

**PHYSICAL SERVICES COMMITTEE
HELD IN ROOM #318
PUTNAM COUNTY OFFICE BUILDING
CARMEL, NEW YORK 10512**

Members: Chairman Gouldman and Legislators Regan & Sayegh

Monday

5:00pm

June 15, 2026

The meeting was called to order at 5:00pm by Chairman Gouldman who led in the Pledge of Allegiance. Upon roll call, Legislators Regan and Sayegh and Chairman Gouldman were present.

Item #3 – Acceptance of Minutes – April 23, 2026 & May 19, 2026

The minutes were accepted as submitted.

Chairman Gouldman made a motion to revise the order of the agenda to address agenda Item #8; Seconded by Legislator Regan. All in favor.

**Item #8 – Approval – Inclusion of Parcels in the Putnam County Agricultural District
– Recommendations from Putnam County Agriculture and Farmland
Protection Board**

Legislator Birmingham suggested keeping this item open for anyone who may arrive later on, since it was listed toward the end of the agenda and this meeting began earlier than usual.

Legislator Regan stated the time of the meeting has been posted for over a week.

Legislator Regan made a motion to waive the rules and accept the additional; Seconded by Legislator Sayegh. All in favor.

Chairman Gouldman stated there are 10 applications for inclusion in the Putnam County Agricultural District (Ag District).

Nicole Scott, Chairwoman of the Putnam County Agriculture and Farmland Protection Board (AFPB) stated the AFPB has reviewed the parcels to see if they are viable for agriculture.

The Ferguson's Farm – Town of Kent

401 Dixon Rd, Carmel NY 10512

Parcel ID #43.-2-13 – Total Acreage: 7 acres

Principal Operation: Apiary and Livestock (*Breeding*)

Legislator Sayegh stated she had the opportunity to visit this parcel and was impressed by their plan. She stated The Ferguson's Farm is certified to ship poultry across the

Country; she believes this farm is the only one shipping poultry within Putnam County. She stated as a member of the AFPB she voted in favor of this parcel being included in the Ag District. She stated they have a great business model.

Cassandra Roth, Chairwoman of the Soil and Water Conservation District Board and member of the AFPB, stated the AFPB had a lot of discussions and debate about agricultural viability, and she encouraged the Legislature to rely on the AFPB for their knowledge.

Chairman Gouldman made a motion to pre-file the necessary resolution; Seconded by Legislator Regan. All in favor.

Crooked Fence Farm – Towns of Kent & Carmel

3326 Route 301, Carmel, NY 10512

Parcel ID #43.-2-44 – Town of Kent – Total Acreage: 104.53 acres

Parcel ID #43.-1-33 – Town of Carmel – Total Acreage: 7.66 acres

Principal Operation(s): Livestock (*Meat*)

AFPB Chairwoman Scott stated Crooked Fence Farm is made up of two (2) parcels, one in the Town of Kent and one in the Town of Carmel. She stated their focus is pork production and they are working on a renovation to turn woodland on the property into pastures. She stated the AFPB recommended these parcels for inclusion in the Ag District.

Legislator Sayegh stated she was impressed with Crooked Fence Farm's operation. She stated they process meat to be served at their restaurant.

Legislator Crowley stated she has eaten at the restaurant and it is true farm-to-table and was delicious.

Brett Yarris, resident of Carmel and Vice Chair of the Soil & Water Conservation District (SWCD) Board, stated the owners of this farm tried to go through the process of getting into the Ag District a few years ago but were discouraged because the process was dysfunctional. He thanked everyone on the AFPB and Legislature for improving the process to allow farms this opportunity.

Chairman Gouldman stated farming is important locally as well as nationally.

Chairman Gouldman made a motion to pre-file the necessary resolution, inclusive of both parcels; Seconded by Legislator Sayegh. All in favor.

Teakettle Farm – Town of Carmel

27 Teakettle Spout Rd, Mahopac – Town of Carmel

Parcel ID #372000 76.17-1-6 – Total Acreage: 4.37 acres

Principal Operation(s): Crops (*Vegetable*), Orchard (*Fruit*), Eggs, Poultry (*Meat*), Dairy, Livestock (*Meat*)

AFPB Chairwoman Scott stated this farm is diversified and the AFPB recommended this parcel for inclusion in the Ag District.

