



Community Planning and Environmental Associates

152 Stolzenburg Road, Berne, NY 12023

518-248-8542 • planningbetterplaces.com

Memo

To: Town of Woodstock Planning Board

From: Nan Stolzenburg FAICP

Date: June 10, 2026

Re: Homesick Blues LLC SPR#26-0392 and SUP#26-0705

Nan C. Stolzenburg

I have reviewed all the submitted elements of the Special Use Permit and Site Plan Review Approval sent to me for the Homesick Blues LLC project. I offer the following for the Planning Board's consideration:

Summary of Current Conditions

1. The project covers 4 distinct parcels, all owned by Homesick Blues, LLC.
2. Public water and sewer are present.
3. The parcels are in the HC and HR Zoning Districts, as well as the Flood-fringe Overlay (FF-O) and Hamlet Protection Overlay (HP-O).
4. There are 10' wide drainage easements shown on lots at the corner of Library Lane and Tinker Street that extend into the adjacent lot at 100 Tinker.
5. 5 Library Lane has a deeded conservation easement upon it.

Summary of Proposal

1. The project includes mixed commercial/residential on two of the four lots; one lot at the corner will remain largely open space, and 106 Tinker will remain residential.
2. Current zoning splits parcels into HR and HC. The applicant is seeking a zoning district change to make all 4 parcels HC. HR prevents using the affected portion of the properties for mixed use and retail. This will be a decision of the Town Board.
3. The Town Board has agreed with the Planning Board serving as Lead Agency for the environmental review.
4. 9 new multifamily dwelling units are proposed. Redevelopment will include Lasher Funeral House and Library Lane contiguous properties at 100 Tinker Street, 106 Tinker Street, and 5 Library Lane – 4 parcels; 9 new units as follows:

- a. Library – commercial use and 5 apartments (Library Lane parking could be used for this)
- b. Lasher House – to be 3 rental units
- c. Lasher Front Barn – extend building with glass house, village café/natural play area
- d. Lasher Back Barn – to be coworking office and business incubator space
- e. Funeral Parlor – rebuild as the Woodstock Sustainable Design Center
- f. 106 Tinker Street -stay as 2 units, but add two new buildings with 4 units
5. Multifamily dwellings need a special use permit, and two-family dwellings are permitted by right in the HC and HR districts.
6. The 100 Tinker Street curb cut will be removed, keeping the one at 106 Tinker – to create vehicle-free green space fronting the property running west from Library Lane.
7. The 20 healthy mature trees on site will be removed, adding new ones, including a heritage apple orchard.
8. Application materials indicate that:
 - a. A waiver from loading berth rules in the HC as per 260-30(D) is being requested.
 - b. The project has already been determined to be an unlisted action under SEQR and a Type I action under TWEQRA.
 - c. Involved agencies are identified as the Town Board, Planning Board, Ulster County Planning Board, NYS DOT, and WEC.
9. NYS SHPO has determined a Phase 1B archaeological study is required.
10. The Site Plan shows a wetland with a 100' buffer with buildings and parking lot located within the buffer.
11. The zoning would require 111 parking spots, and the application indicates that they propose 92 parking spots, with 72 on-site provided for.
12. The project includes mixed uses (commercial and residential) and multiple buildings per parcel.

FEAF Part I Comments

1. C1 (a) could be filled out as “yes”. Although the Comprehensive Plan does not call out this parcel specifically, the application materials mention in several places that the goal of the project is to be consistent with the Plan.
2. D1 (C) – mark this as a yes, as this is an expansion of existing uses.
3. D2 (B) – mark this as a yes, as the site plan does show increased expansion into the existing wetland and within the FF-O. Fill in items (i through v).
4. D2(c) – fill out (c) (I through v).
5. D2(e) – show the calculations of total disturbed area to prove it is less than 1 acre total.
6. D2(k) – fill out the estimated energy demand for the project.

7. E1(a) – complete this table by filling in the estimated changes to site elements.
8. E2(g) – Fill out this question as a ‘no’.
9. E3 (b) – fill out this question as a ‘no’.
10. E3(g) – this relates to the archaeology study which is in progress. When that study is completed, this question can be detailed.
11. E3(h) – fill this question as a ‘no’.

Comments Regarding Checklist per 260-76: Site Plan Applications

1. The submittals to date are sketch phase/concept plans. 260-75 (Sketch Plan Conference) requires a sketch plan depicting all items listed in 260-76 (A) as necessary to illustrate the proposal. The materials submitted so far are detailed enough for the Planning Board to at least determine that the project requires a full review, and that additional submission requirements will be needed. To aid in that determination, the following items required from 260-76 that are currently not provided, and which the Planning Board should expect, unless they waive the requirement, are:
2. The site plan shows all adjacent parcel information but does not appear to show all parcels within 200’ as per 260-76 (A) (2).
3. No grading and drainage plans are shown. If the disturbance is < 1 acre as detailed in the FEAF, no State SWPPP is needed. However, the Planning Board should ensure that none of the changes to the parcels will increase stormwater runoff. Preliminary plans should show and evaluate stormwater needs. Show proposed site improvements such as bioretention and raingardens (mentioned in the project narrative) and their details.
4. The site plans do not indicate the height of new buildings, or of the changes to be made to the Library building.
5. A narrative of parking design and construction materials needs to be provided.
6. There are no internal sidewalks shown. The sidewalk along Tinker Street is proposed to remain, but there are no others. I suggest that the preliminary site plan show sidewalk connections from parking lots to buildings, at least.
7. The parcels are all served by public water and sewer. The preliminary site plan should show water and sewer lines and connections. Utility lines and poles are shown, but it is unclear if these are electrical lines or water/sewer lines. Please clarify.
8. There are no emergency or fire lanes shown, including the location of fire hydrants (item 14). Note that the hydrants may already be shown on the site plan, but there is no legend to prove that.

