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

*Minutes of: Tuesday, September 8, 2026*

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

ROLL CALL: Nathaniel Baum, Richard Dmytry, Darlene Eisenhardt, Richard Gorres, Joseph LaFiandra, Eric Merritt and Ernie VanDeMark

NEW BUSINESS:

- Andrew Rinne of 403 Unionville Road (SBL: 102.3-3-9.1)

Proposing: Subdivision Minor

-Zone M3

-Referred to the ZBA for an area variance before coming back in front of the planning board

OLD BUSINESS:

- Andrew Morano of Camp Sunset Rd. unassigned (SBL 101.2-2-12.912)

Proposing: Four-Lot Subdivision and Four Single-Family Dwelling Units

-Project requires Ulster County Planning Board approval per MHE Engineering

-Waiting for clarification from MHE Engineering on comment letter received on September 2, 2026

- Minard Farms (SBL: 102.1-6-25.11 and 102.1-7-11.2)

Proposing: Subdivision

-Waiting for MS4 from MHE Engineering before going back in front of the town board for approval before final maps can be signed

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| July 28, 2026 | *Adopted with corrections* | EV/RG/AYE |
| August 25, 2026 | *Adopted with corrections* | EV/RG/AYE |

DISCUSSION:

- National Great Pyrenees Rescue (NGPR) noise study review

VOUCHERS: Eight (8)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | $420.60 | MHE Engineering (Sainthan Corp) | EV/DE/AYE |
| 2. | $886.95 | MHE Engineering (Storywood LLC) | RG/DE/AYE |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 3. | $85.20 | MHE Engineering (Richman) | RG/DE/AYE |
| 4. | $682.80 | MHE Engineering (Zelenak) | RG/DE/AYE |
| 5. | $704.25 | MHE Engineering (The Ridgeyard) | *Tabled* |
| 6. | $506.00 | MHE Engineering (Cross Landscaping) | *Tabled* |
| 7. | $375.85 | MHE Engineering (Acevedo) | *Tabled* |

ADJOURNMENT: 7:57pm DE/RG/AYE

**E. VanDeMark**
Okay, roll call, Darlene

**D. Eisenhardt**
Here

**E. VanDeMark**
Nate

**N. Baum**
Here

**E. VanDeMark**
Rich Dmytry

**R. Dmytry**
Here

**E. VanDeMark**
Rich Gorres

**R. Gorres**
Here

**E. VanDeMark**
Joe LaFiandra

**J. LaFiandra**
Here

**E. VanDeMark**
Eric Merritt

**E. Merritt**
Here

**E. VanDeMark**
Okay, first up tonight is Andrew Rinne

*Andrew Rinne (403 Unionville Road)*

**B. Capucilli**
We received a comment letter, it pointed out the usable area, now I did look into that, I saw the definition for the usable area mentioned exactly as it was stated in the comment letter, what I really didn't find is any use of that term in the code anywhere. I did calculations to remove the wetland area from the proposed lot if we removed just the wetland area, we'd be at about 1.6 acres. If we removed the wetland area and the buffer zone, we'd be just under one acre. Now that said, the existing house, the existing well, the existing septic, the neighbor's existing house, well and septic are all within that same buffer zone. So, we're not proposing any new construction, everything already exists there in an area that I guess would be marginal if you would, you know, discuss if that's usable or not, but I'd like to get your take on that.

**R. Gorres**
What zone is that in?

**B. Capucilli**
M3.

**R. Gorres**
M3, that's supposed to be a three-acre zone.

**B. Capucilli**
So, we have it slated right now as a three-acre lot, but about half of it, or 1.6 acres would be usable area, and about 1.4 acres would be DEC wetland.

**J. LaFiandra**
Can you add more usable area by changing the subdivision? Making the lot lines different?

**B. Capucilli**
I mean, it's coming from a sizable tract, lot one that's coming from 74 acres, and it would be a remaining 71. You know, we are interested in making the possibility for access at some point through this area because we're on the intersection of New Unionville and Lewis Lane.

