



PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

June 16, 2026

C. Howard Post, Chair, opened the meeting at 7:32 p.m.

Present: C. Howard Post (Chair), Mike Tiano, Bob Hlavaty, Kevin Brady, Al Riozzi, Gina Kiniry and Brigid Walsh (Alternate).

Absent: Carole Furman (Vice Chair)

Also Present: Dylan Tuttle (Town Planner, NPV).

Pledge

Walsh joined the Board as a voting member in Furman's absence.

The draft minutes of the May 19, 2026 Planning Board meeting were reviewed. A motion was made by Kiniry, seconded by Brady, to approve as written. Board vote: Post-Aye, Tiano-Abstain, Hlavaty-Aye, Brady-Aye, Riozzi-Aye, Kiniry-Aye, Walsh-Aye. Motion carried.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Major Subdivision (9-Lots), Solo Holiday, LLC, Cottontail Lane & Route 212. Presented by Khattar Elmassalemah, Praetorius & Conrad, P.C. The applicant is before the Planning Board for a 9-lot subdivision. The proposed subdivision lot lines have been updated to bring each lot's boundary line to the centerline of the proposed private rural road as requested at last month's meeting. The applicant's team met on site with the Army Corps of Engineers to walk the site today. All in agreement that there will be approximately .5 acres of disturbance to the wetlands and will require the associated permit. There is a stream crossing proposed that will require a culvert, NYSDEC permit will be required. Working on the SWPPP and would like to send it to the Town Engineer to begin reviewing. We have already started the submission preparation for the Ulster County Health Department.

Post-the public hearing has been held open from the May 19, 2026 meeting. Public Comments:

- Jeff Cohen, 20 Osnas Lane-the property owner submitted a letter to the Planning Board at the meeting. The biggest concern is that the house proposed on Lot #1 of the subdivision sits right above where the houses are located in the cul de sac of Osnas Lane. We already all have sump pumps for the existing run off during storms. The addition of a new house with non-pervious surface areas will create additional runoff that our homes can not handle. We have had flooding problems for years. The Town did update the stormwater system in the middle of Osnas Lane years ago but the update did not help the homes on the cul de sac, only the homes closer to Route 212 received relief. They are proposing 9 homes on approximately 75 acres. Why can they not move the house further into the site and away from the edge of the property? Elamassalemah-the building envelope is for proof of buildability only. The future owner can build their home anywhere within that building envelope. They may move it closer to the other part of the property as long as they fall within the building envelope that has been approved. The stormwater management proposed for the subdivision will direct the runoff towards the private rural road. There is a significant amount of existing vegetation between the proposed building envelope and the homes in the cul de sac of Osnas Lane. We do not plan to remove any of that vegetation. There is also a

35'-40' difference in elevation. The house location proposed is approximately 50' from the property line of Lot #1. The setback requirement is 25'. The site will be graded towards the PRR not towards the cliff. The proposed subdivision application will not make the existing conditions worse. Cohen-the applicant can not change the configuration of the subdivision to move the building envelope of Lot #1 further away from the cliff? Elmassalemah-the applicant has put a lot of thought into the proposed layout to ensure privacy while working around the natural restrictions of the wetlands and topography of the site. Walsh-would the applicant consider a curtain drain? Elmassalemah-there are rain gardens proposed in every lot already. The SWPPP will address the flow from each lot. There are retention areas proposed.

Tuttle-the applicant did not provide a new submission. There were changes to the classification of the subdivision under SEQR from an Unlisted Action to a Type I and a new NOI was circulated. However, the 30-day timeframe has not expired for involved/interested agencies to respond. Therefore the Planning Board can not move forward on any decisions regarding SEQR. It would be appropriate to refer to the Town Engineer at this time. We can not close the public hearing until a SEQR determination is made.

