**PLANNING BOARD**
**TOWN OF WOODSTOCK**

planning@woodstockny.gov
**45 COMEAU DRIVE, WOODSTOCK NY 12498**

Ph: (845) 679-2113 Ext.16

Fax: (845) 679-8743

*Colony of the Arts*

**MEETING MINUTES**
**MAY 7, 2026**
**WORKSHOP MEETING (IN PERSON ONLY)**
Held at the Comeau Town Offices
45 Comeau Drive, Woodstock

6:00 PM TIME: 6:02 PM
CALL TO ORDER, determination of quorum

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Members Present: | Peter Cross | |
| | Judith Kerman | |
| | James Conrad | |
| | Eugenie Tartell | Left at 6:55 pm, missed votes at end of meeting |
| | Joseph Vescio | |
| Members Absent: | John LaValle | Resigned March 2026 |
| | Jennifer Drue | |

Updates to AGENDA: n/a

MINUTES: April 16 Make motion to approve minutes: Peter Cross 2nd: Judith Kerman Aye: All

NEW BUSINESS:
SCHEDULED BUSINESS:
WORKSHOP:
6:05 PM **EARTH DAY COMMEMORATION**

- ◊ Introduction of the New Woodstock Environmental Commission
- ◊ Roles of WEC & PB
- ◊ Collaboration with WEC
- ◊ DOT Plans
- ◊ Wetlands & Watercourse Refresh & Update
- ◊ Open Floor: Questions, Concerns?



Present:
WEC Members:

Susan Paynter, Chair
Arlene Weissman, Vice Chair
Ken Panza, Secretary
Julia Blelock, Member
Laurie Kirby, Member
Evan Neumann, Member

Tree Committee: Michael Veitch, Co-Chair
Linda Lover, Secretary

Chairman Peter Cross reads the above agenda itinerary and states this isn't our usual workshop meeting; but it is today. He asks Ms. Melissa Gray to set the tone and start the meeting for us.
All members present introduce themselves as listed above.
Ms. Gray states that in her history the Planning Board has always worked with WEC for input on certain applications. WEC has just recently been enacted again. Basically, the Planning Board and Zoning Board of Appeals are the decisions makers. There are several advisory committees that we work with: WEC, Tree Committee, Committee for Civic Design, etc. The Planning Board can ask for the groups' opinions. We have been known to do a few site visits together, over the years. When we want your input, we want you to take a look and we like to be a team. There's a certain protocol for site visits and following the Open Meeting Law with conversations about applications only being held in an Open Meeting setting.
Ms. Gray wants to thank Ms. Julia Blelock and recognize how great it is to have her back. The Board and audience agree.
Chairman Cross states we have been known to collaborate with site visits. For the wetlands part, our wetlands and watercourse protection in the town code is a good one. We look at state and federal wetlands. There are two state wetlands in this town. This is all based on the Clean Water Act and Army Corp of Engineers in keeping our waterways open. DEC now has categories of wetlands, including vernal pools. He states he hopes that we have WEC join us on site visits. The more eyes, the better. Our and the object is to not prevent development; but protect our environment. We work on the same principles as DEC and use a mitigation process. They discuss the wetlands and scenic overlay laws within the town.
Vicechair Kerman states when you look up while driving, you see why we have this law.
Chairman Cross states we now have a baseline. There are now pictures using drone operation. The point is to be able to see this in years to come. Discussion acknowledges the current new administration for approving this expenditure when the Planning Board has been asking for this for years.
Ms. Arlene Weissman asks what this cost.
Chairman Cross states a thousand dollars.
Chairman Cross asks WEC what they would like from us.
Ms. Julia Blelock asks about tightening the code and where to go for that.
Ms. Gray mentions the Zoning Revision Committee for potential code review.
The Board and audience discuss the Critical Environment Area, what it is, what can't be done with it and what can be. They discuss the Hudsonia mapping that was done. Wildlife corridors are discussed. Ms. Gray adds that sometimes we can connect and have them on plans when reviewing.
The Board talks about mitigation and not being able to 'take' someone's land by telling them they can't. We mitigate. This is one issue we face within the scenic overlay. Chairman Cross states we can't commit a taking.
They discuss further situations they have seen where they had to mitigate to resolve issues. They talk