**R. Gorres**
That's a three-acre zone. It's got to be three acres of usable area, I thought.
That's what the code enforcement is saying, too. Yeah, that's why we got the comment from Jonathan like that.

**B. Capucilli**
So, would you say that the wetland buffer, the 100-foot buffer area, is that considered usable or not usable?

**R. Gorres**
No, that's not usable. Anything that's buffer zone, wetlands, and 15% steep grades is not usable land, and that has to be subtracted from the lot.

**B. Capucilli**
So, we would have to have a parcel greater than three acres because the existing house line is not usable?

**R. Gorres**
Yeah, the house is there already, and you're here before the board. We can't help you create a nonconforming lot. That's what you're creating by doing that. We're not allowed to create something that doesn't fit, even if that's already there, but there's no other land on that lot that can be added to that?

**B. Capucilli**
No, there is land.

**R. Gorres**
Can you get three acres of usable area?

**B. Capucilli**
Everything existing is within non-usable land, the existing house. It's going to be non-conforming no matter what.

**R. Gorres**
We recommend you go to the ZBA and ask for an area variance because the house is already there, so it's not like you're creating a big problem. It's just that you have to go to ZBA so that you can get permission from them, and when you come back with that variance, then we can go ahead and do it.

**B. Capucilli**
Will do. So, I guess there was no further review because of that?

**E. VanDeMark**
We'll invite you back.

*Andrew Morano (Camp Sunset Rd-unassigned)*

**D. Eisenhardt**
You got a copy of Pat's comments for this as well, correct, Bob?

**B. Capucilli**
Yes, I did. I did request a further look at it. I believe I sent the map for the third time on the evening of the second, first thing in the morning of the third.
I received comments. Fifteen minutes later, I sent them back a request for additional review because the elements in the comment letter were shown on this map, and I never received a response from them. I'm hoping we have a direct review here because as you can see, there's a lot. Morano Subdivision, we have shown the proposed houses, proposed driveways, went into disturbance, affected wells, site distances. I think we pretty much have all the elements that we need from our original review. I think there are a couple of details that we want to comment, so if we can add a second sheet to the map.

**D. Eisenhardt**
Let's go over the comments.
And you can tell us what was on there and what wasn't.

**E. VanDeMark**
So, do you have Ulster County approval for subsurface sanitary?

**B. Capucilli**
That is in their hands, and we're just waiting for it to come back.

**E. VanDeMark**
We declare our intent for the agency 26th of May, so that's long expired. So, we are the lead agency. Number three, has that been depicted?

**D. Eisenhardt**
Review of the map identifies the driveway for proposed lot one may be within the buffer area for the wetlands delineated in the vicinity of Lake Sunset. Confirmation of the wetland boundary in this area should be provided.

**B. Capucilli**
Lake Sunset's on the far other side of the project. So that's one of the things I requested clarification on.

**D. Eisenhardt**
Yeah, I get that so question mark on that one.

**E. VanDeMark**
Site distance from the driveways should be depicted. It probably is, I'm sure it is. So that's a check mark, that's done. Limits of disturbance have been identified. Total limits of disturbance are calculated to SWPPP for residential subdivision.

**B. Capucilli**
Okay, so we did put a note on the plan that it is greater than one acre. We do not have an exact calculation. We put a note that it's less than two acres planned over the four lots. So, if you need a more specific calculation, I can certainly add that, but if that's sufficient, then it's already noted on the map.

**D. Eisenhardt**
It's on there. Okay, number six, project requires submission to Ulster County Planning Board upon receipt of detailed plans.

**E. VanDeMark**
Number three we have a question mark on that too because lot one is clear.

**R. Gorres**
Lot one is over here and Lake Sunset’s over there.

**D. Eisenhardt**
He sent a thing back to Pat and hasn't heard back from him yet, so that's why we have a question mark on it.

**B. Capucilli**
No, I mean this information was on the original map too. All the wetlands were on there.

**R. Gorres**
Yeah, but there's no wetlands in this area. This is all paintball area. This is all dry.

**B. Capucilli**
Yeah. We had all that settled last year when we did Mr. Braun's subdivision of the 130 acres for the five lots. I think that was another one of the comments about putting a wetland validation on this map. I've already submitted the map for the 130 acres, which is good for five years, so we're hoping that would be good to cover this lot since it's included.

