

TOWN OF DRYDEN
SPECIAL PLANNING BOARD MEETING
February 7, 2019

Present: John Kiefer, Martin Hatch, Joe Wilson, Deborah Cipolla-Dennis, Jim Skaley (alternate),
Tony Salerno (alternate)

Liaisons: Alice Green (Town Board)

Absent: Tom Hatfield, David Weinstein, Craig Anderson

Chair John Kiefer opened the meeting at 6:00 p.m. and welcomed Tony Salerno. He explained that in the event a member is absent from a meeting, one of the alternates will become a voting member for that meeting. He encouraged T Salerno to participate in discussion whether or not he will have voting status at a meeting.

The Town Attorney will be present at the regular meeting on February 28 to discuss legal issues related to the work of the Planning Board. J Kiefer has sent members a list of topics and encouraged them to suggest any additions, keeping in mind that she should have those at least a week in advance.

Trinitas Part 3 SEQR Review

Over the last few meetings the Planning Board has reviewed the Trinitas Part 1 submission and responded with comments and reviewed the Part 2. Trinitas has submitted some additional information.

R Burger provided an update on the status of the Trinitas application. January 23 was the latest submission and he estimates the application is 90% complete. They still need to provide infiltration numbers for the site; that feeds into the SWPPP calculations. They also need to provide the extended traffic study. Hunt will talk with TG Miller about using conservative infiltration number and overbuilding for stormwater as a result.

2019 update to SEQR – Would this have any impact on this review? R Burger said the applicant has since revised their FEAF to incorporate the new 2019 regulations. The board is free to evaluate it based on that. He is not aware of any substantive effects of the 2019 revisions. It would be useful to look at the new version relative to energy.

J Kiefer shared excerpts from the 2019 SEQR Handbook. He reminded board members that this review is being done for the Town Board. There is still some information lacking and it is ok to say that and the recommendation to the board would be to get more information.

With the results of their Part 2 review and impacts determined to be moderate or large, and based on the comments by the board in that review, the board completed Part 3. The results of the Part 3 review are set forth in the attached table. Significant impacts without sufficient mitigation measures should require an Environmental Impact Statement.

Based on the findings set forth in the attached table, the Planning Board recommends that the applicant provide an Environmental Impact Statement in the areas indicated.

Chair Kiefer thanked members for their work on this task.

J Skaley expressed concern with the definition of story and the applicant's concept of 3 vs 4 stories is incorrect. R Burger said they will be memorializing that in the Planning Department. Stories above grade is the definition will be used. He understands that the façade of building 11 has 4 stories visible and there is a 3-story parking garage attached. The impact of this huge stone and wood façade is undeniable, but as far as meeting 3-story guidance, it is a 3-story building. J Skaley disagrees.

R Burger asked for volunteers to review map of the town for where possible develop areas might be. J Skaley, M Hatch and D Cipolla-Dennis will do that.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bambi L. Avery
Town Clerk

Trinitas Part 3 Review
 2/7/19 Planning Board Special Meeting

	Impact	Duration	Likelihood	Mitigating Measures	Significant?	Vote Yes-No
1. Impact on Land	Large	Long-term	Probable	not well defined	Yes	5 - 1
Very large project relative to the size of the hamlet. Construction would be very disruptive and complicated due to steep terrain.						
2. Impact on Geological Features	No					
3. Impacts on Surface Water	Moderate to large	Long-term	Possible	not well defined	Yes	6 - 0
Project would remove a wetland. Steep slopes = significant erosion risk, especially during construction.						
4. Impact on Groundwater	No					
5. Impact on Flooding	Moderate to large	Long-term	Possible	not well defined	Yes	6 - 0
Flood risk will increase with climate change: frequent 500yr events possible,						
6. Impacts on Air	No					
7. Impact on Plants & Animals	Moderate	Short-term	Probable	None	No	6 - 0
Rationale for "no" vote: we found no evidence of unique or endangered species.						
8. Impact on Agricultural Resource	No					
9. Impact on Aesthetic Resources	Large	Long-term	Probable	None	No	6 - 0
Rationale for "no" vote is that the aesthetic resource (the natural area being disrupted) is not that important.						
10. Impact on Historic & Archeological Resources	No					

11. Impact on Open Space & Recreation
No
12. Impact on Critical Environmental Areas
No
13. Impact on Transportation
Large Long-term Probable Yes 6 - 0
Project would greatly increase the number of cars in the hamlet both in terms of quantity and percent increase.
14. Impact on Energy
Large Long-term Probable mitigated No 6 - 0
Rationale for "no" vote: Building heat is by heat pumps. Building envelopes and appliance efficiencies are very good.
15. Impact on Noise, Odor & Light
Moderate Short-term Probable Needed No 6 - 0
Rationale for "no" vote: Impact is short term, but:
Need to address truck traffic & dust
Hours of operation during construction should be constrained
Contractor should submit operating plan to mitigate impacts for approval by Town prior to Building Permit.
16. Impact on Human Health
Moderate Short-term Possible Unknown No 6 - 0
Rationale for "no" vote: Construction phase dust was the major concern and it can be mitigated with proper operating procedures.
17. Consistency with Community Plan
Large Long to Irreversible Probable None seen Yes 6 - 0
Proposed development is clearly and significantly at odds with the Varna Plan.
18. Consistency with Community Character
Moderate to Large Long-term Probable None Yes 6 - 0
Proposed development would completely change the character of the hamlet.
Recommend Town Board allocate a certain number of units as affordable housing

Planning Board Recommendation: Proposed project should receive a positive declaration of environmental significance.