

Town of Red Hook
Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting Minutes
August 9, 2006

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:15 p.m. by Timothy Ross, Chairman.

ROLL CALL

Members present: Kenneth Anderson, Robert Latimer, Corinne Weber, and Tim Ross, Chairman.

Members absent: Gordon Denegar, John Douglas, and Michael Mosher

PRELIMINARY BUSINESS

The minutes of the July 12, 2006 meeting were unanimously approved.

There was no comment on the Planning Board minutes.

Building Inspector/ZEO permits and letters: Chairman Ross noted that Zoning Enforcement Officer Bob Fennell responded correctly to a July 14, 2006 letter from Attorney Peter Klose regarding the Cease and Desist order issued to the Cokertown Rod and Gun Club.

PUBLIC HEARING

7:20 p.m. Appeal 06-15 David Marshall application for an area variance for construction of storage shed. The hearing was opened at 7:20 p.m. As there were no comments from the public, the hearing was then closed. The applicant stated that his neighbors have indicated to him they have no problem with the construction of the proposed storage shed. He then briefly reviewed for the board his request to build a storage shed seven feet from the side-yard property line. The District Schedule of Area and Bulk Regulations requires a 20 ft. setback. The applicant said he reduced the size of the shed to 10 ft. x 16 ft. in order to be in compliance with the required distance of 12 feet from the corner of his house. Corinne Weber made a motion to grant a variance of 13 feet to allow the storage shed to be built seven feet from the side yard property line based on the following: that there would be no adverse effect on the health, safety or character of the neighborhood, and it will be of benefit to the applicant. Tim Ross seconded the motion which was unanimously carried by the following roll call vote: Ken Anderson - Yes; Robert Latimer - Yes; Tim Ross - Yes; Corinne Weber - Yes.

REVIEW OF NEW APPEAL APPLICATION

06-17 Glenn & Lynda Coon application for an area variance for construction of an accessory apartment in an existing single-family dwelling. The dwelling is on 0.6 acres in the B1 zoning district. The District Schedule of Area and Bulk Regulations requires one acre for an accessory apartment in the B1 zoning district. Tim Ross recused himself from the review of this application due to a prior professional engagement with Mr. Coon. He noted that for the public hearing a minimum of five board members will need to be at the meeting to ensure a quorum once he recuses himself from the hearing. Corinne Weber then invited the applicant to explain his proposed project. He described the changes that would be made to the existing single-family residence, in which the upstairs would be converted into a one-bedroom, accessory apartment. It

was noted that an accessory apartment in an existing building could only be as large as 35% of the primary residence's square footage. Discussion followed in which it was determined that the proposed apartment would be approximately 350 square feet and, therefore, in compliance with the required square footage. The board reviewed the drawings presented by the client. Bob Fennell asked that Mr. Coon meet with him to review the drawings and suggested that the dimensions for every room, as well as halls, bathrooms, closets and ceiling heights be included in the drawings. A public hearing was set for September 13, 2006 at 7:20 p.m.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

7:40 p.m Appeal 06-13A Margarita Carreras application for interpretation of Article I, Section 143-4 of the zoning law regarding the definition of a home occupation (which is limited to 500 sq. feet) and its application to an artist's studio. If determined to be a home occupation, Appeal 06-13B request for an area variance, will be heard. Applicant requests a variance of 2200 feet to build a 2700 sq. ft. studio. Carlos Padilla, representing his wife Margarita Carreras, provided an overview of the application, stating that they would like to construct a 2700 sq. ft. studio. It would be used for both storage of lawn equipment, etc. and as an artist's studio, enabling them to use a larger area than the law allows. Tim Ross said that the board received one letter regarding the appeal and read it into the record as follows:

Zoning Board of Appeals:

We reside at 477 W. Kerley Corners Rd., Tivoli, NY 12583.
We would object to the applicant's request to build a 2700 square foot studio at 460 W. Kerley Corners Rd., Tivoli. The area is not zoned for small business.

