

**TOWN OF NEW BALTIMORE PLANNING BOARD**  
**Regular Monthly Meeting**  
**June 8, 2017 – Page 1**

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Rob Van Etten, Chair, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Board Members in attendance were Jean Horn, Bob Court, Pat Bruno and Lee Salisbury. Ann Marie Vadney and Bill Boehlke were absent.

**Old Business**

**William Brandt – Bristol Manor Assisted Living Facility – Site Plan**

Present on behalf of Mr. Brandt was his attorney, Michael Biscone.

Biscone: We are here on this William Brandt matter; and hopefully, we will conclude it tonight. We presented to the Building Inspector all of the remaining items certified by the Engineer and stamped; and I have a memo from Mr. Mantor indicating that he is satisfied with all of our submissions, that he has approved the same and that he was going to advise the Board. He further said upon the Board's approval of our application, he will be issuing a Building Permit immediately thereafter and that communication is Wednesday, May 24, that I got from him.

Van Etten: Okay.

Biscone: We filed through Mr. Hite just subsequent to the last meeting the rest of the State approvals that we were required to get; and I am also reporting to the Board that I received today from the attorney for the dentists, a formal written recordable easement for the retention pond in the rear allowing them to flow their surface water into our retention pond and us to use a portion of their land to place that retention pond on. However, in the event that they move this road, this driveway, which they will and add more blacktop to their land, they will be required to calculate the additional run-off from their property into this pond and may have to increase the size of the retention pond at their cost. This is a well thought out document between their counsel, who you met before, and myself; and it also takes into effect any further black-topping of their property. So that really is the last thing that I sought to do this. My understanding from Mr. Brandt is upon approval and receipt of a Building Permit, he is going to commence the DOT access road forthwith and then move forward from there.

Van Etten: Okay. As it is now, the pond as it stands covers more than covers [Several words not understood.]

Biscone: Yes, we have had the approval from the State. It covers all the run-off from the assisted living area and the dental office but no more. If there is any building that we do on that middle lot, and I will call it the middle lot, we will need to formulate the proper retention pond for that lot solely. That is to be announced.

Van Etten: Okay. Anybody have any other questions. I think we have more than covered everything.

Biscone: I met with Mr. Mantor at length for almost an hour on May 24. That is when he went back to his office, reviewed everything and wrote that correspondence that I am referring to and provided to him all the remaining issues that he sought.

Van Etten: Okay, I guess it is just a matter of our doing the resolution at this point.

Biscone: I believe you are right.

Court: Do you have that correspondence or heard from Mr. Mantor saying "yes, it is ready to go"?

Van Etten: He told me verbally.

Biscone: You are welcome to photo this or I can recite it to you.

Court: Somebody here had it, seen it?

Van Etten: Yes. And we have a NOI.

Biscone: Yes, I gave that to Mr. Hite to file with you, yes.

**TOWN OF NEW BALTIMORE PLANNING BOARD**  
**Regular Monthly Meeting**  
**June 8, 2017 – Page 2**

Van Etten: So I have to believe we are more than covered finally.

Clerk: If you could provide us with a copy of that letter, I can't make a copy tonight because the copy machine appears to know what Thursday of the month the Planning Board meets and goes down every month.

Van Etten: You will give us a copy of that latest development there, Michael?

Biscone: Yes, I will photo it and send it tomorrow.

Clerk: Or you can scan it and send it to my e-mail.

Clerk's e-mail was provided.

Biscone: I had written him a letter and requested that he answer my letter in writing for the period on the sentence.

**WHEREAS**, William Brandt, wishing to construct an assisted living facility to be called Bristol Manor on parcel bearing Tax Map Number 40.00-4-2.111 located at 12514 U.S. Route 9W submitted current Site Plan Application, replacing outdated application submitted in 2007, at the May 14, 2015, Planning Board Meeting; and

**WHEREAS**, a Public Hearing, having been duly published in THE DAILY MAIL, was held on said application at the New Baltimore Town Hall on December 8, 2017, with no members of the public offering comment; and

**WHEREAS**, 239 Referral was completed and submitted to Greene County Department of Economic Development, Tourism and Planning with response received that it was approval with comment; and

