

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MEETING HELD REMOTELY VIA ZOOM

STATE OF NEW YORK : COUNTY OF ULSTER  
TOWN OF MARLBOROUGH PLANNING BOARD

----- X

In the Matter of

ERIC AFFUSO SUBDIVISION

Project No. 20-4006  
46 Reservoir Road, Marlboro  
Section 108.2; Block 2; Lot 23.300

----- X

SKETCH - SUBDIVISION

Date: July 6, 2020  
Time: 7:30 p.m.

BOARD MEMBERS: CHRIS BRAND, Chairman  
CINDY LANZETTA  
JOSEPH LOFARO  
MANNY CAUCHI  
JAMES GAROFALO  
STEVE CLARKE

ALSO PRESENT: JEFFREY S. BATTISTONI, ESQ.  
PATRICK HINES (Present at 7:35 p.m.)  
VIRGINIA FLYNN

APPLICANT'S REPRESENTATIVE: ERIC AFFUSO, ERICA AFFUSO

----- X

MICHELLE L. CONERO  
3 Francis Street  
Newburgh, New York 12550  
(845)541-4163

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

CHAIRMAN BRAND: I would like to call the meeting to order. Agenda, Town of Marlborough Planning Board, July 6, 2020. Regular meeting at 7:30 p.m. Approval of the stenographic minutes for 6/15. On the agenda this evening we have Eric Affuso Subdivision from 46 Reservoir Road in Marlboro. It's a sketch of a subdivision. Then we have two discussions this evening without the lawyer, engineer or stenographer, the first being Stephanie Popper for 35 Hudson Terrace, Marlboro, a site plan for a bed and breakfast; and Justin McCarthy at 12 3rd Street in Milton, site plan for a bed and breakfast. The next deadline is Friday, July 10, 2020. The next scheduled meeting is Monday, July 20, 2020.

Do I have a motion to approve the stenographic minutes for 6/15?

MR. CAUCHI: I'll make that motion.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Manny. Is there a second?

MS. LANZETTA: I'll second it.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Cindy. Any opposed?

(No response.)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

CHAIRMAN BRAND: So carried.

I would also like to add into the record this evening that Board Member Cindy Lanzetta completed the 2020 New York Planning Federation. It was held June 24th and it was -- the course completed is Understanding Applying the State Environmental Quality Review Act. That is one hour's worth of credit for Board Member Lanzetta. All right.

MR. GAROFALO: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to add three short topics to the agenda.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Okay.

MR. GAROFALO: One is to talk about the future of the Zoom meetings. The second is to talk briefly about the checklist. And third about the bed and breakfast law.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Okay. Zoom meetings, checklist, bed and breakfast law. Okay.

MR. GAROFALO: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Sure. Let's get started. First up on the agenda is the Eric Affuso Subdivision.

Is Pat Hines here?

MR. BATTISTONI: I don't see Pat here.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MS. FLYNN: Let me call him.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Okay. I would like for him to go over his comments. I know he had substantial comments last time. Let's see if we can get Pat in first.

(Pause in the meeting.)

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Was that a yes, hopefully?

MS. FLYNN: Yes. He'll be here in one second.

MR. CLARKE: Chairman Brand, I will say that I got an updated letter from Pat Hines today. Did the Board Members all get that?

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Yes.

MR. LOFARO: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: There he is. Hey, Pat.

MR. HINES: Hello.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: How are you?

MR. HINES: I'm good. I had a little technical difficulty, but I overcame it.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Excellent. It's all about overcoming adversity.

We just got started. We're on the Eric

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Affuso Subdivision. Do you just want to go over your updated comments for where we are with them?

MR. HINES: Sure. So we have -- I know I distributed them this morning. We received the updated paperwork, the short EAF and the site plan checklist that was filled out. So we have the complete paperwork we were looking for.

The driveway location and sight distances were added to the plans, and I noted that we did receive a sign off from the highway superintendent earlier today.

We had a question previously about the agricultural setbacks and the buffers required. They've added a note that the grapes are going to be taken away from that area of the subdivision. So there will be an appropriate buffer. I think they put a note saying 150 feet from the proposed property line.

The septic system still needs approval from the County Planning Department. That's something that they'll have to proceed along with.

In response to the Board's last request the applicants did have a boundary survey of the

1  
2 entire 23.7 acre parcel which they have  
3 submitted. I believe the applicant has stated  
4 they have no future subdivision plans in order to  
5 address the potential segmentation question that  
6 came up.

