



# TOWN OF AMENIA

---

PLANNING DEPARTMENT  
4988 Route 22, AMENIA, NY 12501  
(845) 373-8118, Ext. 122-124 Fax (845) 373-9147

**PLANNING BOARD MEETING  
WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 10, 2022  
7:00 P.M. – IN-PERSON  
AMENIA TOWN HALL 2<sup>ND</sup> FLOOR MEETING ROOM**

**REGULAR MEETING:**

**1. KEANE STUD SUBDIVISION – SKETCH PLAN**

**OTHER MATTERS:**

**1. PRELIMINARY APPLICATION  
SITE PLAN MODIFICATION FOR  
SILO CORE CONDO AND SPA AREAS**

**2. MINUTES 7-13-22 MEETING**



# TOWN OF AMENIA

4988 Route 22, AMENIA, NY 12501  
(845) 373-8118, Ext. 122-124 Fax (845) 789-1132

## PLANNING BOARD MEETING WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 10, 2022 IN-PERSON AT TOWN HALL 2<sup>ND</sup> FLOOR MEETING ROOM

PRESENT: Robert Boyles, Jr, Chairman  
Nina Peek  
James Walsh  
Matt Deister  
Neal Kusnetz

ABSENT: Tony Robustelli  
John Stefanopoulos

OTHERS PRESENT - John Andrews – Planning Board Engineer  
Dave Everett – Planning Board Attorney  
Peter Sander - Rennia Engineering  
Rich Rennia - Rennia Engineering  
Patrick O’Leary – Silo -Spa & Condo  
Leo Blackman

The meeting was held IN-PERSON at Town Hall. Chairman Robert Boyles, Jr. opened the meeting with all those present Reciting the Pledge of Allegiance at 7pm. The exits were announced in case of emergency. Chairman Boyles opened the Regular Meeting. Item #1 was moved to second because presenters from Rennia Engineers were not present yet. The items under **“Other Matters”** were **addressed and Patirck O’Leary introduced the Silo Core Condo Area and Spa ideas as a preliminary application for Site Plan Modification** to the Planning Board members. In the introduction of his presentation, Patrick defined the two areas as being 2 separate projects. He first defined the proposed **“new” Core Condo Area**. The proposal takes away the original Town Houses planned for and replaces them with a another set of Condos to replace the clubhouse and two more sets of Condos. In totality there will be 5 more condo UNITS which will change the entire # of the Master Plan from 245 to 250 total units. This will also change the number

of bedrooms. The number could not be provided yet, because they are still working on the schematics of the changes. This will result in only some minor changes. And the changes will:

- Strengthen the Core Condo Area
- Be nicer architecture
- Be better environmentally by reducing impacts on water, sewer etc.
- The internal changes will reduce impervious areas and exposed parking areas
- The parking areas will now be underground
- Areas provided in VG1 & VG2(for golf) will now be Valet Parking and there will be an enclosed cart barn parking area for day guests to the golf course and will also be included in this Site Plan Modification Plan.

John Andrews says the Master Development Plan will have to be amended as well as the Site Plan and the Subdivision Plat for Silo Ridge. This proposal will eliminate 13 lots and add 2 additional Condo Sites. The SEQRA Analysis will be updated with findings and the bedroom and unit count will be noted on the plans as well. The Parking on the Plan set will also need to be updated and evaluated. Proposal says Carts are being used for the site and not autos and the autos are parked. This all needs to be noted and shown in the plans.

Patrick suggests that in making changes to the graphics, that separate NEW sheets are made to modify just the sections that need to be. Those sheets can be attached to the original MDP Sheets with the modifications.

Dave Everett would like to see the project changes and changes with impacts by having a chart to see the old with the new numbers of units and bedrooms as well as see an overlay document of changes in footprints of the areas proposed for changes in a more simplified format for the Board as well as see the impact on the “community”.

Nina Peek would like to receive a packet which includes the original approved MDP and Findings Statement for Silo Ridge and how the current proposal differs from that and the conditions of findings applicable to the proposed changes. How big is the Net area? (Can the total be reflected in either Gross SF or Net, rather than saleable Sq.Ft.) Also, provide documents that show areas to the North and right sides that show the connecting areas on the property.