A motion was made by Hlavaty, seconded by Tiano, to refer the application to the Town Engineer. A motion was made by Brady seconded by Walsh, to adjourn the public hearing to the July 21, 2026 monthly meeting. Board vote: Post-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Brady-Aye, Riozzi-Aye, Kiniry-Aye, Walsh-Aye. Motion carried.

2. Site Plan/SUP, Black Walnut Farm, 1032 Kings Highway. Presented by Jim Glaub, owner. The applicant is proposing a minor event venue with up to 150 guests. The site is located off Kings Highway. The existing barn was built in 1891 and will serve as the event space. There is also a cottage on site that is currently being used as an Airbnb and will continue to be used the same way. We have been working on this project for four years.

Post-opened the public hearing at 7:48 p.m. Comments from the public:

- Barbara Budik, representing Northeast Solite-the applicant has been working to find an alternative to the railroad crossing via Tissal Road for many years. Personally have been working on getting some railroad crossings along Kings Highway closed for over 20+ years. There have been numerous accidents over the years, some resulting in death. The opportunity to hopefully close even one would be significant. There are currently 14 railroad crossings within the Town of Saugerties and 11 of them are located between Kings Highway and Glasco Turnpike. Solite has expanded over the years with an up take in truck traffic. There are approx. 50 trucks coming in and out of the site per day via Tissal Road. Solite has offered to give the land necessary to the Town to create a safer crossing via Tissal Road in which the applicant could use in the future to access their venue instead of the existing access via a railroad crossing directly from Kings Highway. The applicant is proposing a small venue that we support and would ask the Town to support their effort in providing changes to Tissal Road allowing safer access in the future.

Post-the public hearing will be kept open as the Planning Board does not have enough to move forward with a SEQR determination and can not close the public hearing at this time.

Tuttle-it may be a better choice to close the public hearing and re-open when the applicant has the opportunity to provide responses to Part II that were moderate to large impacts. The Planning Board did receive comments back from the Ulster County Planning Board (UCPB) with the recommendation to deny based on concerns regarding access via the railroad crossing from Kings Highway. The applicant has responded to that concern requesting that the Planning Board consider SUP approval with an expiration date that will allow the applicant some time to operate the venue while working towards the creation of a safer access point via Tissal Road, which will take some time and approvals from the Town. The Planning Board should consider this option. The Planning Board

received the Town Engineer's comments today. The Engineer is investigating to see if CSX requires any changes to the crossing with the change of use. This may have an impact on insurance needed by the applicant.

A motion was made By Tiano, seconded by Hlavaty, to close the public hearing at this time and wait for additional information that will help in SEQR determination and re-open at that time. Board vote: Post-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Brady-Aye, Riozzi-Aye, Kiniry-Aye, Walsh-Aye. Motion carried. The public hearing was closed at 8:01pm.

3. Site Plan/SUP, Baldor Specialty Foods, 3084 Route 32. Presented by the applicant's representatives, Eanca Canameti (Baldor Specialty Foods), Jared Luske (Nixon Peabody LLP) and Sam Burden (Bohler Engineering). Canameti-a brief description of what Baldor Specialty Foods does. Baldor is the largest food distributor in the northeast, servicing from Maine to North Carolina with the main hub in the Bronx, NY and 2,000 employees. The company is seeking to create a temporary cross dock site at 3084 Route 32 to facilitate an unloading and loading area between tractor trailers from the Bronx to box trucks for local deliveries. Luske-we have provided answers in our supplemental materials to questions in the NPV review memo from last month. The light spec sheets have been provided and we have updated and submitted the SEAF. There was an additional submission on June 12, 2022 with additional information. We have covered the disturbance area from 200 linear feet to acres as required in the SEAF Part I, totalling 0.5 acres. The traffic study completed by our traffic consultant was provided. Parking, landscaping and installation of a fence was also included.