about steep slopes and the proposed revisions to the code looking at a few of these things more in detail.
The subdivision over on Glasco was mentioned and Chairman Cross states we were working with good applicants.
They further discuss using judgement, using the code and mitigation to review all applications.
Chairman Cross discusses wetlands and watercourses. Prior it was 12.4 acres to be a wetland. Now, DEC makes the decision and on site.
We are all happy to have an Environmental Commission back again.
They further discuss roads and the safety of going up the mountain to develop.
Ms. Blelock asks the Planning Board what prioritization is the Board looking for from them.
Chairman Cross states he is asking her the same question. What is the highest for you currently, he asks.
WEC member, Laurie Kirby states he thinks development in the scenic overlay is an urgent issue. He sees the view shed be scarred year after year.
Chairman Cross states your participation on site visits helps with those.
They talk about roads in town that are insane to get up with steepness and needing an all-terrain vehicle.
Everyone discusses Planning Board procedure of making sure there is emergency vehicle access and using the fire and highway departments to help evaluate.
Chairman Cross reminds everyone that there is a legal status of not committing a 'taking' of someone's property, while doing our reviews.
Mr. Evan Neumann introduces himself and asks to come on a site visit with the Board, anytime.
Everyone thanks everyone.

DOT Plans:
Chairman Cross states he has read all of Michael Veitch's letters. He wants to remind everyone that none of this is coming to the Planning Board. It is not Planning Board purview. It is solely Town Board and Department of Transportation.
Chairman Cross tells Mr. Veitch that he agrees with everything in his letter. He talks about bikes and walkers and the bike lanes in Kingston.
Mr. Veitch states this is not an issue of bikes and walking. He states the primary issue is that we are a community. We should be collaborating on projects like this. This is big and it is unfortunate that the plans were drafted behind closed doors. They want to take two hundred trees. He was not allowed in the room with this meeting. He is trying to do the same kind of thing we are here tonight. He wants to see this project go back to the planning stage, get public and stake holders involved. This is how the Catskill park works. How ever you want to deal with it, he is asking for more. He wants it to go back to the drawing board. He's been told it's a done deal. He's s saying why weren't we involved initially. It's a mess and he thinks we can do better. With SEQR & TWEQR, how can be done on this, he states. He doesn't think we just sit here and be told to accept this.
Chairman Cross thanks him.

Wetlands & Watercourse Refresher & Update:
Chairman Cross states there is good news, we have an active WEC now.
Mr. Kirby asks about enforcement.
Chairman Cross states the Zoning Enforcement Officer is in charge of all that.
Vicechair Kerman states a lot of times the complaints come from the neighbors.
Conversation among the Board and WEC members goes to neighbors being notified, public hearings and processes of legality and the Board, Building Department and roles.
Ms. Gray talks about other entities involved and always thinking about government and checks and balances systems.

Chairman Cross talks about enforcement with new laws and the working relationship between the Building department and the Planning Board. Further conversation continues about DEC, fines, wetlands, etc. In the past, we have used WEC for changing watercourses and how to fix it or solve the problem. Sometimes our applications are simple between two neighbors.
WEC Chair, Susan Paynter asks about the Little Deep lot and the boulders.
Chairman Cross states if it is a designated DEC creek, they have jurisdiction.
They discuss the town code, goals, and making things happen responsibly.
Discussion about the CEA, its power and purpose.
Chairman Cross shares with everyone the tool we all have with the EAF form online.
We, the Planning Board, use this for every application we see.

6:55 PM Planning Board member, Genie Tartell left the meeting.

Further conversation on CEA between WEC and Board.

Chairman Cross asks if anyone has any further questions or concerns because we have additional business to tend to.