Sincerely,
Stephen and Mary Bayer

The public hearing was opened at 7:45 p.m. Tim Ross said this is a two part review and read from Section 143-4 of the zoning law the definition of a home occupation:

Any limited personal service, professional service or business use customarily conducted within a dwelling or customary accessory building and carried on by the residents thereof, which is clearly incidental and secondary to the use of the premises for residential purposes and does not alter the residential character thereof, and which use shall be fully consistent with use limitations stated in Section 143-32 of this chapter. The term "home occupation" shall include the provision of day-care services for four or fewer children who are not residents of the dwelling and the operation of a bed-and-breakfast establishment as defined herein.

He then noted that the first question is: is an art studio where they create art (not for sale on the premises and to be shipped elsewhere) a home occupation or just a studio? The Code does not have a specific definition for a studio. The applicant was asked if he has any employees, and answered no. Mr. Padilla emphasized that they would not be conducting business from the studio. Chairman Ross advised the applicant that for the board to make an affirmative decision, it would require the majority of the members. As a seven member board that means four members would have to vote affirmatively. Since there were only four members present, all four would have to vote the same way. The applicant was given the choice to table the matter until the next meeting or proceed. Mr. Padilla chose to proceed. Ken Anderson asked for clarification of how the artwork would be marketed, and was told there are reps that send the work to galleries throughout the country. There was then discussion about the process for obtaining a building permit for an accessory building. Bob Fennell said that an accessory use on a property is customarily related to the allowed principal use of the property. The applicant noted there are many artists in the area with facilities larger than what he proposes. Bob reported that the

practice has been to allow people to have artist's studios and not call them home occupations and not restrict them with area restrictions. Ken felt that if one is not marketing a product out of the studio there should be no restrictions. Robert Latimer said that since the applicant has no employees, has no financial transactions with the public on his property and the public will not be coming and going to the studio, it is clearly not a home occupation. He likened it to someone baking bread in his kitchen and selling it at a farmer's market. Tim said that Rob had some good points but that he felt that it "smacks" of a home occupation. If it's interpreted as not a home occupation the interpretation would need to have many caveats to ensure it would not get out of control. He asked the board if anyone wanted to make a motion. This was followed by general discussion of how the application for interpretation and the appeal for an area variance originated. Tim then asked if anyone in the audience had comments.

Dick Hansen, Red Hook: Whether he's giving this product away or selling it, as long as it isn't available to the public to come there and get it, it should be conveyed to who is going to sell it and he should be allowed to be a home occupation and proceed with what he's doing. (Tim Ross explained that if it is a home occupation he's limited to 500 sq. ft.; if it's just a studio and not an occupation it can be much larger. The crux of the issue is: is it a home occupation or just a hobby barn?) The question Ken was after is where is it being marketed? If it's not being marketed and not available to the public, then where does it lie?

Carlos Padilla: Outside the area. My home is not available to the public.

Dick Hansen: Whether he gives it away or sells it, it's not open to the public.

Ken Anderson said he was inclined to look at this like it is a hobby, but was confused with the fact that the applicant would be creating some type of a product...where will that product end up? Mr. Padilla stated that it would go to galleries throughout the country. Bob Fannell then suggested that Tim look at the definition of light manufacturing in the zoning law. Tim reviewed it but noted that it does not address the specific issue of an artist's studio.

Unidentified Person: How does the product leave his house?

Carlos Padilla: UPS or I take it over myself.

Lee Ann Hansen, Red Hook: Look at all the people who make products at home. There are people who do crafts, who go to shows and markets. Really, what's the difference? There's nobody who is going to be coming to his house, there's not going to be traffic coming in and out, what is the harm?

Dick Hansen: There are people who have computer information oriented businesses that aren't opened to the public (Rob Latimer interjects that they are limited to 500 square feet, too).

Carlos Padilla: But you don't go around town policing every home that is doing Internet work or building birdhouses in the garage or making jewelry in the barn.

Dick Hansen: Whether he's making miniature figurines or life-sized figurines, it all ought to be the same thing.

