



Town of New Paltz Planning Board  
Regular Meeting of Monday, **February 12, 2024**  
7:00 PM In Person  
Town of New Paltz Courthouse  
59 N. Putt Corners Road, New Paltz, NY

## **APPROVED MINUTES**

**Present:** Chair, Adele Ruger, Lyle Nolan (Deputy Chair), Matt DiDonna, Lauren McPadden, and Jennifer Welles

**Also present:** Jane Schanberg attended via Zoom  
Ashley Torre (Planning Board Attorney)  
Andrew Willingham (Planning Board Engineer)  
Mark Carabetta (Town Wetland Inspector)

**Absent:** Adrian Capulli

### **Administrative Business**

A motion to approve the minutes of January 22, 2024 meeting, was moved by the Deputy-Chair and seconded by Ms. Welles with no further discussion and all voting in favor.

### **Public Comment**

The Deputy Chair asked if there was anyone in attendance wishing to make a public comment and there was none.

### **Application Review**

#### ***SITE PLAN***

#### **PB23-068 REICH/GOLDMAN**

Location: 381-383 Springtown Road

Applicant: Lee Reich and Deborah Goldman

Zoning: FF SBL: 78.1-2-6

Owners Lee Reich and Deborah Goldman appeared before the board and distributed paper copies of their site plan reflecting the correct square footage of the proposed house.

Mr. Willingham stated the main issue with the proposed site plan is the required filling in, in the floodplain. The codes states that if you fill in the floodplain, you're required to compensate for that same amount of volume excavated. The applicant's engineers make the argument that it's negligible, and it's not going to make a difference in the flood plain. Attorney Torres said this is not something that can be waived. They could seek a variance from the town's Zoning Board of

Appeals or they could seek an interpretation of §140-19 (G) (3) from the town's building inspector, or the applicant could revise the plan to excavate.

Attorney Torre asked the applicant to request a waiver for the requirement of 140-52 (B) (I) – (single trees with a diameter at breast height (DBH) of 12 or more inches to be shown on the plan.) She also noted that this proposed site plan must be referred to the Ulster County Planning Board and suggested they wait until the application is complete.

### **Public Hearing**

Mohonk Brook Farmhouse Rehabilitation Project  
PB22-423 Lenape Lane/Butterville Road SBL: 86.1-1-40.121

A motion to open the public hearing was made by Mr. DiDonna and seconded by Ms. Welles with no further discussion and all voting in favor.

Susan DeMark, Historic Preservation Commissioner, spoke in support of the restoration project and stated the Commission is in accord with Mohonk's plans for the proposed windows.

Harry Ellis of Butterville Road, is very much in favor of the Preserve's work and supports the project.

A motion to adjourn the public hearing to March 11 was made by Ms. Welles with Ms. McPadden seconding with no further discussion and all voting in favor.

### **Application Review**

***SITE PLAN/SPECIAL USE APPLICATION***  
**PB22-423 MOHONK BROOK FARMHOUSE REHAB**  
Location: Lenape Lane/Butterville Road  
Zoning District: A-3 SBL: 86.1-1-40.121

Ryan Weitz from Barton & Loguidice, and Mike Moriello, attorney for the Mohonk Preserve appeared.

Mr. Willingham stated that the applicant has addressed most of the comments made in his review of February 8. There will be suggestions forthcoming with regard to the landscaping plans which Mr. Weitz stated, he has no objections to, but wants to review with his landscape architect and the Preserve's conservation staff. Mr. Willingham recommended Mr. Weitz speak with his firm's landscape architect about whether to use deer fencing or spray on the proposed red cedar trees.

Mark Carabetta, the Town's wetland inspector, went over his report of February 6. He asked Mr. Weitz about the site's septic system which is being abandoned. Mr. Weitz confirmed that while not a requirement of the Ulster County Board of Health, the applicants were going to fill the

septic tank with sand at the top and will not be in the wetland at all. There will be no excavation. An overhead electric line that extends down into the wetland is attached to a pole which will be flush cut with a chainsaw to remove the pole.