The Board moves on with below motions.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:
+ Make motion to approve draft resolutions for Neon Knights Three LLC WWP# 26-063 and Rosen & Allison WWP# 26-066

+ Make motion to return unused escrow in the amount of $ 6,717.74 to 1105 Route 28 LLC

Make motion to approve draft resolutions and return unused escrow: Peter Cross
2nd: Judith Kerman Aye: All

ADJOURNMENT Time: 7:20 PM
Make motion to end meeting: Peter Cross 2nd: James Conrad Aye: All

Approved Resolutions:

**RESOLUTION**
**TOWN OF WOODSTOCK PLANNING BOARD**
**WETLANDS & WATERCOURSE PERMIT APPROVAL**
**NEON KNIGHTS THREE LLC**
**c/o Nigol Koulajian**
**WWP #26-063**

At a regular meeting of the Town of Woodstock Planning Board on May 7, 2026:

Present: Peter Cross, Judith Kerman, James Conrad, and Joseph Vescio

Absent: John LaValle, resigned March 2026
Jennifer Drue
Eugenie Tartell, left prior to vote

A Motion was made by: Peter Cross and Seconded by: Judith Kerman

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| The Vote was: | Peter Cross | Aye |
| | Judith Kerman | Aye |
| | James Conrad | Aye |
| | Joseph Vescio | Aye |

**WHEREAS**, the Planning Board of the Town of Woodstock, located in Ulster County, New York, is considering an application for Wetlands & Watercourse Permit approval (the proposed action) from Neon Knights Three LLC (the Applicant); and

**WHEREAS**, the proposed action involves an activity in a regulated area to install a 15' x 450' feet driveway to an existing vacant parcel in the R3, R5, SO Zoning Districts on Hidden Valley Trail / West Saugerties Road in Woodstock; and

**WHEREAS**, the parcel is designated on the Tax Map of the Town of Woodstock as Section 16, Block 5, Lot 51.120; and

**WHEREAS**, the materials submitted and considered in support of the proposed action includes:

1. *Referral* from Building Department dated March 17 and received on March 20, 2026;
2. *Wetlands/Watercourse Permit Application* received March 20, 2026, including S*EQR/TWEQR Short Environmental Assessment Form* (EAF) dated March 12, 2026 and signed by Nigol Koulajian, Applicant;
3. Site Plan titled *Proposed Driveway & Stream Crossing Plan on Lands of Neon Knights Three LLC* prepared for Wetland and Watercourse Permit Application by Christopher R. DiChiaro, P.E. dated July 18, 2025 and received March 20, 2026;
4. NYSDEC *Letter of No Jurisdiction – Freshwater Wetlands* dated 11/5/2025 addressed to Christopher DiChiaro, P. E. in reference to Parcel 515800 16.-5-51.120 received March 20, 2026; and

**WHEREAS**, in accordance with SEQRA NYCRR Part 617, and by reference to TWEQR, the Planning Board finds that the proposal is a Type II Action which does not require SEQR review and a determination of significance; and

**WHEREAS**, under Section 239 (l) and (m) of the General Municipal Law, and under the Memorandum of Agreement with the Town of Woodstock, dated January 2009, Ulster County Planning Board (UCPB) review and recommendations are not required for a Wetlands and Watercourse Permit; and

**WHEREAS**, in accordance with Town Code Chapter 65, *Environmental Quality Review*, the application and Short Environmental Assessment Form (SEAF) were offered to the Town of Woodstock Environmental Commission (WEC) for their review. No comments from WEC were received with respect to the proposed action; and

**WHEREAS**, on April 16, 2026, the Planning Board held a sketch review, discussed the application and the proposed driveway and stream crossing. With the NYSDEC Letter of No Jurisdiction of Freshwater Wetlands and engineered plans that will be further reviewed by the town's Weltands and Watercourse Inspector prior to a Building Permit being issued and Board conversation with Mr. Brian Evans and Mr.

Craig Wallace, Esq., the Board agreed to waive further review. At the meeting on May 7, 2026 the Planning Board approved this resolution; and

**WHEREAS**, The Applicant has:

1. demonstrated that potential watercourse and/or wetland buffer impacts and losses cannot be entirely avoided;
2. demonstrated that any unavoidable impacts and losses to watercourse and/or wetland functions or benefits can and will be minimized to the greatest extent practicable;
3. demonstrated that the permitted action will mitigate any remaining adverse impacts and losses to watercourses and/or wetlands and the functions and benefits of such resources; and

**WHEREAS**, the Planning Board has fully reviewed the application and relevant materials submitted and has also taken into account its knowledge of the site and the surrounding neighborhood; and

**WHEREAS**, the Town of Woodstock Zoning Law Section 260-34, *Wetlands & Watercourse Protection Standards*, and Section 260-35, *Standards for development within the Flood Fringe Overlay District* were considered in the Planning Board's review of this application;