Jim Walsh would like to schedule a walkthrough with the Board to see the proposed application in October once the applications have been received for both

the Core Condo and Spa. Patrick says they plan on a submission for then and that should workout.

Matt asked about emergency response access to these areas and the vehicles being larger than the road areas. The access looks like cart paths on the proposed drawings. The actual access will be similar to what is already at Condo 2. They will get together with the Fire District once plans have been submitted to get their approval.

The Spa Proposal is driven by the patrons of Silo Ridge. They like the amenities they have at this time but a more intense and elaborate spa experience. The residents wanted it to be near the Family Barn so the access would be close for family members who would be using both areas simultaneously. The proposed area is 2 lots that are directly across from the Family Barn. It is in a somewhat undisturbed wooded area. There are Tennis Courts currently on the lots which will be removed because there will be Tennis Courts at SILAND. Several dedicated areas are proposed in this area for massages, therapy areas, skin treatments, etc. The goal is to build and design the Spa around the existing trees. Essentially everything on the hillside will be taken down. Several hundred feet of retaining wall that approach the area will also be eliminated. The units will be elevated off the ground as to maintain impervious areas. All trees surrounding the proposed building will be existing trees. This will result another significant reduction in the impervious areas that were originally proposed. Still at the conceptual stage, working on color and architecture etc. as well as the landscaping. The area will maintain the overall character and color scheme. This will be much less invasive than the original proposal for the area. John says that this all makes good sense as far as from an engineer's standpoint and as far as the land and grading to perform the necessary work, most of it has already been done. With the proposed project there would be no need to get driveways in there. It would be all greenspace. To be minimizing disturbance to the hill makes good sense. It would be a good thing to put the Spa area near the Family Barn Area because of the families that use it. Nina asked how do people get into the buildings in the back (the ones on the hill)? Still working out details for stairs and ADA requirements. ADA requirements also can mean a person to run guest shuttles with carts as well. Also discussed were elevators in some buildings leading to interconnected walkways to get to buildings. Nina commented that there is also a concern on her part about the use of the term

“Oriental” as it could be considered derogatory or racist. She has asked the applicant to consider renaming the “Oriental Pavillion” to something that is more demonstrative/descriptive of the type of service that would be provided in that structure. Jim also mentioned landscaping as an issue. Patrick says there will be a complete new landscape design in the Condo area that will be submitted in the amended Site Plan Proposal. Dave informed the Board that with the original approval a Landscaping reclamation bond was made with the Town and still remains in effect while the rest of the construction takes place. Patrick offered to create a separate set of plans that were from the original Silo Documents and approvals to go along with the application package when he submits it so that the Board can see the differences. Again, a question was raised about the access by Fire Trucks to this area. When they get to that point in the design, they will ask the Fire District to work with them. Matt commended Patrick on the way his presentation flows so that the entire picture is discussed rather than each thing in an individual document. Patrick will come back to us with an application as his next submittal.

**The Keane Stud Subdivision Application was discussed** now as Peter Sander spoke of the revisions that were submitted with the recent submittal. They submitted with this revision. He also provided an outline showing all Code restrictions and items required and how they have been addressed in the conservation analysis. Rich Renna says there is potential for 26 “new” lots to be developed with the submitted application. The following were items submitted:

- Completed Conservation Analysis
  - Which included Archaeological Completed – Phase 1A/1B – This is identified as being on Lot #17 which the Planning Board will need to determine the sufficiency of approach
- A Visual Impact Analysis dated 7/25/22
- Summary of visual rendering methodology (incomplete-only 1 studio was included)
- Analysis of lot-by-lot Building Envelopes
- Lot designations that are now consistent with the subdivision plat

John Andrews cautions the Board that a large 50 acre parcel is located in the RDO District. This could be a problem in the future. Does the Planning Board want to recognize this in the Plans?

The Planning Board still needs to decide which land has more conservation value and if the information submitted is substantial to generate “conservation findings”. And, does the Planning Board feel, based upon the conservation analysis, that the proposed conventional subdivision adversely affects the Town’s rural landscape and may require a conservation subdivision as an alternative to that of the proposed.

