Chairman Boucher opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. with the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag. Chairman Boucher stated that this meeting is being held via Zoom in conformance with Executive Order 202.10 from the Governor Cuomo.

Regular Meeting

1. **208 Business Center Scoping Extension**

Chairman Boucher provided an overview. The extension to postpone the scoping session for the 208 Business Center draft scope was granted by the planning board during the regular March 23, 2021 meeting. The revised draft scope was not ready in time to meet the April 2021 submission deadline so the applicant provided another extension until the May 25, 2021 regular meeting.

On a Motion made by Member Parise and seconded by Member Karlich, it was **Resolved that the extension provided by the 208 Business Center Applicant in an email dated April 9, 2021 to postpone the scoping session until the May 25, 2021 meeting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member Allen</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Boucher</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member DeAngelis</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Hafenecker</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Karlich</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Kelly</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Parise</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chairman Boucher stated that the board will review the language of a recommendation that will be sent to the Village Board to adopt a local law to require sign postings by planning board applicants. Attorney Cassidy presented to the board § 235-82 Public Notice Signs from the Town/Village of Harrison’s code. From the codes Attorney Cassidy reviewed, a sign size of 30 inches by 20 inches was the standard listed. The sign should also consist of a sturdy and serviceable material. The sign cannot be made of cardboard; it should be made of a more robust plastic material. Member DeAngelis stated that the applicant should be informed of the material requirements of the sign. Attorney Cassidy stated that from § 235-82 the sign is required have a white background with black letters, plainly visible from the most commonly traveled street or highway. The sign also has to be within 20 feet of the front lot line. The sign cannot be buried in the ground and should be at least six feet in the air. § 235-82 also lists the language format the applicant is required to use on their sign. Two-inch lettering is required for the text. Attorney Cassidy stated that the planning board would also provide the applicant with the language format to use on their sign. To have a sign created the applicant will usually go to a sign maker prepare the signs and have the signs installed. If the text on the sign regarding a date needs to be changed then either the black letter stickers on the sign can be replaced or white duct tape can cover the old text and new information is written on. The applicant would be required to do an affidavit to certify that the text or date was updated as requested. Attorney Cassidy presented § 170-105 Notice of public hearing from the Town of Somers. The language used in this section regarding the size and placement of signs is roughly the same. A portion of § 170-105 provides a phone number on the sign which is listed for the public to call if they need information. Listing a phone number is optional. § 170-105 also requires the applicant to remove the signs when they are no longer needed. Chairman Boucher asked if it is listed in the codes the amount of time a sign needs to be up to appropriately notice the application. Attorney Cassidy confirmed this and stated that the time required varies between municipality. Attorney Cassidy advised that the board make the notice period correspond to the mailing date. The mailing date for the planning board is 10 days. The applicant can be required to install a sign once and then it becomes the public’s responsibility to know the adjournment. Attorney Cassidy stated that one code she reviewed required the applicant to re-notice for the newspaper, the sign, and the mailings if the public hearing for that application was adjourned for more than two consecutive meetings. Member Parise asked if these proposed changes regarding noticing and signage will be put under §200-40.8 Temporary signs in the Village code. Attorney Cassidy stated that the proposed changes regarding noticing and signage can be put under your procedure or under § 25-1 Public Hearing. Some municipalities, within their zoning code, have a whole section related to public notice any time a public hearing is required. Member Parise stated that in §200-40.8 Temporary signs there are required dimensions for signs. Attorney Cassidy stated that she will add something in the code to ensure that signs posted by planning board applicants are in line with
Village code and with the standards set in the Comprehensive Plan. Attorney Cassidy advises that the board include language requiring that the planning board applicant remove the sign within a certain time period after the public hearing is over. Member Parise stated that without clear language in the zoning code regarding the applicant’s responsibility to remove signs the building department can’t enforce the removal or clean up of signs. Attorney Cassidy stated that she will list the removal of planning board applicant signs as an exception because in §200-40.8 temporary signs require a permit. Unless there is an explicit exception listed in §200-40.8 then planning board applicants would be required to get a permit every time a sign is needed. Attorney Cassidy stated that she will include the language regarding the planning board applicant signs in the §25-1 Public Hearing and §200-40.8 Temporary signs portions of Village code. Member DeAngelis asked if the sign posted by applicants should include the Zoning District of the project site, the nature of the project, and/or a drawing of the site. Attorney Cassidy stated that the description on the sign is usually carried over from the regular public notice used. The goal of the sign is to make the public aware of the application. Member Parise asked Attorney Cassidy and Planner Fink about their experience with the amount of public attending the virtual meetings put into place because of the COVID-19 pandemic. Planner Fink stated that if there is a controversial application being heard on an agenda there is increased attendance, but for a typical application attendance is low. Planner Fink speculates that either the public aren’t used to navigating the Zoom format or the lack of a physical in person meeting reduces the incentive to attend. Attorney Cassidy stated that she has observed similar rates of public attendance for the municipalities she serves. Member DeAngelis asked Planner Fink about how the Town of Rhinebeck handles signage. Planner Fink presented the Town of Rhinebeck Subdivision Regulations. Planner Fink highlighted 2b. section 3 which reads “On a conspicuous sign posted along the road frontage of the parcel subject to the pending Subdivision plat proceeding before the Planning Board for a period not less than five (5) calendar days prior to the public hearing an in such manner as otherwise specified by the Planning Board at the time of acceptance of the application for Subdivision Plat approval.” Planner Fink speculated that the intent behind this was to avoid excess complexity regarding sign postings and to make accommodations based on the context of where the application was. The Town of Rhinebeck has more diversity in its streets, roads and highways. The Town of Rhinebeck planning board can make case-by-case decisions to handle every circumstance. Attorney Cassidy stated that she will draft language regarding public notice signage for the May 2021 workshop. Attorney Cassidy stated that in the Town of Somers it is required for the applicant to take a picture of the sign and attach it to their affidavit.