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**, That the Planning Board (PB) has determined that they have complied with the procedural requirements of Part 617 of the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA), and that the proposed activity is Type II Action which does not require SEQR review and a determination of significance; Be it Further

**RESOLVED**, That pursuant to Town Zoning Law Article V, *Supplemental Regulations*, Section 260-34, *Wetlands and Watercourse Protection Standards*, the Planning Board (PB) finds the Applicant has met the requirements for development within a watercourse and/or a wetland or their buffers. The PB has reviewed the necessary site development plans and visual information, and considered findings criteria and adverse impacts as described in Zoning Law Section 260-34K(4)(a-i), *Planning Board Decision*.

Accordingly, the PB hereby makes the following findings for this proposed action:

**(A)** The impact of the proposed regulated activity upon wetland, watercourse and wetland/watercourse buffer functions, including:

[1] Infilling of a wetland and watercourse, or other modification of topographic contours. *Findings: The work within the regulated area is being minimized and engineered to create the least amount of disturbance possible. The work being completed is only for installation of a 15' x 450' compliant access driveway.*

[2] Disturbance or destruction of flora and fauna, including disturbance of significant habitats and/or impacts on rare and endangered species. *Findings: Minimal disturbance is anticipated as a result of proposed action.*

[3] Influx of sediments or other materials causing increasing water turbidity and/or substrate aggradation. *Findings: No influx of sediments or other materials.*

[4] Removal or disturbance of wetland, watercourse and wetland/watercourse buffer area soils. *Findings: Minimal disturbance of said soils as a result of proposed action. Silt fencing will be used.*

[5] Destabilization of a stream channel or stream bank. *Findings: There will be minimal disturbance to stream channel as a result of proposed action, with the installation of the culvert.*

[6] Reductions and/or increases in wetland and watercourse water supply.
*Findings: There will be no alteration of said water supplies as a result of proposed action.*

[7] Interference with the circulation of water within or through a wetland or watercourse.
*Findings: No interference is anticipated as a result of proposed action.*

[8] Damaging thermal changes and/or nutrient levels changes in the water supply within or through a wetland or watercourse. *Findings: No changes are anticipated as a result of proposed action.*

[9] Any other considerations that the Planning Board deems pertinent. *Findings: Minimal disturbance to regulated area and work done following best practices.*

**(B)** Any existing wetland, watercourse or wetland/watercourse buffer area impacts. *Findings: Planning will be least intrusive and minimal disturbance.*

**(C)** Impact of the proposed regulated activity and reasonably anticipated similar activities upon flood flows, flood storage, upstream and downstream channel and bank stability, storm barriers, and water quality. *Findings: No impact is anticipated as a result of proposed action.*

**(D)** Safety of the proposed activity from flooding, erosion, hurricane winds, soil limitations, and other hazards, and possible losses to the applicant and subsequent purchasers of the land. *Findings: All precautions are being taken by applicant to ensure safety.*

**(E)** Compliance with federal, state, county, and local land use regulations. *Findings: Proposed action will comply with said regulations.*

**(F)** Availability of a practicable alternative for the proposed regulated activity*. Findings: Chosen location is the best choice with no possible alternative.*

**(G)** Whether the impacts are necessary or unavoidable based on the criteria listed in §260-34K(4) of this chapter. *Findings: No impacts to be necessary or unavoidable.*

**(H)** The impact of the proposed regulated activity upon neighboring land uses (where Town records are available). *Findings: No impact.*

**(I)** The overall impact of the proposed regulated activity upon public health and safety. *Findings: There are no impacts anticipated as a result of proposed action. This is improving the safety of the existing dwelling and brightening the light inside the dwelling.*

In summary, the Planning Board hereby determines that potential impacts, if any, would be minimal and unavoidable provided that the Applicant adheres to the approved plan; Be it Further

**RESOLVED**, That the application for Wetlands and Watercourse Permit (WWP) #26-063 from Neon Knights Three LLC is hereby **approved subject to the following conditions**:

1) Submit three (3) copies of full Site Plan including the compliance statement signed by the property owners, for endorsement by the Planning Board; and

