

Village of Schoharie Planning Board

Apr. 22, 2026

Meeting Minutes

In Attendance:

Board members: Tom Hitter, Steve Babbitt, Dave Knoop, Mike Ullman

Board Consultants: Dave Brennan, Mike Harrington, Nan Stolzenburg

Applicants: CSD Housing team: Mike Newman, David Warren, Jason Dell, Laura Koss, Christine Nealon, Corey Auerbach, JT Pollard

Public: Jill Sholtes, Pete Johnson

Tom, chairperson of the Planning Board, called the meeting to order at 7 p.m.

The Board members reviewed the content of the draft meeting minutes from the March 17 meeting. After no revisions were requested, Dave made a motion to approve the minutes, seconded by Mike, and the vote was 4-0 in favor.

Old business: CSD Housing Depot Lane development

- CSD Housing had submitted site plan review, special use permit, and area variance applications with supporting documentation in March to the village, paid the application fees, met with the Board, and established an escrow account.
- Mike H. had reviewed the submission packet and issued comments dated 04/06/2026 (Lamont Eng Comments #1).
- Nan had reviewed the documentation and issued preliminary comments dated 04/06/2026 (Comm. Planning Comments #1).
- CSD had submitted a revised documentation package dated 04/14/2026, with a response sheet (Lansing Eng Response #1) to Lamont Eng Comments #1, but not to Comm. Planning Comments #1.
- Nan had reviewed the CSD 04/14/2026 package and response sheet and issued comments on 04/22/2026 (Comm. Planning Comments #2)

Status of the review process: The Board is in an initial stage of site plan review, determining whether the application documentation is complete. The Board and applicant have agreed to classify this as a Major project for the site plan review with Type 1 classification for the environmental assessment of the SEQR determination, and the Full EAF form. Lead Agency has not yet been declared nor has SEQR begun.

Using the Lamont Eng Comments #1, Tom read aloud each of the numbered comments and corresponding response from the CSD Housing team (Lansing Eng Reponse #1), followed by discussion. See addendum table at end for the minutiae.

Corey addressed certain of the comment sheet items (10, 11, 12) , emphasizing they pertain to the area variance application, which is for the Zoning Board of Appeals, not the Planning Board:

- He explained their rationale for claiming that the requested relief, an increase of 36 additional dwelling units over the 24 unit maximum zoning law standard, was not 'substantial': the key legal question is whether the additional increase will create any significant adverse impact *beyond what the maximum allowed zoning law standard of 24 would already have created*. They contend it would not; and since 24 units is allowed by the zoning law (if issued a Special Use Permit), any impacts due to their construction would be in harmony with neighborhood character and not adverse. Once those were created, the requested relief of 36 more units would not worsen the impacts.
- Pertaining to the Comprehensive Plan, the development will function as a transition between the commercial/municipal/historic land uses on Depot Lane to the residential single-family homes, and addresses core needs and objectives: increasing the supply and quality of affordable housing, improving housing quality, and redeveloping the jail site for residential housing.

The CSD team had not had time to assess and respond to Nan's comments, but she challenged some of the applicant's assertions pertaining to the variance request as opinions with no backing data to justify the conclusion. She agreed that affordable housing is a desired objective of the Comp Plan, but the scale of the project, the massing of the structure, the number, size, and distribution of the structure(s), the architectural style, features, and trim, also are factors to be considered in assessing how the development

SB 05/06/2026

harmonizes with the neighborhood and community character. The Comp Plan survey data shows less community preference for large multifamily apartment complexes relative to single family detached homes and prefers such developments to distribute the dwelling units across a number of separate apartment buildings. But some apartment complex developments have been allowed: Driftwood Apts has 4 buildings with 2 stories, The Birches has 3 buildings with a mix of 2-story and 1-story, and Mainbridge Commons proposes 4 buildings with a mix of 2- and 3-story.

Table of Submitted or Desired Documents

Description	Type of Document	Received?	Complete?
Site Plan Review application form	Application form	✓	✓
Special Use Permit application form	Application form	✓	✓
Area Variance application form	Application form	✓	✓
Project Narrative	Project Narrative	✓	✓
SEQR Full EAF Part 1	Environmental Assessment Form	✓	✓
Ag Data Statement	Regulatory form—Is this required?		
Site Plan	Drawings	✓	✓
Traffic flow and Signage	Drawings		
Grading & Drainage Plan	Drawings		
Utility Plan	Drawings		
Landscaping Plan	Drawings		
Lighting Plan	Drawings		
Floor plans & elevations	Drawings		
SWPPP	Technical document		
Traffic study	Technical study	✓	✓
Visual analysis (street view renderings)	Drawings or computer simulation		
Wetlands documentation	Regulatory consent letter DEC	✓	✓
Floodplain documentation	LOMR-F application form		
SHPO and Archaeology consent	Regulatory consent letters	✓	✓
Noise study	Technical Study		
List of adjacent landowners	List document	✓	✓
Market study supplied by applicant	Housing Demand Study	✓	✓
2024 Schoharie County Housing Study	Housing Study	On gov't website	✓
Impacts to Community Services	Forecast of Impacts to Public Services Report		
Impacts to school district	Forecast of in-district and out-of-district transportation impacts		

Detailed set of Engineering drawings expected soon: The table indicates most of the desired documents have been received and with sufficient content following the first round of Comment & Response revisions, except for a more detailed engineering drawing package. Jason Dell felt Lansing Engineering would be able to deliver these drawings soon, maybe in 3 weeks or so.