7           And then we're suggesting that the  
8 roadway dedication parcel, which now that we have  
9 the entire boundary survey, the roadway  
10 dedication parcel only dedicates that portion of  
11 the project in front of the subdivided lot.  
12 Typically we require the entire parent parcel to  
13 be dedicated. Currently the property is shown to  
14 the center line of the roadway, which does the  
15 applicant no good. The Town typically wants that  
16 25-foot strip dedicated. The applicant won't  
17 have to pay taxes on the Town roadway any more  
18 like they have been. That will need to be updated  
19 for the survey.

20           The project does require a public  
21 hearing for the subdivision. We're suggesting  
22 that that could be scheduled at this time if the  
23 Board doesn't have any other substantive  
24 comments.

25           CHAIRMAN BRAND: Anything from the

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Board?

MR. CLARKE: The only comment I would have is just looking at the updated map, the secondary septic field looks like it's still pretty close to the north line.

MR. HINES: What that is is that's a shallow absorption trench system. They did put the label on there that the actual septic system itself will be 11 feet from the property line. The grading for the 18 inches of fill that they're bringing in for that will be right at the line. We did comment on that previously. That's going to be under the purview of the Health Department to actually take a look at that. I'm not sure whether Ulster County considers the base of the fill for the separation distance or the actual septic lines that have been depicted. That will come back from Ulster County. If it has to be moved, there's room to move it. We did bring that up as a comment and they labeled that distance.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Anything else from the Board?

MR. GAROFALO: Yes. I have a few

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

comments, one of which is to add the street width onto the plan.

There was also some discussion about the driveway grade, I think being 15 percent grade, and I wanted to find out if that's within the regulations and if that is correct.

My main concern about looking at this whole property is to make sure that they don't get themselves into a fix. Somewhere down in the future if they do decide to subdivide, that they've created a situation where they don't have any good access.

MR. CLARKE: Have you looked at the property, Jim? Have you actually done a drive by?

MR. GAROFALO: I have not done a drive by.

MR. CLARKE: Do a drive by. It will answer most of your questions.

MS. LANZETTA: I agree with Jim. I drive by that property all the time. I sent you a picture from the Ulster County Parcel Viewer, and it pretty well shows the -- for some reason, which I did not agree with, we don't have any



1  
2 idea of the topography of this property. You'll  
3 see, if you look at the photograph that I sent  
4 you, that on the west side it's certainly  
5 challenged topographically. The areas I circled  
6 on the west side are like rock outcrop areas. So  
7 that whole portion is either rock or slanted. It  
8 has quite a significant topography, challenging  
9 topography there.

10 The front of the property which abuts  
11 Reservoir Road, you will see at this point, with  
12 that proposed one-lot subdivision, it basically  
13 cuts off all access along the road area that you  
14 could access the property that is back behind  
15 there that could be further subdivided. That's  
16 basically the area where the vineyards are now.

17 So I agree with Jim that under our own  
18 Town Code 134-9, Section B, we are responsible  
19 for looking at the future development of the  
20 adjoining lands as yet unsubdivided. You can see  
21 it's adjacent to another property that already  
22 has a number of lots and basically what is a  
23 private road. It's a nonconforming private road.  
24 So how they would access the property towards the  
25 back is something that I really have a concern

1  
2 about. You know, if you could say that you would  
3 run a driveway, or possibly a private road, along  
4 the eastern side of the property, which makes the  
5 most sense to access those additional properties  
6 -- that additional property back there, you would  
7 not be able to do it if you put that 1-acre lot  
8 right there in the place that would make the most  
9 sense of running something towards the back of  
10 the property. So I think that's a real  
11 consideration that the Planning Board should be  
12 looking at, and we're required to look at.

13 MR. CLARKE: Cindy, if you look at the  
14 property -- that just assumes that you take the  
15 topography as it sits. But, you know, if you go  
16 in and remove some of the shale and move it over,  
17 you could make a very nice driveway in there. You  
18 know, that's the way it's going to have to be on  
19 some properties. You can't assume the natural  
20 topography is going to be what you're going to  
21 use.

22 MS. LANZETTA: Well if you look at that  
23 western side, that's a huge -- right next to the  
24 road is a huge rock outcrop.

25 MR. CLARKE: Yeah, but then it comes

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

down below the road. Somewhere in there you can make a driveway.