**D. Eisenhardt**
Number seven, NYSDEC wetland delineation validation note be placed on the plan and signed by the appropriate NYSDEC staff. I don't see that on here.

**B. Capucilli**
That's what I just explained. So, we just did a subdivision for the surrounding 130 acres. This lot that we're subdividing further came from that. We did wetland validation last year, which is good for five years on 130 acres. I provided copies of that.

**D. Eisenhardt**
So, number eight is fine because it says each lot complies with the underlying RR 1.5. Number nine, engineering details for the plan should be provided.

**E. VanDeMark**
I don't understand what that means.

**B. Capucilli**
No, I think we're anticipating putting culverts across the driveways and stuff, so it'll be minimum for just the entrance points, but other than that...

**R. Gorres**
Right. Have we got anything from Bob, has he been out there, or have we got any comments from him?

**B. Capucilli**
I believe we got a letter, or maybe there was a comment with our initial comment letter saying that we needed to have sight distances provided, so I believe we were waiting for all this, but it's been just kind of sitting in limbo for the last couple months.

**E. VanDeMark**
It was number four. Highway superintendent's comments on location should be received. So evidently he has not received them, or he hasn't.
Has he been out there?

**B. Capucilli**
I don't think he was going to come out until he received these maps, but like I said, they've just been sitting around since July.

**R. Gorres**
Yeah, he definitely needs these maps when he's out there.

**D. Eisenhardt**
Number ten finished floor evaluations for all proposed structures should be identified along with a grading plan in support of a lot development.

**B. Capucilli**
Okay, we can add that to that.

**D. Eisenhardt**
Eleven inverts should be provided for the driveway crossing pipes.
Twelve erosion and sediment control details should be added to the plan set.

**B. Capucilli**
I believe we are. I mean, we have our limited disturbance, and I believe right next to it we have our silt fence as well, so I have a separate silt fence typical right there, and then LOD right next to it. I don't know what other.

**R. Gorres**
Do you have the number for MHE Engineering? My suggestion is that he call Jonathan and talk to him, because some of this stuff just needs to be straightened out between Bob and Jonathan, because some of this stuff doesn't make sense.

**B. Capucilli**
Yeah, like I said, as soon as I received it, I sent him back an email requesting him to just take another look before the meeting because he's new.

**R. Gorres**
Yeah, but if you didn't specifically say what you wanted him to look at.

**B. Capucilli**
The whole thing needed to be looked at.

**R. Gorres**
The easiest way is to talk to him and find out.

**D. Eisenhardt**
Three, nine, and twelve. And then the last one, the submitted EAF should identify the total acreage to be physically disturbed in section number three. Now that limits of disturbance have been provided.

**B. Capucilli**
I can update that.

**E. VanDeMark**
Section three?

**D. Eisenhardt**
It's a section number three. I don't know what that means. It might be lot three.

**E. VanDeMark**
It may or may not. I don't know what his interpretation is.

**B. Capucilli**
I think that's just asking for the actual numerical value of the acres disturbed. Like I mentioned before, it's under two. I'll put the calculation in the EAF, update that, and re-submit it. I think most of them are straightforward. The engineering stuff, we just need to get the site distances straightened out. I would like to just point out with everyone here, I believe it's lot four, the one next to Lake Sunset, is one that's pretty close to having sufficient site distance, but it's also an existing driveway. Lot one and lot four have existing driveways in them that went back into paintball field facilities.