Some Design Concerns Unsurfaced By the Comments :

- Number of curb cuts: The Land Use Law only allows one curb cut. Perhaps the fire access road could be a separate gravel road from the driveway, with signage indicating for emergency vehicle use only? Further discussion is needed.
- Signage Directing traffic to use the wider northern leg (East-West) of Depot Lane for accessing Main St. and dissuade use of the narrower western leg (north-south): The leg of Depot Lane adjacent to the Creamery and RR Museum is not high

SB 05/06/2026

quality and poorly suited for apartment complex traffic. Signage is needed to direct vehicles exiting the driveway to turn left to reach Main St.

Old business: Mainbridge Commons

Delay to revise stormwater model: Mike H. stated that there is an earth berm at the eastern edge of the parcel, adjacent to the brook, that was not properly accounted for in the initial stormwater analysis. Delay is occurring while the Crawford Engineering firm revises their analysis, design, and SWPPP.

Motion for Consultants to begin drafting an approval document: We discussed conditions to be required if we decide to approve the project (pending forthcoming decision by ZBA on variance applications). Dave K. made a motion for our consultants Dave B & Mike H to begin drafting the document. Mike U seconded the motion, and the vote was 4-0 in favor.

Dress Up the front façade: Jill Sholtes spoke about community opinions pertaining to the appearance of the front façade of the commercial building. She personally likes the serrated gabled roof, but has heard commentary from other community members saying the rowhouse façade is ugly and could use some architectural trim embellishments, such as lintels above windows or lanterns. This spurred discussion and some other suggested improvements would be to use more than just the 2 types of alternating brick for the staggered rowhouse segments and to add a water table foundation line, which is absent.

The meeting adjourned at 8:58 p.m.

Future meetings: To Be Determined

Respectfully,

Steve Babbitt

Ref: Table of Comments #1 & Response

Lamont Eng Comment Item #	Description	Type of Document	Status
1	Flood Hazard Analysis needed	Technical Study	To be prepared by Alton Knapp
2	Include Demolition and Filling description	Project Narrative	Revised to satisfy comments
3	Provide DEC letter showing agreement on the assessment & classification of wetlands	Wetlands/Floodplain documentation	DEC letter of agreement added to submission package
4	Revise Water and Sewer demand estimates	Project Narrative	Revised to satisfy comments
6	Add listing of state & federal permits required	Site Plan Application form	Revised to satisfy comments
7	Identify the need to obtain floodplain development and demolition permits from the village gov't	Special Use Permit Application form	Revised to satisfy comments
8	Improve the description of stormwater collection and conveyance	Special Use Permit Application Form	?
9	Add list of landowners within 500 ft of parcel boundaries	Area Variance Application Form	List and map added
10	Add the adjacent Historic Property and Municipal/Public Works to the listing of surrounding land uses	Area Variance Application Form	Updated as requested
11	Questioned the classification of an increment of 36 more dwelling units above the baseline 24 units as 'would not be substantial'	Area Variance Application Form	Meaning of 'substantial' in variance law. Corey provided explanation and clarification. The area variance has been revised with clarification, but no change to the answer.
12	Suggested that Board might request a study showing why 60 dwelling units is the required minimum	Area Variance Application Form	The response provided a more detailed description of the factors making 60 units the minimum for financial viability.
13, 14, 15, 16	Add Demolition and Fill operations, Flood Plain Dev. And Demolition permits, LOMR-F, DEC Notice of Intent approval, and NYS OPRHP and SHPO 'No Effect' letters	Full EAF Form	Updated as requested; 'No Effect' letters to be provided when they arrive
17	Add that a subdivision of the parcel to deed the strip beneath Depot Lane or a Right Of Way might be necessary due to the northern strip of Depot Lane lying on the parcel	Full EAF Form	Applicant will work this problem as the project progresses into detail design phase.
18-21	Update water, sewer, and energy consumption data, full cut-off dark sky compliant lighting, and historical and municipal land uses	Full EAF Form	Revised as requested
22	Confirm no tree cutting or presence of bat roosting tree sites	Full EAF Form	An Endangered Species Habitat Suitability Assessment Report added.
23	Provide SHPO sign-off	Full EAF Form	Letters from SHPO and Hargen Archeological Associates to be provided when they arrive
24	Remove large trees depicted on rendering	Architectural Rendering Drawing	Revised as requested
25	Fire Access route through the parking lot appears tight. The zoning law allows only 1 curb cut.	Site Plan Conceptual Drawing	An Emergency Access Plan document with layout drawing of fire truck maneuvering through the site added. 2 curb cuts would enable fire trucks to circle the structure and avoid having to back up & turn around.
26, 28, 29	Identify features	Site Plan Conceptual Drawing	Revised as requested
27	The narrow width of the north-south leg of Depot Lane necessitates exiting traffic be directed to turn left onto the wider East-West leg leading directly to Main St intersection; provide signage for this and identify the signs on drawing	Site Plan Conceptual Drawing	Traffic signage will be provided during detail design phase
30	Add first floor elevation (FFE) to drawing. Also add corresponding first floor elevation of jail for reference.	Site Plan Conceptual Drawing	Topo map showing FFE of jail added. Proposed FFE elevation has not been finalized, but flood plain consultant is confident that 5.5 – 6 ft of fill will be needed, yielding an FFE of approx. 611 ft.
31	Will a retaining wall be necessary for edge of 6-ft high fill pad along street frontage side?	Site Plan Conceptual Drawing	Not anticipated, but a definitive answer won't come until detailed design of the grading is completed.
32-34	Identify features	Site Plan Conceptual Drawing	Revised as requested

SB 05/06/2026