2) Final Development Fee in the amount of $350 shall be paid in accordance with Section 3.3 of the Town of Woodstock Development Fee Schedule; and

3) Due to the presence of the protected and threatened species of the timber rattlesnake (*Crotalus horridus*) under Environmental Conservation Law (ECL) Section 11-0535 and New York Code of Rules & Regulations (6 NYCRR Part 182), construction is suggested to be done between November 1 and March 31; during the hibernation time of the species. Consult with DEC if a required permit is necessary. There is also a presence of endangered species, the Peregrine Falcon *(Falco peregrinus)*. Please consult with DEC for best practices to protect their endangered status during construction.
The Planning Board is expecting best practices to be upheld and incidental take-avoidance measures to be followed in regards to the potential impacts to the threatened timber rattlesnake and the endangered Peregrine Falcon throughout the completion of your construction process; and

4) Notice shall be given to the Town of Woodstock Wetlands & Watercourse Inspector and Building Department when work is to start; Be it Further

**RESOLVED**, That once all conditions and requirements of the aforementioned approval have been determined as complete, a Wetlands & Watercourse Permit shall be issued by the Planning Board; Be it Further

**RESOLVED,** That **conditional approval shall expire one hundred eighty (180) days after the date of this Resolution** if the above-mentioned conditions have not been certified as complete within that time period; Be it Further

**RESOLVED,** That the Planning Board may extend the time in which the conditionally approved plans may be submitted for signature, if in its opinion such extension is warranted by the particular circumstances thereof, not to exceed two (2) additional periods of ninety (90) days each; Be it Further

**RESOLVED**, That the **Wetlands and Watercourse Permit and plans shall expire** if the approved activity is not commenced and diligently pursued **within twelve (12) months** of the date of this Resolution. Upon written request by the original permit holder or his/her legal agent, the Planning Board may extend the expiration date of the permit for a time not to exceed that necessary to ensure the work required by the permit is completed, if in its opinion such extension is warranted. ***Requests for extensions shall be submitted prior to the expiration date of the permit***; Be it Further

**RESOLVED,** That any alteration or deviation from the *signed final* plans shall require the prior review and approval by the Planning Board, and shall comply with the requirements of Town Zoning Law Article V, Section 260-34, *Wetlands & Watercourse Protection Standards* and Section 260-35*, Standards for Development within the Flood-Fringe Overlay District*; Be it Further

**RESOLVED,** That this Resolution shall be deemed to authorize only one particular use as defined herein and as delineated on the *signed* and *filed* Plans; Be it Finally

**RESOLVED**, That failure to comply with any of the conditions set forth herein shall be deemed a violation of the approval, which may cause the revocation of said approval, or the revocation by the Building Inspector, of any issued Building Permit or Certificate of Occupancy or Compliance pertaining thereto.

**RESOLUTION**
**TOWN OF WOODSTOCK PLANNING BOARD**
**WETLANDS & WATERCOURSE PERMIT APPROVAL**
**ROGER ROSEN & NANCY ALLISON**
**WWP #26-066**

At a regular workshop meeting of the Town of Woodstock Planning Board on May 7, 2026:

Present: Peter Cross, Judith Kerman, James Conrad, and Joseph Vescio

Absent: John LaValle, resigned March 2026
Jennifer Drue
Eugenie Tartell, left prior to vote

A Motion was made by: Peter Cross and Seconded by: Judith Kerman

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| The Vote was: | Peter Cross | Aye |
| | Judith Kerman | Aye |
| | James Conrad | Aye |
| | Joseph Vescio | Aye |

**WHEREAS**, the Planning Board of the Town of Woodstock, located in Ulster County, New York, is considering an application for Wetlands & Watercourse Permit approval (the proposed action) from Roger Rosen and Nancy Allison (the Applicants); and

**WHEREAS**, the proposed action involves an activity in a regulated area to dredge an existing pond in the R5 and Scenic Overlay Zoning Districts at 343 – 345 Silver Hollow Road in Willow; and