**WHEREAS**, further project discussion was held at the January 12, 2017, regular monthly meeting; and

**WHEREAS**, the Planning Board at its January 12, 2017, meeting completed the Lead Agency portion of the Long Form SEQR, made determination the project would have a negative impact on the environment and issued a negative declaration; and

**WHEREAS**, after further discussion at the June 8, 2017, meeting, it was

**RESOLVED**, that the Planning Board approve the William Brandt/Bristol Manor Site Plan Application with the following conditions:

- Receipt of copy of New York State Department of Transportation road cut approval for 9W entrance.
- Receipt of Site Plan reflecting approved 9W road cut and entrance to New Baltimore Family Dentistry parcel, bearing Tax Map #40.00-4-2.12, from said road cut.
- Receipt of copy of DEC approved Stormwater Pollution Prevent Plan.

Moved by: Court

Seconded by: Bruno

AYES: Van Etten, Horn, Court, Bruno, Salisbury

NAYS: None

ABSTAINED: None

ABSENT: Vadney, Boehlke

Copy of the resolution will be sent to Mr. Biscone in due course. Mr. Biscone was provided a Building Permit Application and the fee amount.

**New York Land and Lakes Development, LLC – Major Subdivision Application**

Present was authorized representative Alan Lord. Mr. Lord presented the required second fee of

**TOWN OF NEW BALTIMORE PLANNING BOARD**  
**Regular Monthly Meeting**  
**June 8, 2017 – Page 3**

\$210.00, and the final maps and mylars.

Van Etten: As far as the slave graves go.

Lord: I met with several of the neighbors in the parking lot after the meeting last month; and I said if anybody knows where they are, let me know and we will get them on the survey map. I have got nothing. The one neighbor, the information I had from DEC on wells, he called. He was here in the audience but he said he was afraid to stand up; but his well, he is located right here on Sodom Road, this one. His well is 150 feet deep and it is 30 gallons a minute. He called me to confirm that. I think he said they did it 12 years ago.

Clerk: And actually with regard to the indentured servant grave yard, I spoke with the Town Historian. He had heard about it a few short months prior to this subdivision coming forward. He made attempts also to find out and he came up with nothing.

Van Etten: So it is a super secret.

There were no further questions from the Board.

Lord: If you are going by that way, we got all the fields mowed out this week. They look good.

Bruno: Yes, I did. I actually live in that area.

Lord: Despite how wet it was, he is going to go over and try to clean them up. They dried up a lot today. He is going to go over them again one more time tomorrow. I thought they came out really well.

Court: You talked about the deed restrictions and you have a lot of things here. Is that stated in this or did I miss that? The property can't be subdivided again.

Lord: It should be in there. No parcel shall be further subdivided.

Van Etten: It is in all of the minutes of the previous meetings too.

Court: It is nice that it is on the map.

Lord: One house, one single family home per lot and no further subdivision. It is on the maps and those same things will be in their deed to each parcel.

It was moved by Court and seconded by Salisbury that the Board approves New York Land and Lakes Major subdivision.

AYES: Van Etten; Horn; Court; Bruno; Salisbury

NAYS: None

Abstained: None

Absent: Vadney; Boehlke

The Clerk advised the Board that the deed has come through to the Assessor's office in the Real Property Transfer Report received today transferring the property from Egan to New York Land and Lakes Development.

Mr. Van Etten stamped and signed the maps and mylar. One set of maps was retained for the file. The lots will be available for sale starting on June 24. The green form was provided to Mr. Lord and he was advised the maps had to be filed within 60 days in the Greene County Clerk's office, the green form stamped and signed by them and the form then returned to the Planning Board so the record reflects the maps were filed within the 60 days. Mr. Lord thanked the Board.

**Lands of Karl Zacek and Peter Zacek – Minor Subdivision**

With regard to this subdivision, the Clerk advised that the attorney for the Zaceks had mailed the final

**TOWN OF NEW BALTIMORE PLANNING BOARD**  
**Regular Monthly Meeting**  
**June 8, 2017 – Page 4**

subdivision maps three days ago but that they had not yet arrived.

**Lands of Keith Wrisley**

Parcel # #15.00-1-4.2  
(02-03)

Minor Subdivision Application, Short Form EAF, copy of deed, maps and \$30. filing fee to correct the non-conforming status of this parcel had been received in advance of the meeting. Property, former Maurer property, is 2.330 acres, located on Alcove Road just south of Sylvandale Road. There is no record of the subdivision having come before the Planning Board nor of a map having been filed in the County Clerk's office.

