

Revised MK 10.6.2016

Town of Ghent Planning Board
Meeting of 10/5/16

Members Present: Larry Machiz, Aaron Groom, Gary Ocean, Geoff French, Dana Rosenstreich

Town Attorney Mitch Khosrova Present

Vice Chairman French opened the meeting at 7:10pm

IV. Donald Hill, Sr. & Robert Leather

Lot Line Adjustment: Located on Cotswold Drive

Tax ID # 84.-1-41.111

Public Hearing Notice was read for the **Don Hill Subdivision Amendment**. This is an application to amend a previously approved Subdivision Plan and lot line adjustment of a 36.927 acre subdivision of multiple parcels.

Maps have been amended based on discussions with the Ghent Building Enforcement Officer. Lots 2 and 3 are going to become part of lot 18. Lot 4 will be added to 17. Lot 5 is amended to include a portion of the previous road right of way. Lot 5 will have 63 +/- feet of frontage.

There was considerable discussion about the cul de sac that is in front of Lot 6 and the small piece of road to the south of the cul de de sac. This road is owned by the town. The Ghent town attorney, Mitch Khosrova expressed concern that there is not an agreement with the Highway Superintendent that matches the survey map that was presented to the board. According to the Ghent Town attorney, the drawing showed that the cul de sac was on lot 5. Concern that there will not be an area to place plowed snow.

There was also a concern regarding an encroachment into Lot 6 from the cul de sac that is currently on the proposed plan.

According to the applicant, the Highway Superintendent met with the surveyor on the property and the placement of the cul de sac was jointly agreed to during that meeting.

The Ghent Town Attorney called the Highway Superintendent to clear up the confusion. Based on Mitch Khosrova's conversation with the Highway Superintendent, it was determined that the placement of the cul de sac as shown on the map was inconsistent with the discussion at the property. The Superintendent had discussed that the placement of the cul de sac would be at the terminus of the road to assist in snow removal. There would be no small piece of road that continued to Lot 5.

Larry Machiz made a motion to go to public hearing and Gary Ocean seconded. Motion Carried
Neighbor Kathy Hoffert, 2114 Route 66, asked to review the map. She expressed concern with Lot 1. Upon reviewing the map more closely, it was determined that the map incorrectly identified that Lot 1 would be merged with Lot 18. Lot 1 will remain by itself. Ms. Hoffert commented that she believes that Lot 1 is not a build able lot. Applicant did not accept that Lot 1 is not buildable. The applicant agreed that the note will be erased regarding Lot 1 merging with Lot 18. The line between Lots 1 and 2 also need to be bolded to signify the two distinct parcels.

Member French explained that the cul de sac needs to be moved so that it terminates at lot 5. Further, the applicant was advised that the cul de sac must be within the road right of way.

The Ghent Town Attorney offered to coordinate a meeting with the applicant, the applicant's survey and the Highway Superintendent.

Member Groom asked if the small piece that goes south from the interim cul de sac is expected to be paved in the future.

According to the Ghent Town Attorney, the Highway Superintendent was expecting that this small piece would be gravel and not hardtop.

Machiz recommended that the Highway Superintendent send a letter to the PB identifying his requirements, if any, including on the road surface and configuration of the cul de sac, after meeting that will occur with the Superintendent, Town Building Inspector, the applicant and the applicant's surveyor.

Member Rosenstreich made a motion to continue the public hearing, and member Machiz seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

III. Heidi Kisselbeck Haner

Lot Line Adjustment: 407 George Street & 2251 Route 66

Tax ID # 75.04-01-69 & 75.04-01-70; application for a of .08 acres exchange of the two parcels

Due to clerical error, there was no public notice given of the application; therefore, the application will be placed on next month's agenda.

IV. Bartlett House

–Application to modify site plan and submission of Landscaping Plan

Tax Parcel IDS 75.04-1-59 & 75.045-2-08

Chad Lindbergh represented the applicant to present some minor adjustments to the site plan that the applicant was considering.