**WHEREAS**, the parcel is designated on the Tax Map of the Town of Woodstock as Section 14, Block 4, Lot 20.200; and

**WHEREAS**, the materials submitted and considered in support of the proposed action includes:

1. Referral from Building Department dated and received on April 7, 2026;
2. *Wetlands/Watercourse Permit Application* received April 7, 2026, including S*EQR/TWEQR Short Environmental Assessment Form* (EAF) dated and signed by Douglas Ostrander of Harvey Ostrander Excavating Inc June 29, 2025 and received April 7, 2026;
3. Depiction of Pong within Parcel Showing Size and Plan for Dredging prepared by Douglas Ostrander, received April 7, 2026;
4. NYSDEC PERMIT Under the Environmental Conservation Law (ECL) General Permit GP-0-20-002: Stream Activities General Permit; and

**WHEREAS**, in accordance with SEQRA NYCRR Part 617, and by reference to TWEQR, the Planning Board finds that the proposal is a Type II Action which does not require SEQR review and a determination of significance; and

**WHEREAS**, under Section 239 (l) and (m) of the General Municipal Law, and under the Memorandum of Agreement with the Town of Woodstock, dated January 2009, Ulster County Planning Board (UCPB) review and recommendations are not required for a Wetlands and Watercourse Permit; and

**WHEREAS**, in accordance with Town Code Chapter 65, *Environmental Quality Review*, the application

and Short Environmental Assessment Form (SEAF) were offered to the Town of Woodstock Environmental Commission (WEC) for their review. No comments from WEC were received with respect to the proposed action; and

**WHEREAS**, on April 16, 2026, the Planning Board held a sketch review, discussed the application, the history of the pond and the permit issued by NYSDEC for the dredging of the pond. The Board agreed to waive further review. At the meeting on May 7, 2026, the Planning Board approved this resolution; and

**WHEREAS**, The Applicant has:

1. demonstrated that potential watercourse and/or wetland buffer impacts and losses cannot be entirely avoided;
2. demonstrated that any unavoidable impacts and losses to watercourse and/or wetland functions or benefits can and will be minimized to the greatest extent practicable;
3. demonstrated that the permitted action will mitigate any remaining adverse impacts and losses to watercourses and/or wetlands and the functions and benefits of such resources; and

**WHEREAS**, the Planning Board has fully reviewed the application and relevant materials submitted and has also taken into account its knowledge of the site and the surrounding neighborhood; and

**WHEREAS**, the Town of Woodstock Zoning Law Section 260-34, *Wetlands & Watercourse Protection Standards*, and Section 260-35, *Standards for development within the Flood Fringe Overlay District* were considered in the Planning Board's review of this application;

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**, That the Planning Board (PB) has determined that they have complied with the procedural requirements of Part 617 of the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA), and that the proposed activity is Type II Action which does not require SEQR review and a determination of significance; Be it Further

**RESOLVED**, That pursuant to Town Zoning Law Article V, *Supplemental Regulations*, Section 260-34, *Wetlands and Watercourse Protection Standards*, the Planning Board (PB) finds the Applicant has met the requirements for development within a watercourse and/or a wetland or their buffers. The PB has reviewed the necessary site development plans and visual information, and considered findings criteria and adverse impacts as described in Zoning Law Section 260-34K(4)(a-i), *Planning Board Decision*.

Accordingly, the PB hereby makes the following findings for this proposed action:

**(A)** The impact of the proposed regulated activity upon wetland, watercourse and wetland/watercourse buffer functions, including:

[1] Infilling of a wetland and watercourse, or other modification of topographic contours. *Findings: The dredging is being done to preserve the pond and for the future benefit of the ecosystem.*

[2] Disturbance or destruction of flora and fauna, including disturbance of significant habitats and/or impacts on rare and endangered species. *Findings: Minimal disturbance is anticipated as a result of proposed action.*

[3] Influx of sediments or other materials causing increasing water turbidity and/or substrate aggradation. *Findings: No influx of sediments or other materials.*

[4] Removal or disturbance of wetland, watercourse and wetland/watercourse buffer area soils. *Findings: Minimal disturbance of said soils as a result of proposed action.*

[5] Destabilization of a stream channel or stream bank. *Findings: There will be no disturbance to stream channel or bank as a result of proposed action.*

[6] Reductions and/or increases in wetland and watercourse water supply.
*Findings: There will be no alteration of said water supplies as a result of proposed action.*

[7] Interference with the circulation of water within or through a wetland or watercourse.
*Findings: No interference is anticipated as a result of proposed action.*