Legislator Sayegh stated they are working with the Town of Carmel. She stated they value educating their children on where their food comes from. She stated she is in favor of this inclusion.

Chairman Gouldman made a motion to pre-file the necessary resolution; Seconded by Legislator Regan. All in favor.

84 Ludingtonville Rd, LLC – Town of Patterson

84 Ludingtonville Rd, Holmes, NY 12531

Parcel ID #22.12-1-5 - Total Acreage: 1.19 acres

Principal Operation(s): Horticultural (*Nursery/ Garden*)

AFPB Chairwoman Scott stated this operation is in the early stages of development, they were working on clearing some land when the AFPB did their site visit. She stated the responsibility of the AFPB is to determine agricultural viability of the parcels, not to determine how far into development the parcel is. She stated after a lengthy discussion, the AFPB recommended this parcel for inclusion.

Legislator Sayegh stated the Legislature received a letter from a neighbor of this property. She stated as a member of the AFPB, she voted against the inclusion of this parcel in the Ag District. She stated she believes the property owners have a dream, but she did not see action. She stated she will vote this out of Committee this evening so the entire Legislature can weigh in.

Legislator Regan stated the Town of Patterson notified the Legislature that in March of this year a violation was issued in relation to a substantial disturbance in regard to the wetlands. He questioned if something like this should give pause to inclusion into the Ag District. (This violation was mistakenly referenced here and is in relation to another parcel.)

AFPB Chairwoman Scott stated the AFPB is purely looking at the parcel and application that was submitted; it is not for the AFPB to take violations into consideration. She stated there was not a lot of active agriculture on this parcel, and not everyone of the AFPB was in favor of this parcel, but the majority of the Board voted to include it in the Ag District.

Legislator Regan questioned if acceptance into the Ag District opens a line from “farm” to “commercial property”.

Commissioner of Planning Barbara Barosa stated inclusion in the Ag District would not impact the zoning. She stated inclusion is an overlay that allows for agriculture and the protections that come with it. She stated as far as commercial operations, the town regulations would still need to be complied with.

Legislator Montgomery stated she appreciates the feedback from the towns. She stated under Ag & Markets Law section 303-D the role of the AFPB is to determine if the parcels are viable agricultural land and whether inclusion is in the public interest.

Legislative Counsel Heather Abissi stated inclusion in the Ag District does not change any laws; it is making a determination that there is a viable agricultural use on the parcel. She stated anything related to permitting would be done through the proper channels, unrelated to inclusion in the Ag District.

Legislator Montgomery stated section 305-B of the Ag & Markets law speaks to local land use applications and covers variances, special permits, or subdivision review within 500 feet of a proposed project. She stated this is what many towns have voiced concern about, especially in regard to notification to neighboring properties.

Commissioner Barosa stated if a parcel is in the Ag District, it affects projects done by neighboring properties as well. She stated for example if a neighbor wanted to build a deck within 500 feet of the farm, there is another layer they have to go through to get approval. She stated smaller pieces of property have more neighbors, which is what the concerns of the towns have been and why a neighbor may be against inclusion.

Legislator Birmingham requested clarification on the zoning of the properties. He provided the example of a farmstand being at the end of a driveway advertising the items for sale. He questioned, although the property is not zoned as commercial, would being in the Ag District give the farm an advantage over another property.

Commissioner Barosa clarified that the zoning does not change; if a property is residential it will remain residential with the same requirements through the town. She stated a variance can be applied for and if denied, a farm in the Ag District can go to NYS Agriculture and Markets for assistance and intervention with the town. She stated being in the Ag District affords that extra advantage.

Legislative Counsel Abissi agreed with Commissioner Barosa. She stated being in the Ag District provides two (2) major benefits: it provides a defense if there is a nuisance action brought against the property and it provides an opportunity to obtain an opinion from NYS Ag & Markets.