MS. LANZETTA: It significantly drops.

MR. CLARKE: Yes, but if you take some off one side and put it to the other side, you can make a 50-foot roadway.

MS. LANZETTA: It's going to be a significant problem to get. And there's also a water course that runs down there, too. That takes water down to that pond.

MR. CLARKE: That's probably seasonal.

MS. LANZETTA: Well, I mean that would be a real challenge to do that. I'm just saying they might be cutting their nose off to spite their face here, because by using that one portion there, that makes it very difficult to develop the back part of the property.

MR. GAROFALO: Some of those portions along that road do not look like they're going to have very good sight distance off of them. You know, I agree with Cindy that, you know, we really need to take a look at the access just to make sure that they are not tying themselves into a knot here.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MR. HINES: Some of that is going to be, you know, the applicant's own desire. I mean there's a multitude of ways to access the property. You could take down the houses. I mean if there's a value to the property, the houses might be worth nothing. So you pick a spot in the middle there and you could design a road where the existing houses are. There is an infinite number of ways to develop that property as you move forward. I don't know that the applicant has any -- I don't think you have a SEQRA issue. The applicant told us he doesn't have any desire to further subdivide it.

MS. LANZETTA: We don't -- he's not really a farmer, you know. There's -- why should we just go by any applicant's say so?

MR. HINES: Because they own the property. I don't think you can force the applicant into developing some imaginary subdivision on the parcel. I think there is other access. I think you could remove one or more of the houses if that was a concern.

What is the square that you drew on the --

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MS. FLYNN: Check your e-mail so you can see what they're talking about. I just sent it to you so you can pull it up.

MS. LANZETTA: The other square is a new building that is in the process of being built.

MR. HINES: That's a barn that's being constructed.

MS. LANZETTA: Yes. It's brand new.

MR. HINES: None of those structures would potentially limit access in the future. I mean if there's value to the property -- we've seen in Town where numerous structures have been removed. Old structures. It's not a limiting factor to the development. There's a lot of property frontage here.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Do you think they would be able to access it from another portion or another piece of the property to get into the back there? Pat?

MR. HINES: Yeah. I don't have a design for this. I think that there's a lot of frontage on there, as Steve said, that you can grade and provide grading on sites to access it. I just

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

don't see where eliminating the 1-acre lot limits the potential development of the parcel. Again, that's kind of a buyer beware -- not buyer beware but owner beware. I think your subdivision regulations have to do with adjoining properties, and it has to do with whether you're linking up adjoining properties, not the subject parcel that the owner has control of.

MS. LANZETTA: No, I don't agree with you on that.

MR. GAROFALO: This would essentially be a self-created problem if they were to sell that parcel and found that they had difficulty getting access to the back.

MR. HINES: We're presuming that there's difficult access to the back. I don't know that that analysis has been done.

MS. LANZETTA: If we had topography, then we would have a better idea.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Mr. Affuso, do you have a comment on any of this?

MR. AFFUSO: I do have comments. So for the concern of future development on my property, I plan on staying there until I'm dead. I guess

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

some day it could be sold and it would be somebody's worry. That could be assumed by the person who has the need or worry at that time. I'm looking to give my daughter a piece of property to build a home in Marlboro.

As far as me not being a farmer, I'm not at the time, but that's not saying I may not want to be. That vineyard is close to 100 years old. It was created and farmed by Mr. Pizel. When he was 100 years old he asked me if I would do everything I can to keep the vineyard going, and I'm going to do that. It's not a profitable vineyard right now but I may look to create more of a profit and an access to move that vineyard along in the future. I don't know that for sure. I'm 61 years old, kind of trying to look to get out of the plumbing business.

Again, as far as future development, unless there's some kind of code or law that says I have to plan for that, I'm okay preventing that. I just have no desire to do so. I have no desire to do much more than farm that vineyard, if indeed I decide to do that. I have no problem with the farming setbacks of the property line.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Cindy travels that road every day. She well understands the topography. Creating that driveway where it is for sight distance is helping out about six or seven homes now where there wasn't a concern prior to those homes being there regardless of before or after zoning. So I think there's going to be an improvement by taking that driveway where it is and creating better sight distance.

And again, if you're asking me to decide on what I want to do with that property in the future, I don't have a crystal ball on it but I don't have a desire to do any more there.