The Conservation analysis has identified lands with conservation value to be preserved/protected. Those including; Federal/State wetlands, stream courses, forests, and steep slopes, agricultural preservation and resources, soils, lands within the viewsheds and Scenic Protection Overlay, open Space and archaeological resources. The proposed methodology for the preservation and protection of these resources is primarily voluntary. It is relying on a low-density conventional subdivision, using building envelopes, rural lanes and hedge rows, conservation areas and future site plan approvals when individual lot developments have been proposed. The exact mechanism by which these measures are to be determined has not yet been determined.

Town Code contemplates the use of a Conservation Easement. That is not being proposed. The preservation is to be by means of deed restrictions. The Planning Board needs to determine if they are comfortable with this approach.

One of the parcels #7167-00-570145 is encumbered by a Wetlands preserve Program (WRP) easement for which a copy is provided. The easement needs to be addressed in the Conservation Analysis. It has been noticed as retained but does not analyze the potential impacts of the proposal on the easement.

There are still several flag lots incorporated in the proposed subdivision. Flag Lots are only allowed by waiver of the Planning Board in its sole discretion. The current proposal does not provide sufficient information for Code 105-21(f). A number of items in this code section will have to be addressed as the process moves forward.

The two (2) forest conservation parcels appear to be landlocked with access by easement only(?) Frontage on a viable road for these parcels is required. Access, the exact mechanism for ownership, management, and maintenance for these parcels must be addressed.

Dave Everett mentions the Zoning Law and again says the Board needs to determine if a Conservation Subdivision design should be required of the applicant. As mentioned above in John’s comments, several items still need to be addressed. Are deed restrictions the way to go? Should Town restrictions be included? Will there be AG restrictions outside the building envelopes? Is there a Sketch Plan

showing all the lands to be protected? As well as their recommended uses, ownerships and management guidelines? If the Board is satisfied with the conservation analysis, then draft “Findings” can be prepared for a future meeting.

Matt asked about his residence and the close proximity to the northern acres of the project and whether or not he needs to recuse himself from the project because of a conflict of interest. Dave says that unless he has taken a “position” from an individual standpoint for or against the proposal outside of being on the Planning Board then he would have to recuse himself. Any neighbors must maintain a neutral standpoint as a board member.

Jim asked; will there be “common driveways” for the lots? Rich says that the applicant is trying to avoid them. And that will come up during the SEQRA Process. Peter did go over where all the proposed rural lanes, roads and existing roads are currently.

Neal asked: what are the planted heights of the trees? He would like to see the actual levels of the trees on the simulations.

Nina provided a list of the things that she would like to see in the plans and corrections made to the information already provided as follows:

1. Please clarify what approvals/determination the Applicant is currently seeking. More specifically, is the PB considering approval of the subdivision plat (and/or rural roads)? Or is the PB considering verifying that the analyses presented are sufficient to conclude the proposed subdivision is equally, or more, respectful of the environment such that additional detail need not be provided, and a full conservation plan is not required? ***In the absence of any quantitative comparison between the proposed residential subdivision plan and a conceptual conservation plan, it is virtually impossible to come to this conclusion.***
2. The size (acreage) of each building envelope should be presented on the building envelope plan.
3. Please clarify the mechanism for restricting any/all development to within the proposed building envelopes (including accessory structures, pools, tennis courts).
4. The total number of proposed lots is still not clear, and not consistent throughout the documents presented. 4 existing = 29 proposed, so should be 25 “new” lots; current narrative says “26” lots, traffic study says 27 lots, RSA recent memo has a different number.
5. The slope map is blank.
6. The lot sizes in the Proposed Subdivision Plan should be the same as those presented in the Building Envelope analyses – and all other documents.

Lot	Building Envelope	Subdivision Plan
6	17.13	17.11
9	15.19	15.22
10	14.65	14.63
11	26.63	27.07
12	20.19	19.71
13	20.28	20.04
15	15.73	16.60

Lot	Building Envelope	Subdivision Plan
16	10.10	9.87
17	Proposal for this lot is not clear.	
18	15.28	15.25
19	19.63	19.56
20	17.29	17.14
21	29.36	29.13
22	22.50	23.13
23	23.64	23.19
24	17.14	17.11
25	19.20	18.99