Unidentified person: I think we should support the arts here.

Charlie Horrocks, Red Hook: What's the purpose of the 500-foot restriction? If I lived in a residential area and someone added 750-1200 square feet onto their home for an accounting business, he would need extra parking spaces, it would smell of commercial business in a residential zone and that is probably why the law was put in place. But this doesn't have the smell of a business. There is no showroom, no one comes there to do business, so it doesn't take

away from a residential zone.

Carlos Padilla: To add to what you're saying, I will live on an 8-acre lot surrounded by another 8 acres, by a horse farm next to that, and by 20 some acres of conserved land. I will not be subjecting anyone to anything.

Charlie Horrocks: This would be a very good law to protect a smaller, residential neighborhood from being infringed upon.

Tim Ross then moves to interpret the business as a home occupation. Corinne Weber seconds the motion. The board votes as follows: Rob Latimer – No; Corinne Weber – Yes; Tim Ross – yes; Ken Anderson – No.

The board then discusses what a split vote means. Drayton Grant, a land use attorney from Rhinebeck, shares with the board a decision called Tall Trees, which came up a couple of years ago on this very issue of an evenly split vote. The court of appeals ruled, for someone who had been held in limbo a long time by a ZBA, that an evenly split vote is a no. Tim Ross said he thought if the board failed to decide this it would either go to Article 78 or default to the ZEO's decision. Since they were unable to overturn the decision, the decision stands. Thus, an artist's studio is considered a home occupation. Chairman Ross then moved the to the area variance phase of this application and re-opened the public hearing for new comments from the audience.

Lee Ann Hansen: Let him put up the building. It will help our taxes and he's not putting any kids in school.

As there were no other comments from the public, the hearing was closed at 8:15 p.m. Tim Ross then made a motion to grant an area variance for 2200 square feet to allow Ms. Carreras to conduct art studio work in and up to the 2700 square feet, on an intermittent basis, based on the information provided us, with the understanding that it would be Ms. Carreras and her husband and no employees at the site, and goods will not be marketed directly from the residence or the studio. Additionally, there would be no adverse effect on the health, safety or character of the neighborhood, and it will be of benefit to the applicant. Robert Latimer seconded the motion, which was unanimously carried by the following roll call vote: Ken Anderson - Yes; Robert Latimer - Yes; Tim Ross - Yes; Corinne Weber - Yes.

8:00 Appeal 06-14 Ralph Franceschi request for an area variance for side yard set back requirements for construction of a storage building. The applicant reviewed his project, noting that the location of the 20 ft. x 20 ft. storage shed was chosen because it provided driveway access and did not interfere with the leach field. Any other location would be in the front of the residence, which the applicant wished to avoid. Tim asked if the one neighbor who would have a view of the shed had any objections. Mr. Franceschi indicated that she did not. Rob Latimer reported that he had already been to the site and had no questions. The public hearing was opened at 8:10 p.m. As there were no public comments, the hearing was then closed. Ken Anderson reviewed a map of the site with the applicant. Corinne Weber made a motion to grant a variance of 12 feet to allow the storage shed to be built eight feet from the side yard property line based on the following: that there would be no adverse effect on the health, safety or character of the neighborhood, and it will be of benefit to the applicant. Tim Ross seconded the motion, adding that the natural vegetation provides good screening so that this variance has minimal impact on the neighborhood. The motion was unanimously carried by the following roll call vote: Ken Anderson - Yes; Robert Latimer - Yes; Tim Ross - Yes; Corinne Weber - Yes.