Wrisley: This piece of property was originally subdivided 30 years ago. Multiple building permits have been issued over the years on this property starting in 1990, 1994 and 1996. I acquired this property in 2011 as a tax sale. Requested the building permits to remove the trailers and all the trash that had been on the property. I spent about \$12,000 cleaning up the property, only to find that as soon as I notified the Building Inspector that I had finished some of the cleaning up of this property, I received a letter on February 9 from the Zoning Board that said I could not do anything further on the property because it was not in compliance. I put \$13,000 into this property to find out nothing could be done to it.

[Several words not understood.] Put a single family house on it, so I spent another \$2,000 having the maps and things done to the property and I come before you tonight to put the property into compliance.

Van Etten: So there are no structures on the property.

Wrisley: It is clear vacant land other than the electric is still on and the septic system, which was approved in 1996, is still there and working fine. It has been tested. The well on the property was contaminated; and we have spent two years working with the DEC to remove the kerosene from the well. We put a [Word not understood.] remediation system in there and it is now almost within star standards with carbon filtration of meeting the star standards for drinking well water.

Van Etten: Is everybody up to speed? Did you read Marjorie's note about the past subdivision problems. We can waive a Public Hearing if everybody is in favor of that.

Bruno: I do not see why not.

Van Etten: This lot has been there a long time and everybody has been well aware of it. So I don't see any reason, I certainly don't personally, for a Public Hearing.

Question was raised as to the location of the property. The property is the former Maurer property located on Alcove Road almost at the corner with Sylvandale Road where the bend is. It is over two acres so it meets Town Code for a lot. Mr. Wrisley pointed out the driveway off Alcove that is being used and will be. He also owns half of the other driveway further north on Alcove which has been gated off to prevent people from dumping on the property.

Question was raised regarding a house on a neighboring property and if they had their own way out. Mr. Wrisley responded no, they are still using driveway as pointed out on map. They had had discussion with them and they do have the ability to put in another driveway. At this point in time, we just allow them to use that driveway, per a verbal agreement.

Part 2 of the Short Environmental Assessment Form was gone through as follows:

1. Will the proposed action create a material conflict with an adopted land use plan or zoning Regulations? - **NO**
2. Will the proposed action result in a change in the use or intensity of use of land? - **NO**
3. Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of the existing community? - **NO**

**TOWN OF NEW BALTIMORE PLANNING BOARD**  
**Regular Monthly Meeting**  
**June 8, 2017 – Page 5**

4. Will the proposed action have an impact on the environmental characteristics that caused the establishment of a Critical Environmental Area (CEA)? - **NO**
5. Will the proposed action result in an adverse change in the existing level of traffic or affect existing infrastructure for mass transit, biking or walkway? - **NO**
6. Will the proposed action cause an increase in the use of energy and it fails to incorporate reasonably available energy conservation or renewable energy opportunities? - **NO**
7. Will the proposed action impact existing:
  - a. public/private water supplies? - **NO**
  - b. public/private wastewater treatment utilities? - **NO**
8. Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of important historic, archaeological, architectural or aesthetic resources? - **NO**
9. Will the proposed action result in an adverse change to natural resources (e.g. wetlands, waterbodies, groundwater, air quality, flora and fauna)? - **NO**
10. Will the proposed action result in an increase in the potential for erosion, flooding or drainage problems? - **NO**
11. Will the proposed action create a hazard to environmental resources or human health? - **NO**

Court: Well, this has been an individual parcel even though we are calling this a subdivision just to get it recorded?

Van Etten: Basically, yes.

Court: Well, this already went through the process once, was subdivided or no?

Van Etten: No, it was not legally subdivided.

Court: Are we obligated to let the neighbors know and I mean ownership changed in 2011. It is a question.

The Clerk explained in the past when the Board corrected a parcel, if it had been a long-standing parcel, nothing is changing, the Board has used its discretion and waived the Public Hearing. Mrs. Bruno advised it was vacant for a period of time and then it went up for taxes. Mr. Wisley advised that nothing was changing. It was subdivided in 1987, on the tax rolls as this piece of property since 1987. Building Permits had been issued in 1990, 1994, 1996 and then when he obtained one.

