

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

KENT FAMILY FARM

Project No. 21-5010
152 & 178 North Road
Section 103.1; Block 2; Lots 24 & 25.1

----- X

SITE PLAN

Date: June 7, 2021
Time: 7:30 p.m.

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

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

APPLICANT'S REPRESENTATIVE: PATTI BROOKS

----- 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: Agenda, Town of Marlborough Planning Board, June 7, 2021. Regular meeting at 7:30 p.m. Approval of stenographic minutes for May 3rd.

On the agenda tonight we have the Kent Family Farm at 152 and 178 North Road for a final for the site plan, and we have Mondello and Perretta for a final of their lot line. We will continue the discussion without the lawyer, engineer, stenographer for the Planning Board site plan review.

The next deadline is Friday, June 11th. The next scheduled meeting is Monday, June 21st.

I'd like to have a motion to approve the stenographic minutes for May the 3rd, please.

MR. CAUCHI: I'll make that motion.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Manny. Is there a second?

MR. TRONCILLITO: I'll second it.

OCHAIRMAN BRAND: Bobby. Any discussion?

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

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Any objections?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Any abstentions?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Okay. All right. Before we begin, I know some of you have some training hours. Was that true or something? Cindy?

MS. LANZETTA: Yeah. I attended the New York State Renewable Energy workshop, and I sent that information to Jen.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Great. Just so that you know, the recording -- the stenographer is going to make a report based on the recording of the meeting this evening.

All right. So first up we have the Kent Family Farm, final of the site plan. I will start with Ms. Brooks.

MS. BROOKS: Good evening. So since the last meeting we made a couple of revisions to the site plan. We revised

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

what was a proposed septic to an engineered septic area, removed the water tank and the trees that were located inside of it. We added the sight distance from the access on Church Street. We showed the access to the agricultural building from the handicap parking spaces. The terminology we changed on note number 10, handicap parking to accessible parking. We added a note on the map that all events needed to be in accordance with Ag & Markets event regulations.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Great. Thank you.

Questions, comments from the Board tonight?

Jen, I don't think you need to share that, though.

MS. FLYNN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: I think she sent it out to all of us.

MR. CAUCHI: I have a few comments.

MS. FLYNN: Steve, can you mute?

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

We have background noise from you.

MR. CLARKE: All right.

MS. FLYNN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Go ahead, Manny.
The floor is yours.

MR. CAUCHI: First of all, I
thank you, Jeff, for addressing the
comments that I had earlier today. That
was very helpful, clarifying a lot of
issues.

One of the issues was why was
there a need of having the site plan
approval. It wasn't really clear to me.
But because of all of the expansion that
they're doing, it's a requirement of the
code. That clarification was well noted.
It wasn't very clear to me. I appreciate
that.

And also determining what is the
usage of that, as well as your
conversation with Ms. Brooks. That was
noted as well. Thank you for that
clarification.

(Technical interruption.)

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: Is he fading out for you as well?

MR. CAUCHI: I still haven't clarity -- excuse me. One of the additional is the safety, the traffic safety and the signs there. I know you have it that it's not per our jurisdiction. I was wondering if you could clarify that a little bit more for me?

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Who is that question to, Manny? To Jeff?

MR. CAUCHI: Yes.

MR. BATTISTONI: I will say that at the last meeting there was discussion of those items. There was discussion that traffic safety in terms of enforcement of speed limits and things of that nature is not a Planning Board issue. That would be more of a policing issue. And signage, roadway signage as well would be something within either the highway superintendent's jurisdiction. Perhaps the Town Board but probably the highway superintendent. So

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

it's not a Planning Board issue.

MR. CAUCHI: Okay. So then we will have to get the highway supervisor involved with that to make it since there will be -- the traffic will be -- more traffic in that area being -- I mean the concept is a really good concept for the Kent family to do that. So we just want to make sure, because the Hamlet of Milton is such a quaint little thing, to increase traffic, we just want to make sure that we are prepared for the overflow and car activity there.

And this brings me up to my next point --

MS. BROOKS: Can I just finish addressing, Manny, just for one second before you head on? What is within the purview of the Planning Board with regard to the site plan review is the internal traffic and how we control pedestrians and their use, which is why we did have the walking path totally within lands of Kent, going from the Church Street parking lot

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

up to the site. So I think that the Planning Board, they had -- they made actually several comments with regard to that, and we've made revisions throughout the review process to make sure that pedestrian safety was well accounted for. So I think that although addressing signage on the road and no parking and so forth, which again I believe is within the highway jurisdiction, I think that the Planning Board has certainly done their due diligence, yourself included, with making sure sure that the on-site provisions were well accounted for.