Cassandra Roth, Chair the SWCD Board and member of the AFPB, stated there is a constitutional right to farm in New York State. She stated inclusion in the Ag District allows NYS Ag & Markets to mediate when and where necessary. She stated there is no requirement for farms to be commercial to be included in the Ag District; only parcels that are viable agricultural land. She stated 305-B comes into effect for a neighboring property if they are doing a project that has the potential to have an environmental impact.

Legislator Regan stated when a property is in the Ag District, it is then a farm. He stated if produce is being sold or if people are invited to pick fruit or vegetables, they are now conducting business. He questioned if the parcel would then be a commercial operation.

Ms. Roth stated all farms must follow all local ordinances. She stated if the farm in the Ag District wanted to have a farmstand they would have to go to the town for the variance. She stated if the town denied their request, they would have the ability to contact NYS Ag & Markets to help them appeal the denial. She stated inclusion in the Ag District does not remove home rule.

Mr. Yarris stated these farms are looked at through a specific lens, and he encouraged the Committee not to get too deep into hypotheticals. He stated these hypotheticals lead to dispersions being placed on the farms. He stated to try to combat confusion around this process public meetings were held for educational outreach which some of the towns attended. He stated these parcels should be judged based on their plan set forth in their application.

Legislator Sayegh stated the neighbors of this property sent a letter to the Legislature that is important to consider. She stated the AFBP voted on this property twice because it did not pass the first time. She stated there is an easement on the driveway to this property.

Commissioner Barosa stated the easement for the shared driveway is something to consider because they did discuss possibly putting a farmstand at the street.

Legislator Sayegh stated this parcel was ultimately approved for inclusion by the AFBP because they are determining if the property is viable for agriculture. She stated any property could be viable for agriculture.

Legislator Montgomery stated all we are here to determine is viability. She stated it is important to take into consideration the feedback from the towns and neighbors, but the ultimate determination is if the parcel is viable agricultural property. She stated she believes it should be made clear to the approved parcel owners that inclusion in the Ag District does not circumvent any local ordinances.

Legislator Regan stated his intention behind his questions or any hypotheticals he may have presented were to understand how his vote could impact the residents he represents.

Legislator Montgomery stated the concerns brought forward are valid. She stated the Legislature's role is to determine that the parcel is viable agricultural land and if its inclusion would be in the best public interest.

Chairman Gouldman made a motion to pre-file the necessary resolution; Seconded by Legislator Sayegh. All in favor.

High Point Equestrian – Town of Patterson

566-572 E Branch Rd, Patterson, NY 12563

Parcel ID #372400 36.-3-10 – Total Acreage: 75 acres

Principal Operation(s): Equine (*Boarding*)

AFPB Chairwoman Scott stated the AFPB voted to include this parcel, an equine boarding facility.

Legislator Regan clarified that his comment earlier about the wetlands violation pertained to this parcel.

Legislator Sayegh stated she had the opportunity to visit this farm; it is a beautiful facility. She stated the wetlands violation was addressed and has been resolved with the town.

Chairman Gouldman made a motion to pre-file the necessary resolution; Seconded by Legislator Sayegh. All in favor.

Hidden Hope Farm – Town of Patterson

542 NY-164 542 554, Brewster, NY 10509

Parcel ID #24.-1-62 – Total Acreage: 18.61 acres

Principal Operation(s): Crops (*Vegetable*)

AFPB Chairwoman Scott stated the crops grown are sold locally; the AFPB voted to include this parcel in the Ag District.

Chairman Gouldman made a motion to pre-file the necessary resolution; Seconded by Legislator Sayegh. All in favor.

CQW, LLC – Town of Southeast

143 Starr Ridge Rd, Brewster, NY 10509

Parcel ID #68.13-1-1.2 – Total Acreage: 20.69 acres

Principal Operation(s): Equine (*Boarding*)

AFPB Chairwoman Scott stated this is an equine boarding facility with 11 stalls; the AFPB voted to include this parcel in the Ag District.

Legislator Regan stated a question about the septic on this property was raised; he asked if this was brought to the attention of the AFPB.

Commissioner Barosa stated there was an open building permit the owner inadvertently did not close and this has since been resolved with the town.

AFPB Chairwoman Scott stated a violation such as the open permit does not affect the viability of the parcel.