MS. LANZETTA: Well, the other -- I still have additional concerns. The property class as -- it's listed for fruit crop. It's considered an agriculturally used property. We have on the books our -- under our farmland protection subdivision regulations that if you're going to put in a home in an active -- in a place that's actively agriculture, you do have to put some kind of a berm or landscaping to protect from -- the back property from active agriculture. If you don't want to do that, then



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

you're going to have to put something in writing on the map that says that you will -- you will -- you, as the parent property owner, will not plant anything within that 150-foot radius so that you would be taking on that responsibility to protect the people that are on that -- the new lot that you're creating.

MR. AFFUSO: Those people are my daughter.

MS. LANZETTA: I'm not -- please don't take this personally. It's not a matter of personal issues. It's trying to make sure that if the day comes that you leave, if the day comes that she leaves, that any person that moves into that house is protected from any agricultural activity, and that's why we have it on the books -- why we have the law on the books. Now, if she's not going to -- if she, as that 1-acre property owner, is not going to put in some kind of a berm or landscaping or something like that to protect herself, then you're going to have to make sure you put it on your subdivision map that you will not plant or do anything within the adjacent area.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

CHAIRMAN BRAND: I think we did that in the past in another situation such as this where there was a note on the map that got filed that said, you know, should the property ever be sold to someone outside of your family, then that would be a condition of the sale, that it would have to be built.

MS. LANZETTA: That was not done --

MR. HINES: That was the brewery.

MS. LANZETTA: -- because we had active agricultural families. That was a family itself that was actually doing the farming. This is a little different situation.

MR. AFFUSO: Okay.

MS. LANZETTA: And then also in regards to sight distance, I'm not really comfortable with the letter I saw from John Alonge because the way that the letter is written, it says that the sight distance is sufficient from the top of the hill. You know, under our town code the sight distance is supposed to be in compliance with the Institute of Traffic Engineers Guidelines for driveway design and location. That is supposed to be done at the intersection -- at the bottom

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

of that hill where it intersects with the Town road. I wouldn't feel comfortable with the letter that Mr. Alonge has sent at this point. I would expect him to say that it does comply with those guidelines in order to really feel that -- it's the kind of letter of approval that I would feel comfortable with.

MR. CLARKE: What's the distance on a 35 mile-an-hour Town road? How many feet do you need sight distance either way?

MS. LANZETTA: Well on 30 miles-per-hour you need 220 for a left and 260 for a right. But they said on rural roads that you have to increase that by 10 percent. I'd like to remind you that that is a 35 mile-an-hour zone. So it would be closer to what's required for 40 miles-an-hour.

MR. GAROFALO: Clearly you would be better if the letter were very specific and referred to the plan.

MR. AFFUSO: What plan?

MR. GAROFALO: The plan that's been submitted, that this is exactly where he's approving the sight distance.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MS. AFFUSO: I mean the map was written where he did approve it for the driveway, Mr. Alonge himself.

MS. LANZETTA: It's saying the sight distance is sufficient at the top of the hill. I don't know what that means, the top of the hill.

MS. AFFUSO: It's semantics. Do I have him rewrite it explaining whatever it is to the code that you guys are referring to at this point?

MS. LANZETTA: Yeah. I would feel a lot better about that.

MR. CLARKE: Isn't that driveway on the crest of a hill?

MR. AFFUSO: Are you asking me a question, Steve?

MR. CLARKE: No. I'm asking Cindy.

MS. LANZETTA: No. It looks to me to be at the bottom.

MS. AFFUSO: No. It's at the stop.

MR. CLARKE: No. This is going up, up, up. You know, I don't -- I have to look at the sight distance here. We go from 468 to 462. It's on the crest. The driveway is on the crest of

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

that hill because, you know, the topography begins to fall off to the west as you go west of the driveway. So I think that's what Mr. Alonge was talking about, that the driveway is on the crest of the hill.

MS. LANZETTA: So I'd want it written from the point where it intersects with the road.

MR. HINES: The applicant's engineer has identified it at greater than 500 feet in both directions on the plan that was recently submitted.

MS. LANZETTA: I'd still feel better if it was where it intersects the road.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Mr. Affuso, can you reach out to Mr. Alonge and perhaps have him provide a more detailed letter?

MR. AFFUSO: I can ask him. You know, he wrote the letter according to how he felt to write it. I'll just be directed as you direct me.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: I would definitely reach out to him and just see if he can make sure that it's a little more specific and address the things that Board Member Lanzetta brought up.