MR. CAUCHI: That's well taken, Patti. My concern is the additional -- the neighborhood people walking. Not only the patrons to the brewery, the neighborhood people walking on that road. All of a sudden -- there's a lot of people that walk there, and so I'm concerned for them as well. Not just the patrons but the people that walk that road, and there's a substantial amount of them that

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

do that.

MS. BROOKS: So that has nothing to do with site plan then. You're saying that that's a concern outside of the site plan?

MR. CAUCHI: I'm looking at the overall picture. I'm not just looking at one specific segment of it. I'm looking at the overall whole picture of that. There needs to be an overall attention to the overall picture is what I'm getting at.

My next comment is that parking is very limited in the Hamlet of Milton, and I understand -- this is great. I just want to know how is the brewery and the Kent family going to monitor that valuable parking space that is there at the Hamlet of Milton since parking is very limited there. I just want to know what is their plan. I'm not saying -- just what do they have planned for hey, you have other businesses in the area, you have, you know, shops in the area. And again,

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

parking is very limited there. I just wanted to know if there is some monitoring that's going to be done. If they could share that with us, it would be helpful. That's all I had.

MS. BROOKS: I think at this point in time there isn't any monitoring proposed. I mean I can speak to this a little bit because my business has one of the few parking lots in the Hamlet of Highland, and it has become an enforcement issue for us personally as business owners. So in our off hours when our staff is not using our parking spaces, we don't enforce it. Not that we encourage strangers parking there, but we allow it to happen. On the occasions where it does become an issue, then we get law enforcement involved and ask them to run the plates, and we try and track down the people. So I think that that would be something that we hope would not occur, but if it does occur that would be up to Mr. Kent to contact law enforcement, 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

as it is with any other business in the hamlet right now. I mean look at Frida's. They have a large parking lot behind them for the laundromat and the bakery, which I'm sure they have issues with people parking there who are not their customers. That generally is a business to business enforcement issue that's the onus, unfortunately, of the landowner.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Patti, how many spots are on the site again? Do you know off the top of your head?

MS. BROOKS: Overall including the field overflow, there were 44. We had 28 spaces in front of the facility itself, and then -- I'm sorry. There's an additional 44 grass overflow down at Church Street. So 28 plus 44.

MR. CAUCHI: My concern is there is a lot of out of towners that come in. Maybe it needs to be -- whatever the monitoring system or whatever it is needs to be well stated, you know, or signs put up, what is the intention, so we don't

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

hold the burden, or the police force does as well. That's all.

MS. BROOKS: Point well taken. Thank you, Manny.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Any other questions or comments from the Board?

MR. TRONCILLITO: Chip -- maybe Chip, I don't know if you can answer this or if Patti can answer it. I have received some calls, and I just need clarification so I can get back with the people that called me. In regard to the inside of the facility, what are the intentions in regards to what's going to be available? That's what was being asked to me. I figured the best person to ask would be you so I could get back with them with the correct answer. I don't want to give them false information.

MS. BROOKS: Are you talking about with regard to food, Bob?

MR. TRONCILLITO: Yes. That's what their concern was. I said geeze, I don't know. That's the reason I'm asking.

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

Just so when I get back with them I can give them the answer, Chip, whatever it is.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: That's actually in our resolution tonight. It clarifies exactly what he's going to be doing and what he's not going to be doing in there.

MR. TRONCILLITO: Okay.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: I mean maybe I can have Jeff go through that when we get to that point. If you still have questions outside of that, then maybe we can ask Chip. I think that it was pretty clear in the resolution.

MR. KENT: We're losing our internet for some reason up here on North Road. You guys are going in and out.

MR. TRONCILLITO: If that's going to be clarified, then that will be the answer for me, and I can get back to my constituents that were asking me those questions. That's all.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: If it's still not clear to you afterwards, please feel

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

free to ask.

MR. TRONCILLITO: Okay.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: I think that
it's very clear.

MR. TRONCILLITO: All right.
Good. Sounds good to me.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Any other
questions or comments from the Board?