3. **Administrative – Fee Schedule, Escrow**

Chairman Boucher stated that this item will be postponed until the May agenda to receive input from all planning board consultants. The planning board fee schedule has to be in line with other municipalities in the area. Attorney Cassidy stated that she will
follow up with the planning board consultants and try to merge that input with the planning board’s current fee schedule. Chairman Boucher stated that the new fee schedule drafted and changes to applicant escrow will be codified at the May 25, 2021 meeting. Member Parise stated that the escrow capabilities are already in Village code. The board can already request applicants to open escrow upon application. Attorney Cassidy confirmed that was true. Attorney Cassidy stated that the current iteration of the planning board’s fee schedule has application fees but no default escrow fees. Escrow for bigger applications can be done on a case-by-case basis, but smaller applications can be covered by listing default escrow amounts on the fee schedule. Member Parise asked if the current fee schedule will be reviewed as well. The last time the fee schedule was reviewed was around 2013. The amounts listed on the fee schedule should be increased. Attorney Cassidy stated that the administrative costs of the planning board, such as the planning board secretary, should also be covered so that these expenses are not passed onto the tax payers. Attorney Cassidy advised the board that the planning board cannot be revenue positive, only revenue neutral. Attorney Cassidy stated that she will check for the board if the fee schedule can be amended by resolution without going through a local law process.

Approval of Minutes

March 23, 2021

On a Motion made by Member Parise and seconded by Member Hafenecker, it was Resolved that the March 23, 2021 minutes be approved.

Member Allen: Yes
Member Boucher: Yes
Member DeAngelis: Yes
Member Hafenecker: Yes
Member Karlich: Yes
Member Kelly: Absent
Member Parise: Yes

April 12, 2021

On a Motion made by Member DeAngelis and seconded by Member Allen, it was Resolved that the April 12, 2021 minutes be approved.

Member Allen: Yes
Member Boucher: Yes
Member DeAngelis: Yes
Member Hafenecker: Yes
Member Karlich: Yes
Member Kelly: Absent
Member Parise: Abstain

Adjournment

On a Motion made by Member Parise and seconded by Member Allen, it was Resolved that the April 27, 2021 meeting be Adjourned at 7:35PM.

Member Allen: Yes
Member Boucher: Yes
Member DeAngelis: Yes
Member Hafenecker: Yes
Member Karlich: Yes
Member Kelly: Absent
Member Parise: Yes