9. There are no energy distribution lines or solar energy facilities shown, but the narrative mentions that the entire project will be net zero and run on renewable energy. It also mentions that rooftop solar panels will be added to the library. If solar panels are to be placed to power the rest of the project, those should be shown on the site plan.
10. No signs along Library Lane or Tinker Street are shown. Add if planned.
11. No lighting plan is provided. This should be included in the preliminary site plan (item 18).
12. The Zoning Requirement Table should be expanded to include the building area for retail sales, office, or similar commercial activity (item 19).
13. The preliminary plan should show a detailed landscape plan showing where, what, how many, and the size of plants to be added (item 20).
14. (B) requires several kinds of data to be included on the Zoning Requirements Table. Several items are missing, including the column labeled "proposed," as well as building area in square feet.
15. An elevation drawing showing the proposed building facades from both Tinker Street and Library Lane.

Zoning Standards Still to be Met, by Narrative and/or Site Plans

1. Meet development standards for the floodplain in Chapters 82-16 and 17.
2. Show locations for snow storage.
3. Site Plan should show address for each parcel, and residential buildings should show number of units in each.
4. Ensure that the new roof and floor addition to the Library does not exceed building height requirements.
5. The parking requirement chart on the Site Plan provided needs further narrative to explain the discrepancy between the required 111 parking spaces and the 92 total shown, with only 72 on site. Information as to where the other 20 spots (92-72) are located. Are those on-street parking spots to be counted? Please provide more information as to where the other parking spaces are. The Planning Board should carefully review and address the parking needs on site.
 - a. If the Board deems 72 on-site parking spots to be adequate, note that 260-30 (C) allows for payment in lieu of providing parking on-site. This payment includes an initial charge followed by an annual maintenance fee per parking space that is required but not provided for.
 - b. 260-30 (B)(6) also says that all off-street parking shall eliminate the need to back out onto the public street. The parking spots along Library Lane are shown on the parcel (not on the street) and do require backing out into the

street. If this is not an issue since it has been like this since the Library was at that location, then the Planning Board may consider this a non-conforming, existing feature and waive this requirement.

- c. 260-30 (D) relates to the requirement for loading berths. Since none of the uses proposed need a loading berth, this requirement could be waived, as they have sought.
6. Dimensions of parking spaces need to be shown on the site plan.
7. Note that 260-30 (B) does not allow any required parking to be located in the front yard, or within 17' of a right-of-way. The existing parking along Library Lane does not meet this requirement, but as an existing feature, could be considered an existing, nonconforming feature. Confirm that the three parking spots shown to serve the new housing on the existing Library Building Foundation are outside of the right-of-way for Library Lane.
8. Use 260-31 to show all requirements for signs, if any are to be included in the proposal.
9. 260-34 regulates Wetlands and Watercourses. (C) (3) and (4) indicate that a wetland and watercourse permit is required for enlargement or construction of any building, or construction of a road, parking area, or driveway within a wetland or watercourse area. It appears as if this project proposed both, and thus such a permit is also required.
10. Use 260-35 to apply standards for development within the FF-O. Redevelopment is an opportunity to bring the new buildings into compliance with this section.
11. 260-37 (Hamlet Preservation Overlay) applies to this project. Thus, any exterior alteration, demolition, or new buildings must be reviewed by the Commission for Civic Design. This process should be integrated into the review and permitting process.
12. Please note that 260-57 has driveway standards for two-family dwellings and thus would pertain to 106 Tinker Street. The site plan should reflect these requirements.
13. 260-60N regulates multifamily dwellings. This establishes 4 units per lot with 25% open space required, and with an ability to have > 4 units based on 25% of the dwelling unit density. It appears as if the lot at 100 Tinker Street (5 units) is of adequate size to accommodate 5 units.
14. Note that 260-60N also requires a deeded conservation easement for common open space to address long-term ownership and maintenance of that common open space. This should be included in the preliminary site plan for 100 Tinker Street. The Library Lane parcel already has an easement on it but is on a separate parcel and additional common open space is planned at 100 Tinker Street.

15. As mentioned above, there is a need to show internal pedestrian connections, especially to link parking areas to buildings.
16. Since there are numerous bike parking areas shown on the site plan, shouldn't there also be bike lanes, or at least shared vehicle/bike lanes with demarcation for safety? I recommend that safe biking to the site be further explored and the site plan detail how that can be done.

Other Comments

1. I note that Zoning 260-63N and Article VIII allow for multiple buildings for multi-family development on site. The definition for mixed occupancy allows for more than 1 permitted use in the HC. This indicates to me that the mixed use nature of the proposal is allowed even though there is nothing else that articulates mixed uses.
2. I find the applicant's arguments why the entire 4 parcels should be in the HC district to hold a lot of merit. I support the change to all HC.

Said it is net zero with 100% renewable energy – How?
Pitched roof over the library with solar panels