Legislator Sayegh stated something that struck her while visiting these properties is that everyone wanted to improve their land. She stated this violation was taken care of immediately.

Chairman Gouldman made a motion to pre-file the necessary resolution; Seconded by Legislator Regan. All in favor.

Dingle Ridge Pollinator Farm – Town of Southeast

50 Ridgebury Rd, Brewster, NY 10509

Parcel ID #69.17-1-18.1 – Total Acreage: 16.67 acres

Principal Operation(s): Apiary (*Bees/ Honey*) and Horticultural (*Nursery/ Garden*)

AFPB Chairwoman Scott stated this is a small-scale operation focusing on lavender production and apiary. She stated the AFPB recommended this parcel for inclusion in the Ag District.

Legislator Sayegh stated this was a historic farm and the owner is working diligently to restore the farming operation.

Chairman Gouldman made a motion to pre-file the necessary resolution; Seconded by Legislator Regan. All in favor.

Twin Oak Ventures LLC – Town of Southeast

189 Brewster Hill Rd #189, Brewster, NY 10509

Parcel ID #57.-2-52.4 – Total Acreage: 48.88 acres

Principal Operation(s): Equine (*Boarding*)

AFPB Chairwoman Scott stated this is an equine boarding facility. She stated they have a 12 stall barn and an outdoor riding arena. She stated the AFPB recommended this parcel for inclusion in the Ag District.

Legislator Sayegh stated this is a beautiful property.

Chairman Gouldman made a motion to pre-file the necessary resolution; Seconded by Legislator Regan. All in favor.

Clara Patunga Farm – Town of Putnam Valley

35 Canopus Hollow Rd, Putnam Valley, NY 10579

Parcel ID #72.12-1-6 – Total Acreage: 1.7 acres

Principal Operation(s): Orchard (*Fruit*)

AFPB Chairwoman Scott stated this is a startup operation beginning an orchard on the property. She stated there are currently trees, berry bushes, and a few raised beds. She stated the AFPB recommended this parcel for inclusion in the Ag District.

Legislator Sayegh stated as a member of the AFPB she did not vote to include this parcel in the Ag District. She stated she would be voting it out of Committee this evening so the

entire Legislature has the opportunity to vote on it. She stated this parcel applied for inclusion last year as well and since that time nothing new has been added. She stated the owner stated the vegetable production was for their personal use. She stated she understands the startup for orchards is five (5) years.

Legislator Regan stated this parcel is much smaller than other parcels. He questioned why the AFPB recommended this parcel for inclusion.

AFPB Chairwoman Scott stated the acreage does not matter, especially here in Putnam County where there are many small parcels of land. She stated this orchard is within the startup window, is in the beginning stages, and she believes it is still a viable property.

Legislator Crowley stated this is the third year in a row this parcel has applied for inclusion and the scope of what was being done has changed.

AFPB Chairwoman Scott stated the parcel did have hives on it previously but there were issues. She stated the principal operation is an orchard.

Legislator Montgomery stated the acreage, although lower than many other applicants, is not part of the State law.

Legislator Sayegh stated the application states there are 15+ standard fruit trees but when she visited the property she saw maybe nine (9) and half were thriving.

AFPB Chairwoman Scott stated on the site visit there was the beginnings of an orchard. She stated this counts as a viable piece of land.

Legislative Counsel Abissi stated a startup orchard is the first five (5) years, since it takes trees a long time to grow. She stated this allows for the orchard to get established, taking into consideration that some trees do not survive. She stated this parcel is within the guidelines.

Director of Real Property Patricia McLoughlin stated she struggled with this application as well. She stated this owner is very knowledgeable and has learned from the successes and failures he has experienced in growing certain types of fruit and has shifted his focus to have more successful growth. She stated she ultimately voted to include this parcel. She stated the property can be reviewed again next year during the 8-year review.

Ms. Roth stated this property owner is also the president of the Putnam Valley Grange which is the only County Grange. She stated the best way to describe a grange is that it is an agricultural-focused rotary club. She stated the AFPB had many of these conversations and spent a lot of time on these applications. She stated it is frustrating to see the AFPB recommendations not taken. She stated she hopes the Legislature would trust the expert AFPB.