[8] Damaging thermal changes and/or nutrient levels changes in the water supply within or through a wetland or watercourse. *Findings: No changes are anticipated as a result of proposed action.*

[9] Any other considerations that the Planning Board deems pertinent. *Findings: Minimal disturbance to pond and circumvent area with work to be done following best practices.*

**(B)** Any existing wetland, watercourse or wetland/watercourse buffer area impacts. *Findings: Planning will be least intrusive and minimal disturbance.*

**(C)** Impact of the proposed regulated activity and reasonably anticipated similar activities upon flood flows, flood storage, upstream and downstream channel and bank stability, storm barriers, and water quality. *Findings: No impact is anticipated as a result of proposed action.*

**(D)** Safety of the proposed activity from flooding, erosion, hurricane winds, soil limitations, and other hazards, and possible losses to the applicant and subsequent purchasers of the land. *Findings: All precautions are being taken by applicant to ensure safety.*

**(E)** Compliance with federal, state, county, and local land use regulations. *Findings: Proposed action will comply with said regulations.*

**(F)** Availability of a practicable alternative for the proposed regulated activity. *Findings: No possible alternative.*

**(G)** Whether the impacts are necessary or unavoidable based on the criteria listed in §260-34K(4) of this chapter. *Findings: No impacts to be necessary or unavoidable.*

**(H)** The impact of the proposed regulated activity upon neighboring land uses (where Town records are available). *Findings: No impact.*

**(I)** The overall impact of the proposed regulated activity upon public health and safety. *Findings: There are no impacts anticipated as a result of proposed action. This is improving the ecosystem of the pond for the future.*

In summary, the Planning Board hereby determines that potential impacts, if any, would be minimal and unavoidable provided that the Applicant adheres to the approved plan; Be it Further

**RESOLVED**, That the application for Wetlands and Watercourse Permit (WWP) #26-066 from Roger Rosen and Nancy Allison is hereby **approved subject to the following conditions**:

1) Submit three (3) copies of full Site Plan and including the compliance statement signed by the property owners, for endorsement by the Planning Board; *Plans have been received, please submit signed compliance statement.*

2) Final Development Fee in the amount of $350 shall be paid in accordance with Section 3.3 of the Town of Woodstock Development Fee Schedule; and

3) Notice shall be given to the Town of Woodstock Wetlands & Watercourse Inspector and Building Department when work is to start; Be it Further

**RESOLVED**, That once all conditions and requirements of the aforementioned approval have been determined as complete, a Wetlands & Watercourse Permit shall be issued by the Planning Board; Be it Further

**RESOLVED,** That **conditional approval shall expire one hundred eighty (180) days after the date of this Resolution** if the above-mentioned conditions have not been certified as complete within that time period; Be it Further

**RESOLVED,** That the Planning Board may extend the time in which the conditionally approved plans may be submitted for signature, if in its opinion such extension is warranted by the particular circumstances thereof, not to exceed two (2) additional periods of ninety (90) days each; Be it Further

**RESOLVED**, That the **Wetlands and Watercourse Permit and plans shall expire** if the approved activity is not commenced and diligently pursued **within twelve (12) months** of the date of this Resolution. Upon written request by the original permit holder or his/her legal agent, the Planning Board may extend the expiration date of the permit for a time not to exceed that necessary to ensure the work required by the permit is completed, if in its opinion such extension is warranted. ***Requests for extensions shall be submitted prior to the expiration date of the permit***; Be it Further

**RESOLVED,** That any alteration or deviation from the *signed final* plans shall require the prior review and approval by the Planning Board, and shall comply with the requirements of Town Zoning Law Article V, Section 260-34, *Wetlands & Watercourse Protection Standards* and Section 260-35*, Standards for Development within the Flood-Fringe Overlay District*; Be it Further

**RESOLVED,** That this Resolution shall be deemed to authorize only one particular use as defined herein and as delineated on the *signed* and *filed* Plans; Be it Finally

**RESOLVED**, That failure to comply with any of the conditions set forth herein shall be deemed a violation of the approval, which may cause the revocation of said approval, or the revocation by the Building Inspector, of any issued Building Permit or Certificate of Occupancy or Compliance pertaining thereto.