MR. GAROFALO: Yes. I have some
questions and comments. I had asked for
sight distances, and on the new June
revision you provided the sight distance
off of Church Street. I think for the
highway superintendent we should have
sight distances where the other two
accesses are being -- well, one is being
created and one is really already there.
The one that is already there is already
paved. But that was my other concern,
that the accesses, the initial portion of
it, according to our code, needs to be
paved. I can't remember whether it's 15
feet or 10 feet or whatever. But that
isn't shown on the new plan as being paved

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

for those two other accesses. So I think what we need to do is have in the resolution that the highway superintendent approves the accesses and any signing that goes along with those accesses and the width of those accesses, because they are -- two of the accesses are going to be one way. So they really need to be signed because one of them is going to be gravel and you're really not going to be able to put a pavement marking on that gravel. But to have appropriate signing. I'm okay with him signing off once he looks at the sight distances and the signing for those two one-way and sees that you've included paving on those other two accesses for that short distance.

MS. BROOKS: James, you had mentioned that last month and so I tried finding it in the code. I had written down that you said it was Section 130(C) 121, and I couldn't even find that section in the code. So I certainly -- if you could provide that to me, I greatly would

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

appreciate it. I think that your solution or your suggestion that we leave it up to the jurisdiction of the highway superintendent is certainly fine as far as I'm concerned. But I just also wanted to point out that the sight distance for the two accesses along North Road have always been shown on the site plan and they're there. They're across the street. They're in green. So I thought that you were just asking me to add the one on Church Street, which I did, because the other ones have been shown all along.

MR. GAROFALO: I apologize. You are correct. It is in green, it's just hard -- I didn't see it because it was in green. So yeah, those are provided. Thank you very much.

MS. BROOKS: Okay.

MR. GAROFALO: I'm sorry about pointing that out when it was unnecessary.

MS. BROOKS: No problem.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Anything else from the Board?

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

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN BRAND: I'm going to say that's a no.

Jeff then, you have prepared two documents for us this evening. Did you just want to review them, the first being the SEQRA negative declaration and notice of determination of non-significance and the Planning Board approval resolution for the site plan?

MR. BATTISTONI: Yes, I can do that. First let me just ask a question. Board Member Garofalo just said that he wanted a condition added that the highway superintendent sign off on, let's say the surface of and the signage for the access points. If we phrase it that way, is that acceptable?

MR. GAROFALO: In the locations.

MR. BATTISTONI: Okay. Bear with me a second.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Is the Board in agreement to add that as well? Does anyone object to adding that, I should

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

ask?

MR. CAUCHI: No.

MR. BATTISTONI: Okay. So following the last -- at the last meeting the Board closed the public hearing. I was directed to prepare a resolution for a negative declaration and also a resolution for site plan approval. I did prepare that and circulated those two resolutions. Manny had several questions today by e-mail and we tried to address those, and Tom Corcoran had some questions as well. In the approval resolution, at the very end of it there is a paragraph E which reads as follows, "The owners do not intend to operate a restaurant on the property, so this approval does not grant an approval for such operation. However, state law requires establishments which sell alcoholic beverages for on-premises consumption to make food available. A diversified selection of finger foods such as cheeses, fruits and crackers has been held to be sufficient. The provision 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

such food is approved. Further, to the extent that events are held at the property" -- excuse me. "Further, to the extent that events are held at the property, outside catering businesses and food trucks are authorized to provide food service on the property." So that's that fifth condition or condition E that I added.

Bob, I hope that answers your question about food service.

MR. TRONCILLITO: Yes, it does. This way when the people -- when I get back with them and say hey, this is what it is. And that's fine. I just needed a little bit of clarification. Thank you. I appreciate it.

MR. BATTISTONI: And that's a specific condition in the resolution.

And finally we'll add one, and I'm just going to read the language. This will be sub-paragraph F, "The highway superintendent must sign off on the location of the surface of and the signage

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

for the access points."

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Now, I may be incorrect but I feel like we've discussed this before for a different agricultural site where the paving -- it may have even been this one. We talked about some portion -- that maybe the accessible parking spaces on ag sites did not need to be paved. Am I incorrect in that?

MR. BATTISTONI: I think that was the discussion but I'm unclear about whether an access point requires a certain amount of paving. I would leave that up to the highway superintendent. If he feels it's required under the code, he'll require it. If he feels he can sign off on it, he'll sign off on it. That would be his jurisdiction.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Okay. I'm comfortable with that.