7. The existing conditions base plan should present the current existing condition on the site. The plan should include all the existing buildings, paddocks, fences, and structures on the site. This **actual** existing condition base plan should be utilized as the base for **all** proposed plans, images, aerials and analyses (including the traffic analysis).
8. Please clarify the size of the building envelopes on each plan in the “building envelope” analysis and confirm any/all other accessory structures (pools, tennis courts, outbuildings) and other hard spaces would be included within that envelope.
9. The SPO requires analysis of ag buildings >10K and land disturbance. If the as of right proposal assumes large scale/commercial animal processing, this would include buildings of such size and should therefore be analyzed, presented in the plan and visual impact analyses provided therefor.
10. Please provide location, length and calc. for impervious coverage of all roads (rural, private and driveways).
11. Lot G-2 is proposed to be subdivided from 62.1 acres to 27.22 acres and is indicated to have a greenhouse “not included in the HOA”. Does the greenhouse occupy the entire 27.22 acres? Is this a commercially operated greenhouse? Where will vehicles park and what is anticipated access. The traffic study did not anticipate this use.
12. What is the difference between “in HOA” and “owned by HOA” as marked on the proposed subdivision plan?
13. For large scale agricultural uses, where is the proposed access by farm equipment? Will the vehicles travel on rural lanes, and utilize the individuals’ driveways to access the “farmed” fields?
14. Would the Applicant please run through the proposed circulation plan with the Planning Board using the proposed subdivision plan and differentiate between existing/new rural and private roads.
15. Are these fee simple lots – owner buys/owns land and all improvements on the land? How does HOA ownership/management work?
16. Will the HOA own/operate/maintain the agricultural parcels on the individual parcels?
17. The narrative states:
  - a. “60 percent of the lot acreage **not included in the conservation areas** will be preserved for agriculture” please clarify this statement. What is the total acreage for the conservation areas? Is that 60 percent of each lot, total for the entire development?
  - b. “411.76 acres on 27 parcels” – which 27 parcels?
  - c. “52.22 acres for equestrian uses”- does this include 11,571 lf for horse trails?
18. Visual Impact Analyses
  - a. While it is understood and appreciated that two consultants prepared the imagery, the proposal should be the same regardless of who prepared the materials. The Planning Board is being asked to



determine that **a/the/one** subdivision proposal is “less impactful” than a conservation subdivision may be. Providing two different proposals, makes it impossible for the PB to make such a determination.

b. The visual impact analyses should be completed for/and compared to the existing conditions – for both the aerial photography and viewpoint analyses. Neither consultant is utilizing existing conditions aerial photographs, and one is using photos that seem to date back to 2008.

c. Photosimulations should be provided from upper Depot Hill – looking at the site, because these residential neighbors are clearly affected by the current proposal, as they would not have been by the “Conservation” graphics presented for the proposed 2008 project.

d. The visual analyses should present, existing and proposed from each viewpoint **for each alternative**. The current layout is disjointed, and confusing. The photos presented are not at the same scale, not quite the same perspective or location and not the current condition. Please provide this information with (current) existing conditions at the top of the page, proposed at the bottom for each alternative.

e. The methodology should be provided by both consultants and the photos (including aerials) should be time/date stamped.

f. The narrative states: “11,571” lf of horse trails. The horse trails, and rural roads, should be shown for the proposed condition.

g. The visual impact analyses should show all the proposed hedgerows.

19. Historic Orthoimagery – please show year for each orthophoto.

20. Traffic Study – prepared for 27 lots, does not include trucks, horse trailers, special events.

Chairman Boyles also made it clear that they need to submit new renderings from the photographers of “Current” arial pictures. The Board asked specifically for the renderings and aerial photographs to be updated to show current pictures for this revision and the same photos were submitted as the previous submission.

Rich Rennia asked for the attorney to please begin the draft resolution for the approval for the project and he feels that the documentation that has been submitted is complete. The Chairman and the rest of the Board say that more information needs to submitted per the above statements and requests in order to make a determination.

In Other Matters, J. Walsh made a motion, seconded by N. Peek and carried to approve the planning Board Meeting minutes from the July 13, 2022 Meeting. Amotion was made by J. Walsh, seconded by N. Kusnetz and carried to adjourn the meeting at 9:00pm.

Respectfully submitted



Judith Westfall

Planning Board Secretary