Burden-there was a little confusion regarding the requirement of NYSDOT referral. The GTS Consultant has compared the existing and the proposed use for the site and determined that this would be a minor traffic generator with less than 100 vehicles a day. Under that classification it would not normally have to be referred to NYSDOT and not warrant a traffic impact study. However, UCPB has recommended that it be submitted to NYSDOT. What does the Planning Board want to do? Post-it has been our practice to refer to NYSDOT for comments. A letter in writing back from them that they do not have any comments/concerns would be appreciated.

Post-opened the public hearing at 8:04pm. Public comments:

- Mike Bellarosa, 1606 Old Kings Highway-currently tractor trailers are not located on this site. We understand that this is a tenant requesting the SUP for this site. My wife, Christine, and I purchased our home in 2013. It was important to have a home with history, which dates back 300 years. We maintain our home with the integrity of its history. A lot has changed since purchasing our home, which we live in with our children. The use of GPS sends many trucks down Old Kings Highway and creates dangerous traffic. Our home borders commercial properties on all sides. Getting our mail from the other side of the road is dangerous. There is an existing problem with truck traffic. The Town should follow the zoning regulations to prevent conflict between business and residential living. The temporary facility is being proposed to see if it is worth building a bigger facility. Will this be on that site? Will there be electrical power to the site? Understand there will be port o potties on site and that most of the truck traffic will take place between 3am and 6am. The applicant is grossly understating the impact of the intended use. The proposed use will make an existing problem worse. Concerns regarding truck traffic noise, increase in number of trucks and impact on the surrounding residential area.

Mr. Bellarosa provided pictures of existing traffic in the area and 3 historic houses within the Town of Saugerties.

Luske-in response, this is a lawful use under the zoning code. Noise has been complied to what is required by code. The applicant is proposing to start with approximately 2 tractor trailers to enter the site at the beginning with up to 5 within the timeframe we plan on using the site. Noise levels have been calculated and fall within the Town Standards. If the temporary site is successful Baldor will be looking to construct a larger facility but not on this site. Looking for a temporary use of the site with a 3-year expiration of the SUP. Tiano-are there any

buildings proposed? Electric? Truck arrival times? Luske-electric is proposed on site. There is one modular office space proposed that will be removed when the use is expired. Trucks will enter the site between 3am and 6am. Riozzi-there was a discussion last month regarding the back up warning noise on the trucks? Luske-the noise has been included in the noise study that was provided in the June 12, 2026 submission. Tiano-you will have 25 employees? Luske-the plan is to have up to 25 employees.

Tuttle-NYSDOT contact is preferred as a courtesy referral. Luske-we will make contact. Tuttle-the supplemental submission from June 12, 2026 came in after the formal submission date and will be reviewed for the July meeting. The Planning Board can refer to the Town Engineer at this time for comments. The applicant can submit responses to the SEAF Part II in writing.

Post-we will adjourn the public hearing until we receive a response from NYSDOT, SEAF Part II responses and Town Engineer. A motion was made by Riozzi, seconded by Kiniry, to keep the public hearing open until the July 21, 2026 monthly meeting. Board vote: Post-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Brady-Aye, Riozzi-Aye, Kiniry-Aye, Walsh-Aye. Motion carried. A motion was made by Brady, seconded by Riozzi, to refer the project to the Town Engineer for review. Board vote: Post-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Brady-Aye, Riozzi-Aye, Kiniry-Aye, Walsh-Aye. Motion carried.

OLD BUSINESS

1. Site Plan/SUP, KCE NY 34 LLC/Key Capture Energy, 7 Tomsons Road. Presented by Paul Williamson (*Key Capture Energy*). Also present was Hyde Clarke, Esq. Williamson-we have submitted our response memo from the May NPV review memo. We are still working on the fire and safety analysis. Page 1 to Page 2 regarding the submission status, there is a comment regarding hiring a 3rd party consultant for the Planning Board in reference to conformance with the updated NYS Fire Code. We are fully supportive of this action and acknowledge the financial responsibility. We request that the Planning Board consider a consultant that is NYSERDA certified and can therefore continue to provide guidance to the Building Department throughout the construction of the project. Tuttle-we can definitely look into this. We have currently received estimates from three consulting firms which NPV is familiar with and specializes in this type of project review. Will have to have a conversation with NYSERDA to see which consultants would be local and could provide us with the services required. Have a call scheduled for tomorrow with a representative.