Any other questions regarding that?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN BRAND: All right 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

MR. GAROFALO: There was one item in the resolution where you put I think no new building is proposed or something like that -- to that effect, item F. There was some discussion about the barn and, you know, the Building Department treating it as a new building because it hadn't been inspected but had been built under the farm regulations. Maybe rather than say no new building, maybe it would be better to say no building construction is proposed. Something to that -- something to that effect.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Well they are fixing the old one in the back, so that wouldn't work with what we discussed so far.

MS. BROOKS: I think the way it's worded right now is correct for the reason that I understand that the building inspector was contending that it's not an existing building, but the point is that we can all drive by it and see it and it is an existing building. So again, we're

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

crossing over with what Building Department rules and regulations are as far as use on the interior of the building and zoning and the fact that the building is an existing building. We don't pretend -- you know, again our site plans are very clear. When something is proposed, we call it proposed. When something is existing, then it's shown on the building as an existing feature. So although, you know, I do understand we had received that comment from the building inspector, it certainly is an existing building, and right now we call it, you know, building agricultural/barn, and that is a factual statement.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: It's there right now, at the time of the approval. Okay. I'm good with that.

Anything else?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Okay. As far as the application of Charles T. Kent and James D. Kent Junior as owners and

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

applicants for site plan approval, the
Town of Marlborough Planning Board SEQRA
negative declaration and notice of
determination of non-significance.

Jen, would you poll the Board.

MS. FLYNN: Chairman Brand?

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Yes.

MS. FLYNN: Member Troncillito?

MR. TRONCILLITO: Yes.

MS. FLYNN: Member Garofalo?

MR. GAROFALO: Yes.

MS. FLYNN: Member Lanzetta?

MS. LANZETTA: Yes.

MS. FLYNN: Member Lofaro?

MR. LOFARO: Yes.

MS. FLYNN: Member Cauchi?

MR. CAUCHI: Yes.

MS. FLYNN: Member Clarke?

MR. CLARKE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Then we have the
Planning Board of the Town of Marlborough
approval resolution of site plan for the
application of Charles T. Kent and James
D. Kent Junior as owners and applicants

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

for site plan approval.

Chairman Brand offered the following resolution which was seconded by Member Lanzetta with the agreed upon addition of subsection F which essentially notes the highway superintendent signing off on specific portions of the access, sight distance and possible paving.

Jen, would you poll the Board.

MS. FLYNN: Chairman Brand?

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Yes.

MS. FLYNN: Member Garofalo?

MR. GAROFALO: Yes.

MS. FLYNN: Member Troncillito?

MR. TRONCILLITO: Yes.

MS. FLYNN: Member Lanzetta?

MS. LANZETTA: Yes.

MS. FLYNN: Member Lofaro?

MR. LOFARO: Yes.

MS. FLYNN: Member Clarke?

MR. CLARKE: I'm going to have to abstain on this one. The two families are a little too close for me to make a decision. So I'll just -- let me abstain

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

on this one.

MS. FLYNN: Okay. Member Cauchi?

MR. CAUCHI: Yes.

MS. FLYNN: Patti, can you give me the last revision date?

MS. BROOKS: Yes. May 20, 2021.

MS. FLYNN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: All right. I believe that finishes up Kent Family Farm.

MS. BROOKS: Thank you very much.

MR. TRONCILLITO: Good luck, Chip.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: I don't know if you can still hear us.

MS. FLYNN: I think he's frozen.

MS. BROOKS: I'll send him an e-mail and let him know.

(Time noted: 7:55 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 22nd day of June
2021.

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

MONDELLO & PERRETTA

Project No. 21-5003
James Street, Marlboro
Section 109.1; Block 4; Lots 65 & 67

----- X

LOT LINE

Date: June 7, 2021
Time: 7:55 p.m.

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

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: All right. Next on the agenda this evening we have Mondello and Perretta for a final of the lot line on James Street in Marlborough.

Jeff, I guess I'll start with you. You also approved a resolution of approval for this. Anything that you'd like to point out to the Board?

MR. BATTISTONI: The resolution is straightforward. It was a Type 2 action and it qualified for the waiver of the public hearing under your Town Code. So there was a variance -- an area variance granted by the Zoning Board of Appeals, so the resolution is straightforward.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Great. Any questions or comments from the Board?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN BRAND: No. Then for the application of Lucas A. Mondello as trustee of the Lucas A. Mondello living trust and Steven Perretta as trustee of the Frank Perretta living trust, a lot

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

line revision, you have before you a resolution of approval by the Town of Marlborough Planning Board dated June 7, 2021.