**R. Gorres**
Yeah, they were put in without really somebody's permission.

**B. Capucilli**
Yeah, we'll call it existing nonconforming.

**D. Eisenhardt**
Arlene, can you reach out to Jonathan and just get clarifications on number three, nine, and twelve?

**R. Gorres**
Yeah, and I think it would be good for you to call him for that clarification too Bob.

*Minard Farms*

**P. Brooks**
So, it's been some time since we were here, so I wanted to get back on the agenda and bring everybody up to speed. We received final approval on this, but we had quite a few conditions. I printed out Pat's comment memo, the status of the Health Department for subsurface sanitary. We do have the approved plans for that. We did submit them. The conservation easement must be approved by the planning board attorney. That has been satisfactorily addressed, and I actually have the executed agreements for both the conservation easement and the stormwater facilities management agreement ready for the supervisor to sign. Coverage under DEC construction stormwater permit is required. The office will assist in preparing the MS-4 authorization for the town. I still have not gotten anything from Pat. This was one that when we did the Paribelli subdivision, we went back and forth on it, because most towns don't require the MS-4 authorization until you actually start construction. But the town of Plattekill has been requesting it. That's also something that has to be approved by the town board, but we need the paperwork from Pat. So, that still needs to be completed. I believe that is the only outstanding item. Previous SWPPP comments have been addressed, so we're good with that. Method for long-term operation and maintenance of the infiltration practices should be addressed. So, I reached out to Andy Willingham, and I said, was this addressed on the plan during the stormwater agreement? It is addressed in the stormwater agreement. Then the last one was stormwater facility maintenance agreements for each of the lots should be provided to ensure long-term maintenance. Well, not only have they been prepared, but they've also been approved by the town board. So, right now, the only condition is the MS-4. But again, I wanted to get back in front of this board, because there, again, I believe may be some new members that were not familiar with it, if anybody had any questions. Because when we get the MS-4, I can bring it back to the chairman for signature without coming back in front of the planning board again. Again, I'm here tonight to answer any questions that anybody might have. And by the way, the conservation easement and the stormwater facility maintenance agreements were reviewed and approved not only by Dominic Cordisco, but also by the town attorney Ben Gailey. In fact, he asked for a couple of minor changes as protections for the town, so all the changes he requested have been made. But again, we're proposing three four-family dwellings. It's substantially a conservation subdivision with a restrictive area of 69 acres.

**E. VanDeMark**
Anybody have any questions that is not familiar with the project? Because it's been around for a while.

**D. Eisenhardt**
I don't have a question on that one, but I do have a question for you on Cross Landscaping are they almost done?

**P. Brooks**
They submitted all the final prints for signature. We found out today that DOT has issued the permit, which was the last item, but we don't have a copy of that in hand. We're hoping to get the physical copy. Arlene got an email from Mike Tinney from DOT saying, yes, we issued the permit, and here's the number, but none of us have seen the permit yet. So, the final prints are in and waiting for signature from Ernie once we really get that confirmation.

**D. Eisenhardt**
Okay.

**E. VanDeMark**
So, we'll move on to the minutes. Anybody have any other corrections?

**D. Eisenhardt**
Page one on July 23rd. Where I say Patty said yes. It should be Patti.
The last Ernie Vandermark on page three. Says Patty as well with a Y.
On page ten, second one down under Miss Hollick. I have P. Brooke. It should be Brooks

**E. VanDeMark**
Anything else?

**D. Eisenhardt**
No. Everybody else good with the twenty-third?

**E. VanDeMark**
I'll make a motion we adopt the minutes from the July 23rd meeting with the corrections noted.

**R. Gorres**
Second.

**E. VanDeMark**
On the vote.

**ALL**
Aye.

**N. Baum**
Abstain.

**E. VanDeMark**
August 25th. We got another one.

**N. Baum**
On page twenty-six. Second paragraph from the bottom. We don't have enough to pay conservation easement. Is that what I actually said? We don't have enough to pay conservation? I just don't recall that.

**A. Christiana**
I will have to listen back to the audio.

**N. Baum**
Okay. Thank you. Because it's a very specific comment. I'm wondering if I just said we don't have enough to pay the voucher.

**D. Eisenhardt**
Page thirty-three, Arlene. The very last one from my name. You're just missing a T at the end of my name.

**N. Baum**
Do you want to push it ahead with corrections, if one is necessary?

**E. VanDeMark**
Okay. I'll make a motion that we adopt the minutes from the August 25th meeting with the corrections noted, and one correction, if needed, referring back to the audio.