Williamson-a site specific ERP and Hazmat will be submitted for the July meeting. There will be technical information on the batteries as well as technology data and statistics. The Supervisor's office has informed us that there will be an informational session at the Town Board meeting on July 15, 2026 regarding the project. Allowing for additional opportunities for the public to learn more.

Sample of what emissions may look like in a fire event. The furthest extent of concentrations seem to be approximately at 18 meters which equals 59' away from the location of the project equipment. The two closest property boundaries are just over 60' away, and that is only to the fenceline not the equipment.

Tiano-are there facilities close by that we can visit? Williamson-we have one in Saratoga but is currently undergoing improvements. The next closest one that is most indicative of the proposed project would be in the Buffalo area. There have been talks with the Town Supervisor's office to try and set up a visit for those that are interested in doing so.

Hlavaty-I asked last month and was curious if you will be proving a site specific dispersion analysis for this project? Williamson-we will do so if the Planning Board requires it. Post-pollled the Board and all members agree that they would like a site specific dispersion analysis. Williamson-will comply. Post-we have polled the Board and we will be requiring that all trees 6" in diameter and larger will need to be identified on the site plan. Williamson-will comply, most likely with an additional page on the site plan for clarity. Brady-when doing the noise evaluation was it modeled under conditions like hot weather, when the cooling units will be at max load? It

says hot weather but then states it was 50 degrees when the analysis was completed, that is not hot weather. Williamson-the noise consultants have shown in full range to include all variable conditions. The model was created in a worst case scenario.

A motion was made by Tiano, seconded by Hlavaty, to allow NPV and the Chairman the authority to approve a third party fire safety consultant. Board vote: Post-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Brady-Aye, Riozzi-Aye, Kiniry-Aye, Walsh-Aye. Motion carried.

Tuttle-geotech report? Williamson-in progress.

Tuttle-we performed a segmentation analysis as per SEQR requirements for this project and the Esopus Ridge Solar project. NPV is advising that the projects be reviewed separately under SEQR. We have shared our determination with the Planning Board Attorney and he is in agreement.

2. Site Plan/SUP, Samantha & Mark Tiano, Old Stage Road. Presented by Samantha & Mark Tiano, owners. Mark Tiano-the application was previously before the Planning Board back in October for a residential rural resort. However, due to the 50-acre minimum requirement the project has been shifted to a Membership Sports and Recreation Club with an Inn. The Recreation Club will include the proposed wellness center and the Inn will include the retreat cottages. We are still proposing the same number of clients and personnel as the October submission just stepping back and reconfiguring the use. The cottages will allow for 1 to 2 guests overnight. The center will be 2,000 sq. ft. and the cottages will be 480 sq. ft. each.

Received the review memo and would like to address several items. We will provide clarification on plans to separate the uses. There are two site plans, one with topo and one without that includes additional information. The disturbance plan and erosion control provided. Tuttle-the Board will want to know building materials being used, clarify on the site plan. Mark Tiano-utilities will be shown. Does the Board need a photometric plan? Tuttle-usually the Board is concerned with the intensity of the proposed lighting but in this case they may want more within the parking area for safety reasons. A plan should be provided for that. Even lighting is more important in those areas rather than intensity. Mark Tiano-the site is heavily wooded, we propose not to over landscape and keep the natural vegetation. The buildings are not visible from Route 9W nor Old Stage Road. Tuttle-will you be landscaping around the area at all, around cottages or the wellness center? Providing the general location of where you may be placing flowers/flower planters would be required. Walsh-have you thought about rain gardens on the down spouts/gutters? They may be a nice addition. Mark Tiano-will consider and update the site plan to reflect what we are planning on adding.