Legislator Sayegh stated she trusts the AFPB and has been a member for many years. She stated something she has heard over and over is that the job of the AFPB is to look at

the agricultural viability of the property. She stated the final vote goes to the Legislature which is why questions are being asked and discussions are being had. She stated the expertise of the AFPB is certainly valuable to the Legislature while making their decision.

Chairman Gouldman made a motion to pre-file the necessary resolution; Seconded by Legislator Sayegh. All in favor.

Chairman Gouldman thanked the AFPB for their hard work.

Item #4 – Approval – Utility Easement – Carmel Tax Map #53.19-1-12 & #64.7-1-5 – NYSEG Power Line Relocation – Stocum Ave Bridge Replacement Project

Deputy Commissioner of Department of Public Works Joseph Bellucci stated this will allow NYSEG to replace the poles.

Chairman Gouldman made a motion to pre-file the necessary resolution; Seconded by Legislator Sayegh. All in favor.

Item #5 – Approval – Budgetary Amendment 26A047 – Finance – Sybil Ludington Restoration – Record Expenditures from Outside

Chairman Gouldman made a motion to pre-file the necessary resolution; Seconded by Legislator Regan. All in favor.

Item #6 – Approval – Budgetary Amendment 26A048 – DPW – Costs Incurred for the Bridge 5 Project

Deputy Commissioner Bellucci stated this is the final balance. He stated the consulting services come in less than budgeted.

Legislator Birmingham questioned where this bridge is located.

Deputy Commissioner Bellucci stated it is in Brewster by Lia Honda.

Legislator Birmingham stated the Budgetary Amendment lists “use of capital reserve” but clarified that this is actually a use of designated fund balance, which we call capital reserve. He stated his intention to put a resolution forward to recapture that designation.

Chairman Gouldman made a motion to pre-file the necessary resolution; Seconded by Legislator Sayegh. All in favor.

Item #7 – Approval – Rescinding Resolutions #319 of 2019 and #280 of 2021 – Authorizing Sale of County Property Pursuant to Chapter 31 of the Putnam County Code – 34 Gleneida Avenue, Town of Carmel for \$600,000

Chairman Gouldman stated the Legislature did not approve the sale of the property when an offer was before them at the June Full Legislative Meeting. He stated the Legislature is different now than it was when the sale of this property was approved.

Legislator Regan thanked Chairman Gouldman for bringing this forward.

Legislator Sayegh stated she was on the Legislature in 2019 and 2021 when these resolutions were considered and she voted to approve the sale of this property. She stated she has no problem selling this property, however she recognized some issues with the property, specifically the lack of parking. She stated she is in favor of bringing this proposal to the Full Legislature at this time.

Legislator Montgomery stated it has been mentioned throughout this year that decisions made now will impact future Legislators and it may not be fair. She stated this is a great example of how things can be changed at any point.

Legislator Regan stated to leave these resolutions hanging with no intention of selling the property results in many people doing work that will not come to fruition. He stated future generations can make a different decision, but at this time the Legislature is voicing their opinion on what to do with this property.

Legislator Sayegh stated this property has been on the market since 2019 and it has been difficult to find a buyer without parking.

Chairman Gouldman stated a full price offer came in and the Legislature did not approve the sale.

Chairman Gouldman made a motion to pre-file the necessary resolution; Seconded by Legislator Regan. All in favor.

Item #9 – Approval – Planning Dept. – Putnam County’s Annual Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan Update in Conformance with and as Required by the US DOT’s Final Rule (49 CFR Part 673)

Commissioner Barosa stated this is a required plan related to compliance with safety requirements in the transportation system. She stated this year there was a substantial update, adding the safety plan for the on-demand service the County has begun.

Chairman Gouldman made a motion to pre-file the necessary resolution; Seconded by Legislator Regan. All in favor.

Item #10 – Other Business – None

Item #11 – Adjournment

There being no further business at 6:30pm, Chairman Gouldman made a motion to adjourn; Seconded by Legislator Regan. All in favor.

Respectfully Submitted by Deputy Clerk, Beth Robinson.