REVIEW OF NEW APPEAL APPLICATION

06-16 Ralph Choinsky application for a use variance to construct an accessory structure (a garage) on a vacant parcel of land. The District Schedule of Use Regulations requires the

presence of a principal building (e.g. a house) prior to the construction of an accessory structure. Mr. Choinsky stated he wished to build a garage for his daughter and, eventually, a house. Currently the parcel is landlocked and has no bonafide right-of-way. The only way to get to the parcel is to pass through the neighboring lot also owned and occupied by Mr. Choinsky. The Chair explained to the applicant the requirements for a Use Variance, indicating they are very difficult to meet. The fact the lot is landlocked and has no right-of-way poses a unique situation. The Chair provided the applicant with a card listing the requirements are for a use variance. He asked the applicant to provide the board with a copy of the easement he has, to get to his current parcel. Discussion ensued as to whether the building of an agricultural barn would be allowed. Tim pointed out the need to prove financial hardship might be the most difficult requirement of the use variance to prove. Christine Chale noted that to prove financial hardship the applicant would have to go through each and every permitted use and prove that each one would not present a reasonable return. The Chair suggested the applicant to get a copy of the Use Chart from either the Zoning Enforcement Officer or the Clerk of the Zoning Board of Appeals. Mr. Choinsky asked if he could just get a building permit for an agricultural barn and was advised by the Chair to decide if he wanted to do that and, if so, he could then withdraw his application to the ZBA. A public hearing was scheduled for September 13, 2006 and 7:40 p.m.

PUBLIC HEARING - CONTINUATION

8:20 p.m. Appeal 06-11 Cokertown Rod and Gun Club application for interpretation of Chapter 143, Article VIII of the zoning law regarding non-conforming use.

Tim Ross stated the board received a few more letters (from Peter Klose, Vicky Perry and David Miller). These letters are attached to and made part of this record. Chairman Ross also said that he has had a few conversations with members of the Cokertown Rod and Gun Club and saw photos of past events, such as turkey shoots, showing use of the shooting range. Regarding the ZBA requesting names of Gun Club members, he pointed out that in the minutes the board requested a listing of officers and/or members, the purpose of which was to get the best possible accounting of what the membership was through the years. It wasn't specifically names, it was officers and/or members. The board didn't receive names, it received a head count, by year. The Chairman then opened the public hearing at 8:40 p.m.

Jeff Rothschild, Attorney for Cokertown Rod & Gun Club: Felt at the last public hearing the interpretation of the law regarding deed restrictions or deed covenants, and the zoning code case law interpretation, had been perverted and wanted to provide a rebuttal. There was much focus at the last meeting on the language in the deed from Madeline James and Jean Horkan. Chairman Ross had also stated that the language had been brought to his attention, specifically: "The party of the second part shall quietly enjoy the said premises." This has nothing to do with noise; it is the complete opposite. Real Property law, Sect. 253 defines quiet enjoyment as, "A covenant that the grantee shall quietly enjoy the said premises *must* [speaker's emphasis] be construed as meaning that such grantee [Cokertown Rod & Gun Club] their heirs, successors and assigns shall and may at all times thereafter peaceably and quietly have whole use, occupy and possess and enjoy the said premises and every part and parcel thereof wit the appurtenances without any let, suit, trouble, molestation, eviction, or disturbance of the grantor, his heirs or assigns." This language guarantees that the grantor [the Horkans] will not interfere with the Gun Club's use of the property. This is not a deed restriction. If it said, "you are not allowed to use this property as a junkyard," that is a deed restriction. He also agreed with a comment by Mickey Steiman that what is important is what was the use at the Club prior to February 1993. Mr. Steiman noted at the last meeting that original members of the Club said there was no pistol range when the Club was started. The Club was formed April 2, 1955. The fact that there was no pistol range in 1955 is irrelevant. (Tim Ross interjected that the board is fully aware that what's important is what existed prior to February 1993.) During this proceeding people have wanted to know how many members the gun club has, how much shooting is occurring, the level of noise occurring. The board is looking at expansion of use and it seems that is being equated with the number of members. No one can say how many or what type of members the Club can have. Mr. Fennell's