Mr. Carabetta stated there are two proposed wetland buffer enhancement areas totaling 5,300 square feet (0.12 acres) in size. The area of proposed enhancement is significantly smaller than the area of proposed disturbance within the wetland buffer area. Mr. Weitz said much of what's in the buffer is all previously disturbed. Mr. Carabetta said he just wanted to see the rationale and thinks a precedent has been established for allowing disturbance in the buffer and then offsetting it with some restoration. He agreed with what Mr. Weitz was saying - that it's not necessarily a goal by area, but establishing a buffer between the wetland and the area that's being used is important and he likes the idea of wrapping it around. Mr. Weitz stated that when it comes to the value of a buffer, it's that linear nature extending out from the delineation so in that case they would be providing that added benefit other than just having the grass that's there now. Mr. Weitz said he will revise and clarify a response so it's part of the record of why they are doing what they're doing.

Mr. Carabetta's final comment was in regard to the challenge to establish a meadow where there used to be lawn. It is a multi-year process, so there will need to be some sort of maintenance and monitoring going forward. Mr. Weitz thanked Mr. Carabetta for providing different resources to consider, and stated he will provide a document saying they will substantially comply with these requirements.

Mr. Weitz offered for the board's consideration, a project that they're going to hopefully get site plan approval and move forward into construction of phase one and go through the building permit process, etc. and as part of that, the escrow account that was established with the town will remain open until they close that out. He suggested in order to provide a level of assurance, perhaps have a one year or two year wetland inspection by Mr. Carabetta, whereby he provides written comments to the Preserve if there's any recommendations. Mr. Carabetta agreed that the annual monitoring should be somewhere in the two to three year range – one to two visits per year – he'd have to look at the seed mix to determine when.

Ms. Torre said the applicant needs to complete SEQR and should respond to the engineer and wetland inspector's comments before making a determination of significance and the information from SHPO regarding the letter of resolution.

The Chair asked what color the farmhouse would be, and Mr. Weitz responded that it would be white and the barns would be red. There are new color renderings which will be submitted to the board before the next meeting.

Mr. Moriello noted for the board the applicant may not have anything signed for a while so if the board as lead agency is okay with the letter, it can still go ahead and grant a negative declaration or complete SEQR because OPRHP is really an interested agency not involved so we're not bound by a mandated negative declaration first or determination of significance first depending on where we are in the process.

Ms. Torre responded that the board will want to see the letter and they're aware of the

comments that people had originally, so you said we were going to be proposing most of them if not all of them, so I think that this board can evaluate the historic and cultural impacts to see what you're proposing and if anything significantly changes with SHPO then you could always come back if necessary.

Mr. Weitz said for the March 11 meeting, they will be submitting revised plans to address Messrs. Willingham and Carabetta's comments, as well as provide a draft letter of resolution. He understands they need DEC, NYSEDA and OPRHP's signature on it and getting all of those executed in two weeks is not going to happen.

A motion to refer this application to the Ulster County Planning Board was moved by Deputy-Chair Nolan and seconded by Ms. Welles with no further discussion and all voting in favor.

### **Adjourn**

A motion to adjourn was moved by Ms. McPadden and seconded by Ms. Welles with all voting in favor.

Submitted by Kristine Tabasko

NOTE: A full viewing of the February 12, 2024 Planning Board meeting can be found at:  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VvqTSLJTnOw>



TOWN OF NEW PALTZ PLANNING BOARD  
APPLICATION REVIEW / DECISION DOCUMENT "TRACKING SHEET"

Meeting Date: 7-17-24

Applicant: Lee Reich  
Property Address: 381-383 Springtown Rd  
Proposal: Site plan review of application

REFERRAL(S): ☐ ZBA ☐ EnCC ☐ HPC ☐ Water/Sewer ☐ Highway ☐ TN BD ☐ County ☐

SEQR: ☐ Type I ☐ Unlisted ☐ Type II ☐ None Designated  
☐ Lead Agency ☐ Long EAF  
☐ Short EAF ☐ Positive Declaration  
☐ Negative Declaration

PUBLIC HEARING DATE: \_\_\_\_\_ TIME: \_\_\_\_\_ CONTINUED TO: \_\_\_\_\_

ISSUES TO BE CLARIFIED: - fill material in flood plain  
15, 500 cfm 574 cfm

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REQUIRED: - building inspector interpretation 1401140  
- ZBA variance  
ask for windows - show trees existing?

DECISION: ☐ Approved ☐ Approved w/ conditions ☐ Denied ☐ Incomplete

Special Conditions: \_\_\_\_\_

Signatures:

[Signature]  
Planning Board Chair

Lee Reich  
Applicant

[Signature]  
Planning Board Contact