Will add the zoning table as required. We understand that the Glasco FD has expressed concerns with the width and grade of the access drive. We have proposed a two lane entrance/exit and a wider neck by the parking area. The remaining drive will be one lane with areas for two cars to pass. The length of the drive is 300' and we are proposing it this way to limit the amount of disturbance to the site. We would like to keep the site as natural as possible. Tuttle-you should provide fire truck specs to the site plan to show the ability of the fire truck to access the site in the event of an emergency. Mark Tiano-there is a pre-existing driveway on the other end of the site with a 10% grade, potential to keep that open for emergency access. Will make the walking paths traversable. We understand that the Glasco FD has a UTV as well.

We are in the process of developing an operational narrative. We are proposing about 10 clients onsite at one time, one vehicle for each cottage, 1 instructor on site at a time, 1 staff member and handicapped access. We will specify the building materials. On site septic is proposed, one for the 3 cottages and one for the wellness studio. We will ensure that the lighting is dark-sky compliant. Tuttle-you will need a determination from the Building Inspector of what is considered a kitchenette to ensure that what you are proposing complies with the restrictions of an Inn. Mark Tiano-the distance from the studio to the cottages is 65'. We will submit it to SHPO.

Tuttle-this is an uncoordinated review for SEQR. The only other involved agency was the Town of Saugerties ZBA with the previous submission for a bulk area variance but since they have changed the use it is not required. The two items to be addressed are the driveway and the determination of what constitutes a kitchenette from the building inspector. The Planning Board can not take further action at this time.

PRE-HEARING CONFERENCE

1. Lot Line Revision, Wafa Karajeh & Wendy Sorto, 35 & 37 Old Lasher Road. Presented by Bruce Utter, Praetorius & Conrad, P.C. The applicant is proposing to move the existing lot line to the center of the duplex and separate each unit onto its own parcel. They meet all bulk and setback requirements. Access is via Old Lasher Road with a ROW through 35 Old Lasher Road to 37 Old Lasher Road, which can also gain access from Mauro Court, as there is frontage on that road. There will be utility easements required, water/sewer/septic.

Tuttle-this is a straightforward lot line revision and the Planning Board can waive the public hearing and sketch plan approval with a supermajority because the size of the area being transferred is larger than the bulk area requirement in the district. The applicant is proposing to line the lot line with the units. The easements will have to be provided to the Planning Board attorney for review and approval. This is a Type II Action under SEQR.

A motion was made by Tiano, seconded by Kiniry, to waive the public hearing, waive sketch plan approval and conditionally approve the lot line revision with the condition of PB attorney review of the utility easements proposed. Board vote: Post-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Brady-Aye, Riozzi-Aye, Kiniry-Aye, Walsh-Aye. Motion carried.

ADDITIONAL ITEMS

1. Extension Request, Peter Larson, Minor Subdivision, 1058 Churchland Lane. The applicant is requesting a 1-year extension for submission of the final plat for signatures.

A motion was made by Hlavaty, seconded by Brady to approve the 1-year extension as requested. Board vote: Post-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Brady-Aye, Riozzi-Aye, Kiniry-Aye, Walsh-Aye. Motion carried.

2. Designation of Members for the Water Resource Planning Committee. The Village has developed this committee to discuss the future of the water system. They have asked that we have two members participate on behalf of the Town of Saugerties Planning Board. Mike Tiano and Bridgid Walsh volunteered. The Planning Board secretary will add them to the committee email thread and introduce them to the group.

ADJOURNMENT

Since there was no further business to discuss, a motion was made by Riozzi, seconded by Brady, to adjourn the meeting. Board vote: Post-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Brady-Aye, Riozzi-Aye, Kiniry-Aye, Walsh-Aye. Motion carried.

The meeting was closed at 9:29 pm.

Respectfully Submitted by,

Becky Bertorelli
Planning Board Secretary