These changes included:

1. Adding a temporary vestibule to the entry. This would be a clear structure, double door entry that would only be erected during the colder months. Since the structure would be visible from the front, the applicant wanted to ensure agreement with the Planning Board.
2. Relocating a utility pole in the parking lot which is being used as a tension guide wire.
3. Adding 4 parking spots to the north end of the parking lot.
4. Adding 2 light poles along the stone wall. The proposed lighting would be 2 dual light 8 foot fixtures that will be placed on the stone wall which is 2 feet. The proposed fixtures are identical to those on the east side of the building but placed on a pole. The fixtures will be downward facing and dark sky certified. These new fixtures are being proposed since there have been concerns about

the darkness of the parking lot. The height is to illuminate over larger vehicles such as SUVs and trucks.

5. Presentation of a planting plan as required in the resolution approved by the Planning Board
6. Adding a proposed pergola for additional seating outside

Member Machiz asked about the usage of the Railroad Ave overflow parking. Applicant has a short term and long term option; however, these options have not been finalized.

Member Groom asked about the two additional lights. Upon review of the submitted plans, the applicant realized that the proposed lights were not in the lighting plan. He will need to update the plans when they are submitted.

Member Groom also mentioned that there were concerns about light wash on properties across Route 66. He wanted to ensure that the proposed landscaping mitigations were accounting for this concern.

The applicant, supported by a landscaping architecture expert from Callanders Nursery felt that a hedge row of bushes along Route 66 would not be advisable since the salt wash will pose a plant viability concern and a shrub row would pose a safety concern since it would impede the site line.

The Ghent Town Attorney mentioned that neighbors to the north have commented negatively on the fence. Specifically, there was concern about the column side facing the neighboring property.

Member Machiz asked if there had been any feedback on the garbage. The applicant and other members have not heard any feedback.

The applicant described the proposed pergola. The movable non-permanent structure would provide an additional 4-6 tables for outside seating area. Applicant is asking for conceptual approval at this time.

The applicant asked if the requested revisions would require a public hearing. The Ghent Town Attorney advised the Planning Board members that he generally likes to be as conservative as possible and recommended a public hearing.

Member Rosenstreich indicated that she would like to hear feedback from CLC regarding the pergola which encroaches on the Rail Trail.

It was advised by the planning board that the Applicant may want to amend the application to only be the plantings. Then they could come back when they are ready with the other items since the plantings are the only items that need to be done before the winter months.

The Board discussed if we could just approve the landscaping plan tonight. Ghent Town Attorney, Mitch Khosrova gave counsel that we would not need to go to public hearing pursuant to the previously approved Resolution. The applicant, represented by Callanders Landscape Architect, discussed the different planting choices. Specifically, the flowering pear was concerning to Member Ocean who felt that a crab apple may be more hearty.

Planning Board members determined that since all of the issues that were identified at the public hearing including light wash to neighboring properties were mitigated, there was no reason to go to public hearing. Planning board agreed that the landscaping plan as defined and presented would take into account the public's concern.

The board agreed that the Chairman's approval will indicate that it is for the landscaping plan only. The landscaping plan will be provided that shows the additional detail discussed during the meeting. The revised landscaping plan will remove all proposed lighting. Applicant will submit a revised plan for stamping which shows only the landscaping features changed from the original site plan.

Consistent with our original approval, the applicant has come back before the board with a final landscaping plan indicating the various species of plantings and two additional lilacs on the Route 66 side. Motion made by Groom, seconded by Machiz to accept and approve the landscape plan as revised and resubmitted to the chairman. Unanimously approved.

Review of August 3rd minutes

Member Groom requested movements of the final two sentences of Section 1 to earlier in the discussion.

Reviewed Renfro language to make certain minor changes

Member Rosenstreich made motion to approve, Member Ocean seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

Motion made to adjourn meeting from Member Machiz, Member Ocean seconded. Motion passed unanimously.