Resolution presented as follows:

**WHEREAS**, Keith Wisley purchased a 2.33 acre parcel bearing Tax Map #15.00-1-4.2 located at 739 Alcove Road from the County of Greene in 2011; and

**WHEREAS**, having learning that there was no evidence of a legal subdivision of the parcel, presented Minor Subdivision Application at the June 8, 2017, Planning Board Meeting; and

**WHEREAS**, after discussion by the members of the Town of New Baltimore Planning Board at its June 8, 2017, Regular Monthly Meeting, it was

**RESOLVED**, that this action be granted a negative declaration for the purpose of SEQRA; and be it further

**RESOLVED**, that since this parcel has already been a taxable parcel of 2.33 acre for many years, the Planning Board exercises its discretion to waive the need for a Public Hearing and approves the Minor Subdivision Application, bringing the parcel located at 739 Alcove Road into compliance.

Moved by: Court

Seconded by: Bruno

**TOWN OF NEW BALTIMORE PLANNING BOARD**  
**Regular Monthly Meeting**  
**June 8, 2017 – Page 6**

AYES: Van Etten; Horn; Court; Bruno; Salisbury

NAYS: None

Abstained: None

Absent: Vadney; Boehlke

Maps and mylar were signed and stamped by Mr. Van Etten and copy retained for the file. Mr. Wrisley was provided with the green form to be stamped and signed by County Clerk's Office and then returned by Mr. Wrisley to the Planning Board. Mr. Wrisley thanked the Board for their time and the Board complimented Mr. Wrisley on the work he had done to enhance the condition of the property.

**Lands of John and Betsy Murray – Minor Subdivision Application**

Prior to the meeting, completed Minor Subdivision Application, Short Form EAF, copy of deed and map had been received. Mr. and Mrs. Murray were present and came before the Board. They wish to do a two-lot subdivision. Their home, which they plan to put on the market, is located on a 1.5-acre parcel at the corner of Route 9W and West Hawley Lane. They wish to subdivide 4.25 acres, Lot #2 on the map, from the separate ten-acre parcel owned on West Hawley Lane to go to the Ubrichs, neighboring property owners to the north who are currently using the property. The balance of the property labeled Lot #1 on the map, which also goes across West Hawley Lane and includes a little triangle across Route 9W as well, they propose to combine with the 1.5 acres, creating a 6.75 acre parcel which they hope will increase the marketability of their home.

It was moved by Court and seconded by Horn to classify the application as a minor subdivision.

AYES: Van Etten; Horn; Court; Bruno; Salisbury

NAYS: None

Abstained: None

Absent: Vadney; Boehlke

\$60.00 application fee was paid completing the application. Public Hearing was scheduled for 7:00 p.m., July 13, 2017. Blue sheet instruction letter for sending the certified letters was provided, as well as the list of surrounding property owners needing to receive the letters.

Mr. Murray advised the Board just for full disclosure, what we plan to do is to get the house listed for the summer season. There will be some kind of contingency language that it is currently 1.5 acres and on Planning Board approval will be 6.75 acres.

**Lands of Louise LaFalce and Lands of Jacqueline Davis**

Mr. LaFalce and his sister Mrs. Davis were present and came forward.

Davis: The property was originally Uncle Lou's property. He left it to my Aunt. It belonged to the Giaquintos prior to that and Carys before that. It has been multiple farms along the years. Uncle Lou bought it. When he passed away, he left it to my Aunt Millie. Aunt Millie passed away. In the process, it was to go to my Dad but Dad passed away at the same time. My brother and I then became partners on the property. We didn't realize when you do partners on a property, you take a mortgage out together, you are both accountable for the mortgage. Several years ago, we split the property. He has his 15 acres; and I have it on this property. This is 9W. The property in yellow on map presented is my property listed in name of Jacqueline Davis. The blue is Louie's property, the 15 acres with a house trailer and everything. The big yellow is mine.

Van Etten: So this dotted line is what you are looking to do?

Davis: Right. That is where he keeps his horses and stuff. My company is forcing me to move to Richmond, Virginia, so I have to re-locate and I have to sell the property in order to re-locate. His horses and all--we have shared the farm for years. That is his pasture; his everything so we had a surveyor we talked to. He called and he said we would have to come talk to you to see if we needed to subdivide it or if we could get a lot line moved. It is not accessible from the road anywhere. It is landlocked.