MS. AFFUSO: Just for specifics, can

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

you restate what you want in that letter just so he knows so he can write it?

MR. AFFUSO: (Inaudible.)

CHAIRMAN BRAND: I'm sorry. I didn't hear you, Mr --

MR. AFFUSO: Are there minutes that can be forwarded to John Alonge?

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Certainly. Yeah.

MR. AFFUSO: He's a Town employee.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Yes.

MS. LANZETTA: It's in our town code.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: I would just reach out to him and ask him to provide a more detailed letter. If he has a question he can contact one of us, or I can reach out to him even.

MR. CLARKE: It's on the map you have 500 feet in each direction, which is more than sufficient for the town code.

MS. AFFUSO: If it's on the map, we still need the letter along with the map that we already submitted? I'm just confused. Is it just putting it verbal and visual? I'm not sure why one isn't sufficient but both would be.

MS. LANZETTA: Under town code we need

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

the approval of the highway superintendent that it meets sufficient sight distance.

MS. AFFUSO: So he wrote it was sufficient. He's basing it off of what he saw and what the engineer put on the map which shows 500.

MS. LANZETTA: That's not what the --

MS. AFFUSO: (Inaudible) agrees with the map that it's sufficient, because that's what we submitted where the driveway is.

MS. LANZETTA: The way the letter was written, I don't think it was -- it said it was from the top of the hill. It's supposed to be from the intersection with the Town road.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Jeff, do you have any input on this one?

MR. BATTISTONI: I'm just pulling up the highway superintendent's letter. It says, "In regards to the proposed driveway in the Affuso Subdivision on Reservoir Road, I have found it to have safe, suitable sight distance at the top of the hill as discussed with Rick Affuso and Dave Zambito." He does say at the top of the hill. I'm assuming that he can clarify that to mean in both

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

directions.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Okay. I'll reach out to him myself and give him some more specific direction for the letter.

MR. GAROFALO: One other question. Does this plan need a certification block regarding the DEC requirements for the pond, et cetera?

MR. HINES: The pond is not regulated. It's not a designated DEC wetland. DEC only regulates wetlands that are 12.4 acres or larger. That is not it. They have shown a 100-foot buffer or more for their septic system and such. There is no DEC-associated buffer with that pond.

MR. GAROFALO: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Pat, do you have specifics on the driveway grade, too? I know that was one of Mr. Garofalo's previous questions.

MR. HINES: I didn't, but the maximum driveway grade permitted is 14 percent. We've gone through that extensively on some projects. If the applicant's engineer could add a note that says maximum driveway grade 14 percent. My comments previously were the existing topography.



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

I didn't calculate the proposed topography, but I can do that between now and the next meeting just to give the Board that information. I just don't have a scale sitting on my couch here right now.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Anything else on this one?

MS. AFFUSO: To clarify, are you going to speak to Mr. Alonge or --

CHAIRMAN BRAND: I will speak to Mr. Alonge.

MS. AFFUSO: So I can do my due diligence and what I need to get for paperwork.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: I will speak to him.

MS. AFFUSO: Do we meet again for his letter and then go to public?

CHAIRMAN BRAND: I mean I feel comfortable scheduling the public hearing, and then we'll just --

MR. BATTISTONI: A letter condition.

MS. AFFUSO: Okay. Just so I know what I need to do.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Jen, when are we able to do that?

MS. FLYNN: August 3rd. I won't be able

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

to put it in the paper in time for the next meeting. I'm sorry.

MS. AFFUSO: That's all right.

MR. AFFUSO: She's more inpatient than I am.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: August 3rd for the public hearing.

Anything else on this?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN BRAND: No. All right. I thank you then.

MR. HINES: We need a vote on that public hearing I believe.

MR. BATTISTONI: Normally there would be a motion to set the public hearing date.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: I'd like to have a motion to set the public hearing for the Affuso Subdivision for August the 3rd.

MR. CAUCHI: I'll make that motion.

MR. GAROFALO: I'll second it.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN BRAND: So moved. Thank you.

MR. AFFUSO: Thank you very much. Have

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

a good night.

MS. AFFUSO: Have a good one. Thank  
you.

(Time noted: 8:00 p.m.)

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

I, MICHELLE CONERO, a Notary Public  
for and within the State of New York, do hereby  
certify:

That hereinbefore set forth is a  
true record of the proceedings.