**R. Gorres**
Second.

**E. VanDeMark**
On the vote.

**ALL**
Aye.

*National Great Pyrenees Rescue-Sound Study*

**R. Gorres**
Sounds like they said it's okay if they fall in code.

**D. Eisenhardt**
That's what I got out of it, too.

**R. Gorres**
And if they don't follow the code, then the building department has to go out there and do their job.

**E. VanDeMark**
That's correct.

**D. Eisenhardt**
Yeah, if you've noticed on the second page, they're habitually barking.

**R. Gorres**
Yeah, because those dogs bark a lot, so that's why they got that comment in there.

**D. Eisenhardt**
Otherwise, the levels were fine.

**R. Gorres**
The question for them is, when they come back in, is if you've got a dog that's going to be out there during the day and it's going to bark all day, what are you going to do about it? We've got to ask that question to cover ourselves.

**N. Baum**
We also need her to elaborate on the discrepancy between her initial application and her most recent visit upon how many dogs can be outside at one time. I remember that because originally it was six per outside activity. Now could be six and all the rest, so we need to know her limit.

**D. Eisenhardt**
Right, and I believe he says something about six dogs.

**N. Baum**
Yeah because the more you put out there, the louder it can be. Even with this noise study, it's a different breed of dog. Even if there's more dogs at a different frequency, if their barks are at a different frequency that travels further and there's no tree coverage in the winter, you're going to hear it further away.

**D. Eisenhardt**
Number one states that the applicant has indicated that no more than six dogs will be in the dog run areas at any time. However, it may be assumed that all dogs housed at NGPR may be in outdoor areas. So, yeah, we definitely got to discuss that.

**E. VanDeMark**
Yeah, we need to really nail her down to specific details.

**D. Eisenhardt**
Yeah, see, he even says some additional information may be requested from the applicant.. Speaking of the 22nd, Joe and I will not be here for that meeting.

**E. VanDeMark**
So, we can move on to vouchers.

**N. Baum**
Voucher for MHE Engineering for work done on Sainthan Corp., 2080 Route 32, in the amount of $420.60.

EV/DE/AYE

**N. Baum**
Voucher for MHE Engineering for work done on Wakabayashi Fosler Road in the amount of $886.95.

**D. Eisenhardt**
They're now known as Storywood.

**R. Gorres**
Storywood?

**D. Eisenhardt**
Yeah, she took her name off.

RG/DE/AYE

**N. Baum**
Voucher for MHE Engineering for work done on Richmond 75 Allhusen Road in the amount of $85.20.

RG/DE/AYE

**N. Baum**
Voucher for MHE Engineering for work done on Zelenak 44 Old East Road in the amount of $682.80.

RG/DE/AYE

**N. Baum**
Voucher for MHE Engineering for work done on the Ridgeyard in the amount of $704.25 and we do not have enough to pay. An email was sent on August 26, followed up with a voicemail on August 28. So, we're going to have to table this until they replenish.

**A. Christiana**
Originally, last meeting you asked for $1,500 and they have the voucher for $704.25 as well as the other voucher which is $482.25.

**D. Eisenhardt**
So I say we make a motion we increase their escrow by another $1,500.

**E. VanDeMark**
Second. On a vote.

**ALL**
Aye.

**N. Baum**
Voucher for MHE Engineering for work done on Cross Landscaping and Lawn Care Inc. in the amount of $506. We do not have enough to pay.

**R. Gorres**
I make a motion we increase Cross Landscaping Escrow by $500.

**D. Eisenhardt**
Second.

**E. VanDeMark**
On a vote.

**ALL**
Aye.

**N. Baum**
Voucher for MHE Engineering for work done on Michael Acevedo, 1157 Route 32 in the amount of $375.85 which is not enough to pay.

**D. Eisenhardt**
So they're almost done, I believe. I think we should, what, $250 maybe or $500?

**R. Gorres**
I make a motion we ask Acevedo to increase his escrow by another $500.

**D. Eisenhardt**
Second.

**E. VanDeMark**
On a vote.

**ALL**
Aye.

**D. Eisenhardt**
I make a motion we adjourn.

**R. Gorres**
Second.

**D. Eisenhardt**
On the vote.

**ALL**
Aye.