Van Etten: Well, you are dividing the property so I would think it would fall under subdivision. It certainly does not meet the criteria for a lot-line adjustment.

**TOWN OF NEW BALTIMORE PLANNING BOARD**  
**Regular Monthly Meeting**  
**June 8, 2017 – Page 7**

Davis: I don't know. I have no idea. I have never done any of it. I kind of get stuck here. I have until next year to sell everything and move to Richmond.

Van Etten: So you are going to keep that property, other than what you subdivide off in your name.

Davis: It is going to get sold. It is going on the market. I have to sell it.

LaFalce: The other part is going to go to me.

Davis: Currently, everything in yellow is in my name.

LaFalce: I think 20 acres.

Davis: It is 45 acres that I own in my name. That is what is in the yellow.

Salisbury: Couldn't that be a lot line adjustment?

Van Etten: There is too much acreage the way I see it.

Davis: It was a different parcel at one time because actually.

LaFalce: Mr. Biscone.

Davis: Mr. Biscone has the original deeds that he did for Giaquinto before he passed away. I mean it has been all over. It is not accessible to anybody and it is on the side of a mountain but I don't know. So we didn't know what the next steps are. I know that I have to have it sold by 2018 so I can move to Richmond.

Court: Is there a limit to a lot line adjustment?

Salisbury: I didn't think there is any.

Van Etten: I was thinking it was two acres.

Salisbury: Well, it is Chapter 114.

Van Etten: Maybe I read it wrong.

Horn: I thought there were limits?

Van Etten: Yes, I really do think there is a limit in that.

Clerk: When you are transferring it to another parcel and there would be enough to create more subdivisions, then it has to be done as a subdivision and not a lot line adjustment.

Van Etten: Road access isn't [Word not understood.]

Davis: They [referring to the horses] don't care.

Salisbury: You are adding half of this to his property?

Davis: Yes.

Salisbury: And join it so you are going to make it a joint deed so it is one parcel

LaFalce: No.

Salisbury: Oh, you are going to keep it two separate deeds?

LaFalce: Yes.

Davis: Well, we are going to do whatever is the best for us.

LaFalce: What is the better way to go.

Davis: We have no idea. We are just trying to make it right. I don't want to leave my brother without land for his horses but I don't have a choice. I have been with Blue Cross for 20 years; and if I don't go, I lose my job.

Salisbury: Well, you can do it as a subdivision. Then you would have a separate deed for that parcel.

Van Etten: Well after you do the subdivision, it can be added to the other property.

[?] Right, it can be.

Van Etten: You are taking what, 10 acres?

Davis: It is about 20, the property is 45; and when I talked to the surveyor when he looked back at the old maps, he is saying that he figures it is about approximately half.

Court: I think we have to look at this. If it was a subdivision, there would have to be a right-of-way

**TOWN OF NEW BALTIMORE PLANNING BOARD**  
**Regular Monthly Meeting**  
**June 8, 2017 – Page 8**

because you would be making a landlocked lot. So if we can do this as a lot line adjustment, and then I mean I have to read the regulations again, it wouldn't land lock any property. So I think the Board needs to review the lot line adjustment again.

Davis: And that is fine. That is why we wanted to come in front of you guys and talk to you, right.

Court: And if it happens to go the way of subdivision, then this property here is going to have to show a right-of-way to the second lot.

Van Etten: Yes, but if it is a subdivision with a stipulation that it is added on to this parcel which it is supposed to be. Isn't that what it is going to be, added on to your parcel?

LaFalce: Yes.

Van Etten: Added on to this deed.

Davis: But you have to have one deed no matter which way you do it unless you add a right-of-way.

Court: I thought he had to wait a number of years.

LaFalce: I could do that. I want to do whatever is the easiest way.

Van Etten: I don't think; well, this hasn't been subdivided recently, right?

Davis & LaFalce: No.

LaFalce: Because Uncle Louis bought it in the 19--.

Davis: The only piece that we sold out was; originally, we had the middle piece and right now that is owned by Eagle Tools. Actually I went and talked to him first about mine because I back him up.

Salisbury: Maybe, we could search it out and do it as an altered lot line.