I further certify that I am not  
related to any of the parties to this proceeding by  
blood or by marriage and that I am in no way  
interested in the outcome of this matter.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto  
set my hand this 11th day of July 2020.

*Michelle Conero*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
MICHELLE CONERO

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MEETING HELD REMOTELY VIA Zoom

STATE OF NEW YORK : COUNTY OF ULSTER  
TOWN OF MARLBOROUGH PLANNING BOARD

----- X  
In the Matter of

Planning Board Meetings Held Via Zoom

----- X

BOARD BUSINESS

Date: July 6, 2020  
Time: 8:00 p.m.

BOARD MEMBERS: CHRIS BRAND, Chairman  
CINDY LANZETTA  
JOSEPH LOFARO  
MANNY CAUCHI  
JAMES GAROFALO  
STEVE CLARKE

ALSO PRESENT: JEFFREY S. BATTISTONI, ESQ.  
PATRICK HINES  
VIRGINIA FLYNN

----- X

MICHELLE L. CONERO  
3 Francis Street  
Newburgh, New York 12550  
(845)541-4163

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

CHAIRMAN BRAND: So Mr. Garofalo, the next things on our regular agenda are without the stenographer, attorney and lawyer. Do you feel as though we need to have them present for the things that you are bringing up?

MR. GAROFALO: Maybe just the Zoom part. And I sent you an e-mail. I had contacted the State Office on Open Meetings and they said that there's a possibility that there may be an extension to allow for continued non in-person meetings. They also recommended that the in-person gathering -- social gathering limitations should apply to our meetings also. So if we are in stage 4, we shouldn't have more than 50 people present if we do an in-person. So we may or we may not be doing the next meeting with a Zoom depending on whether they extend it past today.

MR. HINES: Today or tomorrow, right, is the deadline.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: I wouldn't necessarily disagree with just having our next meeting as a scheduled Zoom meeting, and then, you know, that way we're safe either way and we can take it from there.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MR. GAROFALO: I don't know as if we can legally. The Executive Order allowed us to not have them in person. So I think that if they don't extend the Executive Order, we may be forced to go back to in-person.

I personally would like to see them make it permanent that we can have Zoom meetings because I think that's good for the applicants in that there's less time spent both on their part and on all the professionals' parts in that they don't have to do all this traveling.

So my personal opinion is I like to have the Zoom meetings because it's better for everyone, but I don't think we can necessarily have them unless they extend that Order.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Right. So I think what we'll do -- right now as it stands we can still have the Zoom. He's making another Executive Order in the very near future?

MR. GAROFALO: Well he may. It hasn't been made yet, and today is the last day you can do it, you can have a Zoom meeting.

MS. FLYNN: I don't think we get more than 50 people anyhow.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

BOARD BUSINESS

MR. HINES: No. That would be rare.

MR. GAROFALO: That would be pretty rare.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: I guess we'll -- I don't know. Any suggestions? Jen?

MS. FLYNN: My cutoff is on Friday, and right now I have two things on the agenda for the next meeting, which is the Young Subdivision and then the Santini Site Plan. That's all I have at the moment.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Okay.

MR. CAUCHI: What is the Town Planning Board doing?

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Is Al still here? Was he here on this meeting before?

MR. LANZETTA: Yeah, I'm here.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Al, what's the Town Board doing?

MR. LANZETTA: We're having a Zoom meeting. We haven't heard anything yet one way or the other as far as Executive Order and not having a Zoom meeting. Until I get confirmation, I think the next meeting will be a Zoom meeting.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: I think that would be

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

my recommendation as well, that we just go ahead and make it a Zoom meeting unless we hear differently. If we have to go in person, then we can make those adjustments as necessary.

MR. LOFARO: I'll second that, Chris.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Anyone else on that?

MR. CLARKE: Good choice.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Okay. So we'll do that.

All right. So I guess we are done with Jeff, Pat and Michelle. Thank you for being here.

(Time noted: 8:04 p.m.)



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

I, MICHELLE CONERO, a Notary Public  
for and within the State of New York, do hereby  
certify:

That hereinbefore set forth is a  
true record of the proceedings.

I further certify that I am not  
related to any of the parties to this proceeding by  
blood or by marriage and that I am in no way  
interested in the outcome of this matter.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto  
set my hand this 11th day of July 2020.

*Michelle Conero*

---

MICHELLE CONERO