, the March 10th meeting, due to a lack of quorum to approve.

J. LaFiandra:

Second.

E. VanDeMark:

On the vote. Aye.

E. Ackerly (Clerk):

Oh, we did get an escrow check from New Paltz Rescue, so we will be able to put those vouchers through tonight.

DISCUSSION: *Jacobowitz & Associates LLP* Letter, re: Brune Subdivision

E. VanDeMark:

Before we get into the vouchers, I have a letter. Did you see this letter? There's a letter in your packet regarding the Brune subdivision.

J. LaFiandra:

Actually, there isn't even a subdivision. That's the issue.

E. VanDeMark:

It is not a subdivision.

J. LaFiandra:

It's one lot. That's the issue. Across the thruway.

M. Lembo (Sup.):

One lot that was split by the thruway. So, what he needs is a separate tax SBL number. So, my suggestion to Ernie was he could waive the fees to do the subdivision so he could get a SBL number and make it kind of short and simple. You know, because it was divided by the thruway, it wasn't really his fault. So, you know, try to expedite it so it's not a big deal. And then also get a letter of intent from the other owner because this way it will have a lot line deletion so it's not a landlocked piece of property.

P. Hines:

We don't want to just do a lot line change?

M. Lembo (Sup.):

I don't know. Can you do that to get a separate SBL?

P. Hines:

No, but it would eliminate that whole... I'm just talking out loud. I just saw this letter. But if we did a lot line change between the two parcels on either side of the thruway, you could transfer the portion of the... I haven't read this whole... Transfer the portion of the property that was quote-unquote naturally subdivided by the thruway to that other parcel in one fell swoop.

M. Lembo (Sup.):

Well, if that's your suggestion, fine.

P. Hines:

I think that would be the cleanest way. I mean, we'll have to have a public hearing on it. You'd have to have one anyway to make that...

M. Lembo (Sup.):

Right.

P. Hines:

So, I think we're going to be... He'd be doing that process twice. If he gets a subdivision to create two lots... ...which would be difficult, because he's going to have bulk requirements and access, and then you'd have to go through and consolidate those two. So, I think if we just do a lot line change, and I'll

look at this a little further, but I think if we just do a lot line change between the two parcels, and if both owners are amicable and looking to do that anyway, it could... That could be the way to do it. Probably take two meetings.

M. Lembo (Sup.):

Right. Okay. That's fine. And, I mean, you know, then Liz can put something in writing and then contact, you know, the other parties, and I guess send those letters to me, too, also.

E. VanDeMark:

Let's let Pat review this.

P. Hines:

I'm going to take a look at this. I may talk to Dominic, the planning board's attorney, too, as long as he's good with that course. I don't want to lead these people down the wrong course. And if that's what we agree, we'll contact Liz, and she can... Or I can have Dominic contact this attorney and tell him that's how we... Might be a better way to handle it.

M. Lembo (Sup.):

Okay. Sounds good.

P. Hines:

I think it'll be smoother for all the parties. All right. From just what I read on the first two paragraphs.

E. Ackerly (Clerk):

I have a copy you can keep right here, Pat.

P. Hines:

Okay. But if that's the intent, to transfer it to the adjoining landowner, I think that's the quickest way.

M. Lembo (Sup.):

Yeah, it is. Okay.

VOUCHERS: Two (2)

E. VanDeMark:

Okay. Vouchers.

N. Baum:

Do you have a ledger by chance?

E. Ackerly (Clerk):

I only gave you the one for New Paltz Rescue, since that was...

E. VanDeMark:

That's the only one?

E. Ackerly (Clerk):

Yep. Because we're... We didn't have any. We're just doing these, because they were old, and we just got the check from them.

N. Baum:

We have a voucher for MHE Engineering for work done on Workshop Storage LLC in the amount of \$310.70.

J. LaFiandra:

Isn't that New Paltz Rescue Squad?

MOTION:

E. VanDeMark:

Yeah. I'll make a motion we pay MHE Engineering \$310.70 for work done on New Paltz Rescue, otherwise known as Workshop Storage LLC.

J. LaFiandra:

Second.

E. VanDeMark:

On a vote.

All:

Aye.

E. VanDeMark:

Carried.

N. Baum:

Voucher for MHE Engineering for work done on New Paltz Rescue, also known as Workshop Storage LLC, in the amount of \$71.40.

MOTION:

E. VanDeMark:

I'll make a motion we pay MHE Engineering the sum of \$71.40 for work done on New Paltz Rescue, otherwise known as Workshop Storage LLC.

J. LaFiandra:

Second.

E. VanDeMark:

On a vote.

All:

Aye.

E. VanDeMark:

Carried. Simple. Anybody have anything before I make a motion to adjourn?

J. LaFiandra:

I'm just going to mention that I have a couple of things I'd like to bring from my previous experience to the Planning Board application, and I'll just generally describe it as an entity disclosure form. Basically, it assists us in identifying the people who are behind things like LLCs. In my previous experience, some of these LLCs have been less and forthcoming about their identity, and it has sometimes become difficult to chase them down, to collect fees. So, what I will do is send a PDF of these documents. One of them is the form itself, and the other one is part of a town law. So, this might require some coordination with the Town Board. But at any rate, I'll send them to Liz, and she can forward them to the Board, and then we can talk about it at a later date.

N. Baum:

This would be the forced disclosure of any officers of a company?

J. LaFiandra:

Any applicants have to disclose—

N. Baum:

Anyone who's in ownership of the company?

J. LaFiandra:

Basically, that's, yeah, basically that, and also if there are, I think, any conflicts of interest as well. I think we might have something like that already on our application. I'm not sure. But at any rate, it's just something that has proven to be useful. We didn't personally have it in my department when I was working for Rockland County, but some of the municipalities did, and one of them, Town of Orangetown, and theirs was kind of like a model. We didn't have any issues, actually, with any of the applicants to that municipality, but the disclosure form, I think, is a good model for us to emulate.

MOTION:

E. VanDeMark:

Works for me. I'll make a motion we adjourn.

E. Merritt:

Second.

E. VanDeMark:

On a vote.

All:

Aye.

E. VanDeMark:

Adjourned.