

Village of Schoharie Planning Board Meeting June 9, 2020

Attendees: Bill Olewnick, Mike Meyer Veen, Colleen Henry and Chairperson, Dusty Putnam  
with Dr. Elbially

Meeting called to order at 7:32 p.m.

Motion to approve minutes as amended by Bill Olewnick and second by Colleen Henry, all in favor of approving the amended minutes. Motion approved.

\*\* 7:34 p.m. Board Member Tom Smith arrival

Chair handed meeting agenda to members and Dr. Elbially gave each board member his narrative and amended sketch.

I. SITE PLAN REVIEW CONTINUUM

Dr. Elbially addressed outstanding items:

He had a discussion with adjacent neighbors regarding fencing...neighbor Wilkinson wants arborvitae planted as well as a portion of fencing near Bridge Street, the neighbor is not interested in another fence abutting her current fence in place, unless it matches the existing fence there now. The Manchester neighbor prefers fencing to block their view. Further discussion is needed to make the matter harmonious with neighbors.

Board Member Tom Smith, added that the least objectionable is to match the Wilkinson neighbors fencing and have the greenery as recommended by the LUL and be in harmony with neighbors.

Dr. Elbially asked Board-- if "green" until an approved fence be listed on application. Board members are in agreement—that before application is approved this is agreed upon. In addition, Dr. Elbially informed Board that neighbor Wilkinson discussed with him arborvitae may not live at the area near Bridge St due to the nature of other vegetation (Walnut trees) harming their growth.

Chair referred to sketch regarding the vegetation at the entrance/egress from Bridge St parking lot that it not be solid hedging. Dr. Elbially agreed and added there is a 10 foot setback allowing for visibility.

Chair questioned the outline of the trees that will be removed because there are a lot of mature trees on site and the sketch plan is not clear on what is remaining and what will be removed. Chair presented pictures she took of the site just this morning. Chair has asked that board members go to site and look at the trees on the 110 Bridge St property. Chair informed the doctor that parking needs to be addressed with trees planted to follow the requirement of the LUL (every 6 spaces a tree be planted). Dr. Elbially is insistent that he does not want to give up parking spaces. Further review is necessary.

Board Members reviewed the Narrative: The narrative is accepted.

Chair: Neighbor Wilkinson is concerned with water run-off--

Dr. Elbially: informed Board that the survey engineer indicated that no more than an acre is being disturbed so the site does not need a run off study. Dr. Elbially said he can get an engineer document that addresses the water run- off stating the project will not add or upset the adjacent neighbors. Chair gave suggestion of pavers with greenery between the seams as this will help "soak" up standing water, if any.

**Application for site plan approval deemed as complete**

## II. SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION

Dr. Elbially informed Board that Contractor Chris Lawton informed him that the project is less than an acre, therefore, a document regarding water erosion is not necessary, however, Board is requesting such document.

Reviewed the amended narrative to include the proposed action does increase the dust, the traffic and the noise and to include a statement from Contractor Chris Lawton then the board will consider the application for special use permit to be complete.

### Board review of Site plan review check list in continuum

- a. waste to Casella transfer station,
- b. architect indicating waste disposal truck will get into site without any problem and deemed sketch plan adequate for the truck.
- c. Lighting plan: pole height 66 inches or 84 inches and fixture is 36 inches as per Dr. Elbially.
- d. Erosion and lighting are continuum, no new signage...other than traffic
- e. Topography is ok
- f. Landscaping plan continuum with Chris Lawton giving erosion, perc test statement....

SEQRA:

Part 1: 1. No

2. YES Schoharie County Planning Commission approval is necessary

3. Total acreage of proposed action is 1.3 acres

4. Deemed Commercial and Residential

5. Yes Permitted use and is consistent with the adopted comprehensive plan

6. yes

7. No

8. a./b. No, c. accommodations for bikes/ pedestrians as sidewalk exist

9. energy code requirements: yes

10. yes

11. Yes

12. Yes

13. No

14. Identify habitat: suburban

15. no

16. 100 year flood: yes

\*\*17. Yes and No as proposal has-- 2 catch basins on sketch plan—parking lot creates the catch basins.  
Chair will review with N. Stolzenburg

18. no

19. No

20. No

Affirmation that the information provided correct and complete.

PART 2:

1. NO —this is a small impact

2. YES Moderate impact: a home is being removed

3. Impair the character of the community? No

4. No

5. No

6. No

7. A. No B. No

8. No

9. No

10. No

11. No

SEQRA-Part 3.....

Impact #2, moderate impact

RATIONALE: The impact is three-fold: There is structural demolition, one single residential home is converted into a parking lot, and a 2 story addition to the main building. Also, an increase in patient load, an increase in parking and increased use of a four-bay garage. Architecturally, the addition and garage will be compatible with the main building. There will be the addition of landscaping for screening and softening purposes as well as addition of catch basins in the parking lot. Determined to be harmonious blending new and old.

Once the board confirms QUESTION #17 by a conversation had with Nan Stolzenburg, Planner for the Village of Schoharie, the negative declaration may be given and a package can be sent to the county planning commission.

The county planning commission needs the package within 10 days before the notice of a public hearing. Copy of items to be included in the package consist of all items reviewed this evening and any additional items Dr. Elbially has been informed to bring to the next scheduled meeting.

Next meeting is scheduled for 6/16/ 2020 at 7 p.m. with the intent on forwarding the completed package to the county that day. Continuous neighbors to be given notice of public hearing which is tentatively scheduled for 6/30/2020 with deliberations after the public hearing closes. County has 62 days to respond to the package.

Meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Colleen M Henry