Van Etten: I can but I don't really see that it meets the criteria. Maybe I misread the lot line adjustment. We can put that out to our lawyer and see what he thinks of it, the Town's lawyer. Should we send it over to Tal and get his thoughts on it?

Horn: Yes, rather than their doing it the wrong way and not have it legal. It is good that you have come in early.

Davis: That is why we did. The young surveyor had called and was checking into everything and he told me to make an appointment to come see you guys, bring my map and talk to you, see what was the best way to go with it. What we should do.

Van Etten: Oh, I didn't see that line, your dividing line.

Davis: That actually is a stonewall. Van Etten: Is that where you are using for a boundary?

Davis: Pretty much, yes. So Louie has his fence all the way up right now and then there is actually a stonewall that goes all the way to the top of the cliff and then there is a stonewall all the way across the cliff too but we were not sure what to have surveyed because he said now if we subdivide it, then we have to do different surveys than if we do a line adjustment and then that is a different survey. When I started hearing the price of the survey, I wanted to cry.

Van Etten: I think you are going to end up having to do the survey if you are thinking of selling this.

Davis: Well definitely but which way to do it so he said if it was a line adjustment we probably should have Louie's surveyed too. So that is why we did not want to pay or do anything until we knew exactly what to do.

Van Etten: I really don't think it is going to meet the lot line adjustment criteria. I think it would probably be the best thing to let our Town lawyer weigh in on that. I really don't want, as you say, to get it wrong.

Court: Sounds good to me. Davis: Yes, yes, better it be right. Van Etten: So not to put you off.

Davis: No, no. That is why we came and we will come back. I just wanted to make sure we get it



**TOWN OF NEW BALTIMORE PLANNING BOARD**  
**Regular Monthly Meeting**  
**June 8, 2017 – Page 9**

started.

Van Etten: I wasn't clear on how much. I see a very faint line there. That is basically it right there?

Davis: Yes, right straight down. This is all of Louie's now and this actually comes around the corner and this is the cliff all the way across; but there is no way, like I said, there is no way in to this piece at all.

Van Etten: At this point, you have to come up through here and over.

Davis: Yes, either you come up my way or you come up through Louie's and come around.

Van Etten: Either way, it is going to be added on to your deed. All right, let's get some legal clarification on that.

Davis: Sounds good. Thank you very much, appreciate it.

Court: I did not see any description of minimum acreage in a lot line adjustment on those papers. The only thing it speaks in there is that the intent of doing it is to increase one's parcel and then you have to state that in his deed and it is not for the intent of creating an additional building lot. The verbiage has to be in the deed.

Salisbury: Well, as long as he joins it to his main parcel and it is a complete deed for the whole thing, I don't think you need that. If it is on a separate deed, then you need it.

Court: Right, if they kept it on a separate deed, that is not a building lot. That is the way I read it anyway.

Salisbury: That it is not a building lot.

Van Etten: Okay. Like I said I think it would be a good idea to run it by Tal. Get another opinion on it.

Mr. Van Etten will speak with the Town Attorney on the matter.

Mr. Court reminded the Board that we had a similar situation a few years back with land down on the river. There was a house for sale and a neighbor wanted to buy a parcel of it. The Board allowed the subdivision of that land, it was landlocked and we still allowed it. We probably shouldn't have. Ann Marie brought it up that we should have a right-of-way in through there but there was the understanding that the neighbor was going to join it with her property, Through hindsight--it is still right now today a separate deeded landlocked land. The Clerk advised that it had been combined. Mr. Court questioned that he thought it had to stand for a certain number of years but she could have chosen not too and it would have been that.

Right-of-ways

Mr. Court advised he had not seen anything in the Code book that stipulates what a right-of-way can or can't be or what a driveway can or can't be. I can only find that the driveway, one driveway per parcel. I researched other places in the State and pretty much a right-of-way can be 10 to 12 feet, just enough for a driveway. It doesn't need to be 50 feet down through their thing. If it is a street or through road, then yes, or on a major subdivision, 60 feet; but for an individual private property for the Town to say to a landowner you have to give up 50 feet when they only need 10, I don't know where you go from there if it is not stipulated. Mrs. Alfeld responded that was only if there was the intent to put a Town road in.

Court: Right but this is a single parcel, no houses there. It is a driveway.

