TOW Conservation Commission
Meeting Notes

Meeting of 02/07/05

Begin

7:35 pm

Attending

- Salvatore LaBruna
- Claude Braithwaite – Not attending
- Patricia Owen
- Jon Paul Heurich
- Kevin Sumner
- Mike Leary
- Kate Fox – Not attending

Review of Previous Meeting Notes

- Minutes were handed out and read individually. Nominated for approval by Sal. Seconded by Pat.

Official Business

- Announcement of SEQRA "What it means to you" presentation. Thursday, Feb. 17, 2005.
- Received the final environmental impact statement on the Golden Triangle project.
- Received 1st batch of site plans from the planning board.
    - Distributed and reviewed.
    - Discussed how to review?
        - By neighborhood closest to individual members.
    - One of major concerns is Scotchtown Mews
        - Kevin does not believe this meets wetland, runoff and other requirements. Appears that some town houses are within 10 feet of the wetland boundary.
        - Sal - This project is in final review.
        - Kevin – We need to pick our battles. Does it make sense to work on something that is already in final review?
        - Sal – He will talk to town engineer to see if runoff requirements have been considered.
- Discussion of proposed flea market on 302
    - Actually old storage buildings on the site already.
    - Want to expand, but they will do a good bit of paving.
- Wetlands law proposed by Councilman King

    - No houses on wetland unless a minimum amount of non-wetland on the property.
    - We should investigate other town's laws to see if we can learn anything from them.
- The Tetz final impact statement has been delayed.
    - 90 day extension.
- Reviewed Dan Depew's Kill overlay.
    - Kevin – Special consideration to farming. But, could say that farmer should have a conservation plan. Sal agrees. Sal says that Commissioner King has already told Dan the same thing.
    - Kevin – Septic and storm flows need to be away from Kill. Might not be possible if natural drainage is towards the overlay. Forward owner that there could be a problem. Mike – but don't most lots have natural drainage towards the stream? Won't be excluding essentially everything from the law?
    - Kevin – Make it town wide rather than the Shawangunk in particular. Easier to go through the process once rather than multiple times for each stream. Agreement with all attending. More easily defensible if town wide rather than isolating only areas along the Shawangunk. Most other towns have town wide laws that work. Putnam is a good example. Combine with a wetlands law.
    - Other general concerns. Too general. Vague wording. Recreational uses? Could be interpreted to include ATVs, horses, etc.?
    - Sal - How this compares to other similar town laws? Kevin – Most are 50 feet from the 100 year flood line.
    - If town wide then how does it affect the Wallkill? Different animal? No, would be the same for the Wallkill as any other stream.
    - Kevin – Has contacted Jill Knapp from the Wallkill River Task force. She has agreed to research the issue of a town wide law. She will review other town wide law and see if they have been working, whether they have been legally challenged and how they withstood the challenge.
    - Mike – Ask board to wait for Jill's research to be completed. Possibly use a template from another town to replace Dan's law. Dan's law is well intended and his effort is appreciated, but the consensus of members attending is that a more comprehensive combined stream conservation and wetlands law makes more sense to the commission.
    - Individuals review the Putnam County laws. Much better written.
        - Most have inspector position. How will that be paid for? Paid by fees to developers. Shouldn't cost the town anything extra.
        - Delineate based upon classification. How do we classify? State wetlands are already classified. Federal ones are not.
    - Resolve – We recommend a town wide law covering both streams and wetlands modeled on proven laws from other towns. Inform Dan immediately of our recommendation.
- Sal – More information on ag law.
    - If house on it then classified at "220" residential.

    - Map, with help from OC water authority, rating the ag land. Darker green - better soil quality. Light green – probably wetland and rock outcrop.
    - Individual members noted several areas that are not listed, but are known to be used for agriculture.
    - Sal has some new lists that may add some more parcels.
    - How do we add to map? What does that gain us? No official protection, but town board will try to keep the areas that are more ag based from being subdivided and turned into development.
- Sal - John King thinks he has enough votes to authorize a PDR law in the town.
    - Easier sell than bonds for open space like was done in Goshen.
- Golden Triangle – Do we need to do anything with it?
    - Should review and see how they answered our comments?
    - Mike volunteers to read and review.

Adjourned

Motion to adjourn by Jon. Seconded by Mike. 9:35.

Copies:

- Mike – 7 copies of 5 page meeting notes
- Sal – 7 copies of 4 page agenda and other documents. Property list from county costs $75.
- Kevin – 50 copies for stream protection laws. Map of ag land (roughly $20 map).