Jen, would you poll the Board.

MS. FLYNN: Chairman Brand?

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Yes.

MS. FLYNN: Member Lanzetta?

MS. LANZETTA: Yes.

MS. FLYNN: Member Lofaro?

MR. LOFARO: Yes.

MS. FLYNN: Member Clarke?

MR. CLARKE: Yes.

MS. FLYNN: Member Cauchi?

MR. CAUCHI: Yes.

MS. FLYNN: Member Garofalo?

MR. GAROFALO: Yes.

MS. FLYNN: Member Troncillito?

MR. TRONCILLITO: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Great. Just as

a -- before we move to the discussion without the lawyer, engineer and stenographer, obviously the stenographer is not here this evening, there were two

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

outstanding issues from our last meeting that I just want to check in with where we are.

Pat, you're going to get to me the fee for the conceptual site plan application review.

And then I believe there was a question from the Crimi Varolis regarding their status. Do you know what I'm referring to, Pat?

MR. HINES: I don't. It came at the end of their approval that it was a County highway. Now the County has determined that they do not want dedication of that portion of the lot, is my take on that, what I saw in some e-mails.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: So we're just waiting for the final maps to be submitted?

MR. HINES: We're waiting for the final maps to be submitted. We're removing that dedication offer. The County road will remain a County road by

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

use.

(Time noted: 7:58 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 22nd day of June 2021.

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

DISCUSSION ON THE SOLAR ARRAY CODE

----- X

BOARD BUSINESS

Date: June 7, 2021
Time: 7:58 p.m.

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

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: Okay. I think then -- is there any other reason not to dismiss Jeff and Pat for the evening?

MS. LANZETTA: I have a question that I'd like an opinion by Jeff, or possibly Pat could weigh in. The Zoning Board of Appeals is going to be looking at -- they're currently looking at a solar panel array that was pre-standing that was put in the front yard of a home, and of course that's considered an accessory use and therefore is not in compliance with our code, our new solar code. In taking a look at that, it says that our -- if you're not in the R-1 District, and this is -- in this particular case it was the AGR-1, that they're supposed to come in for a site plan before they do anything, which was a surprise to me. I hadn't really realized that when we were looking at the code as it was drafted. In the code it does explain an expedited site plan, you know, requirement, but we don't -- but then it refers to our code with 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

full site plan.

I'm wondering if in the future this comes before us, because it's probably more likely that we'll get a freestanding solar array in an Ag District, do we have to put them through the entire site plan review or can we look at the expedited site plan as it's outlined in the solar code?

MR. BATTISTONI: I'll look at your solar code so that I know what it says. Generally an action like that would be a Type 2 action, so in terms of environmental review it's quick. But I don't know offhand what your solar code says about site plan requirements. I'll look at that.

MR. HINES: It sounds like if it's before the ZBA they'll have a public hearing so you'll get a feel from the neighbors the concerns as well initially before they even get back to you.

MS. LANZETTA: Well I mean it's done. They built it.

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: Right. The ZBA has to have a public hearing.

MS. LANZETTA: And they are. But if they approve it, it's kind of moot because it never came before us for a site plan.

MR. HINES: The ZBA grants them relief. It will have to come back to you for site plan.

MS. LANZETTA: Okay. Thank you for bringing that up because I was wondering about that. So if the ZBA says it's okay, we'll give them the variance to have it in their front yard, they come back to us for site plan, what's the point because it's built?

MR. GAROFALO: I think the point is that you have to go through site plan, otherwise you have people just building everything and saying oh, it's done. Because in theory, if we said no, they might have to remove it or make changes to it. So I think that it becomes a requirement, otherwise you just 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

people skipping the Planning Board and just going ahead and building things.

CHAIRMAN BRAND: Even if the ZBA approves it? We can't say no then, could you?

MR. GAROFALO: Sure. Even if the ZBA approves say a change in the side yard, that doesn't mean we're going to approve the project. It's just --

(Technical interruption.)

MS. FLYNN: Did everybody go?

(Time noted: 8:02 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 22nd day of June
2021.

Michelle Conero

MICHELLE CONERO