Van Etten: Is that what it shows up as now, 50 feet, the right-of-way? Court: Yes, it is huge.

Van Etten: Yes, I agree with you but I still think ten feet might [Rest of comment not understood.]

Court: Too small.

Van Etten: Yes.

Court: 12-foot is.

Van Etten: For a roadway.

Court: Right but we have in our Code Book for a common road to be 12-feet. So if you can have two

**TOWN OF NEW BALTIMORE PLANNING BOARD**  
**Regular Monthly Meeting**  
**June 8, 2017 – Page 10**

houses on 12, you certainly can have a single parcel on 12. So I don't know what the next step would be for the Town to get something in writing that would stipulate. Say this person did want to subdivide and he wants to put a right-of-way in now for this land, what are we going to require? Say, we get a 12-foot right-of-way but now I have a 90 degree turn, you have to give him a maneuverable clearance as well. So I think the Code Book needs to have another page put in there.

Alfeld: And you need a turnaround at the end of the road.

Court: No, not if it is going to a private parcel. It is a driveway. It won't require a turnaround because it is not going to be a road.

Public Comment

Mrs. Alfeld raised a question with regard to a resident putting a fence across down on Sylvandale Road making it a private road and questioned if it would have impact on the Wrisley property? Mrs. Bruno responded that it would not. He is right up at the top and will have nothing to do with Sylvandale. He borders it but it is all woods and stuff there. Mr. Wrisley's driveway is right near the road.

**MINUTES:**

It was moved by Court and seconded by Van Etten to accept the minutes of the April 13, 2017, Regular Monthly Meeting as presented.

AYES: Van Etten; Horn; Court; Bruno; Salisbury

NAYS: None

Abstained: None

Absent: Vadney; Boehlke

It was moved by Van Etten and seconded by Salisbury to approve the minutes of the May 11, 2017, Zacek Minor Subdivision Application Public Hearing as presented.

AYES: Van Etten; Horn; Court; Bruno; Salisbury

NAYS: None

Abstained: None

Absent: Vadney; Boehlke

**CORRESPONDENCE:**

1. Copy of DEC Division of Water, Bureau of Permits 4/16/17 Acknowledgement of Notice of Intent, re: William Brandt.
2. Copy of Supervisor Dellisanti's 6/6/2017 letter to Central Hudson and State Telephone Company, re: Weak Electric and Internet Service.
3. From Assessor Bennett, copy of May, 2017, Greene County Real Property Transfer Report
4. Building Permit Applications: 1 deck; 1 pool deck; 1 deck addition; 2 pole barns

Mr. Van Etten advised that the Board did receive a letter following the May 11, 2017, meeting. He was not going to read the letter but would comment on it though, just the last sentence, that directs a very serious accusation at the Board members. I am looking at the people we have on this Board, some of the most outstanding people, I think, in the community who I have known most of my life. When I see something like that, I would just consider that letter junk mail. That is how I would look at it and I would not even consider anything that is in it. He emphasized when you make that kind of accusation at people, I just look at that letter as junk mail.

Further with regard to the May 11 meeting, Mrs. Bruno commented that she felt bad about the burial grounds. They had the opportunity to do something, to disclose the location so it could be shown on the map and at least preserved in that manner. Instead, nothing was done.

Mr. Van Etten further pointed out taking 260 acres, making 16 lots and putting in deed restrictions to prohibit further subdivision of the lots, the residents of that area should do so well. Think what another developer could have come in and how many lots they could have done. Ms. Horn pointed out with all their arguments, she could not find anything legal to base a "no" vote on. It was emotional but nothing to substantiate a "no" vote.

**TOWN OF NEW BALTIMORE PLANNING BOARD**  
***Regular Monthly Meeting***  
***June 8, 2017 – Page 11***

With regard to Item #2 under Correspondence, question was raised as to whether a copy of that letter should be sent out to the residents and then questioned which residents? It was felt it should go to those who had received certified letters but that the Board should wait until the Supervisor receives a response, which when dealing with a public utility, may take time, a while.

With regard to the well issue, it is hit or miss no matter where you drill in the Town.

**ADJOURNMENT**

It was moved by Van Etten and seconded by Court to adjourn the meeting.

Ayes: 5      Nays: 0      Abstained: 0      Absent: 2

mbl