Cease and Desist order stated: "It is our belief and understanding that the Cokertown Rod & Gun Club has expanded or extended the nonconforming use on the above referenced parcel in violation of the Town of Red Hook Zoning Law Chapter 143, Article VIII." Mr. Rothschild said he would like a definition of expansion of use. He feels the ZEO is looking at intensity of use, i.e. the guns, the members, the noise. The Town's Zoning Code, Section 143.125 Subdivision A, defines expansion of use as: "Any lawful nonconforming use of buildings or open land in existence on the effective date of the chapter may be continued indefinitely if maintained in accordance with all applicable codes, ordinances, regulations and other requirements, but shall not be expanded, restored, moved, changed or reestablished except as specifically provided in this Article. (1) A nonconforming use may be expanded...on an existing site, provided that the extent of such expansion...does not exceed 50% of the site dedicated to the nonconforming use at the time of enactment of this chapter." This is an area measurement and has nothing to do with intensity of use. The Board will be provided with the information they have requested; the Club has established its nonconforming, pre-existing use. The question before the Board is: 1) if the Club has expanded that use; and, 2) how is the expansion defined. The definition of expansion is in the Code: The Club has used all 5.2 acres in a nonconforming use way. Logically, it cannot be said that the use has been expanded since the entire property has been used in a non-conforming way. Expansion of use has nothing to do with intensity of use. John Hopeler, David Smith and Bob Ogden are then introduced to speak about the types of uses that took place prior to Feb. 1993 and where they took place on the property. Their presentations will show that prior to Feb. 1993 there was a gun range there and that the entire property was used as a gun club.

John Hopeler, Red Hook: Reviewed a list entitled, Cokertown Shooting Events Prior to and After 1993. (This list is attached to and made part of this record.) Also distributed photos of the police using the gun range (shows the berm prior to trees growing on it), various club events, the shooting shed and pistol range. Some of the photos were dated. It was noted that activities took place at the stream on the far-end of the property as well as at the gun range on the other end of the property, and people have hunted on the land between these two points.

David Smith, Kingston: Born and raised in Red Hook and was a guest at the Club from 1976-1980, at which point he became a member until 1986. Was a range member from 1998-2005. Remembers activities such as turkey shoots, fishing, sighting days, etc. The membership was larger at that point than currently. Friday meetings would have at least 50-75 people in attendance. There were sighting breakfasts; it was used much more and would like to see it used more than it is at this point. Likes to shoot, has taught his children to shoot. It's better to go to a range than to be shooting out in the woods where there is not a proper backstop. The Club is part of him, part of Red Hook-- a town where the revolutionary war was fought. Would hate to see it closed or infringed upon. He's also a pilot and donates time to the Land Conservancy and the DEC. He can get aerial pictures of the Gun Club. He would be much more worried about someone shooting without proper backstops. Has done a lot of shooting at the Club and has never seen illegal activities or illegal weapons shot there.

Bob Ogden, Milan: There was a shooting range at the Club when he joined. The range was used a lot then for pistol shoots, family days, girl scouts. The Club provided tents for the Scouts and they would use the whole area and stay overnight. The Club wasn't there just for shooting, wanted to give something back to the area, as well. Said he was upset over an article in the July 6, 2006 Daily Freeman that referred to them as "terrorists." That was an insult and he was offended. He's a veteran, has lived here all his life and went to school here. Doesn't want to argue about it, just wanted people to be aware.

Dick Hansen, Red Hook: Asked if the photos provided by the Gun Club are dated. (Tim Ross answers that some of them are.) Are they of any evidentiary value if they are not dated? (Tim said it shows that they had some things there, but the ones that are dated would be more valuable when looking at what occurred before Feb. 1993.) Are these just pictures or are they worth

something to help the Board make its decision if they are not dated? A court wouldn't accept them as evidence if they're not dated and this, so much, is a court for zoning. (Tim notes the photocopies of the pictures are all on the same pages and some are dated, some not, but all will be kept in the file.)

Sam Lore, Milan: A charter member of the Club, he was one of the ten who started it in the 1950s and the oldest living member. Believes in the turkey shoots and other activities, but also believes in the protection of the surrounding area and the people living there. Indians used to hunt in New York City but don't anymore. Things need to be cut back to a certain extent. The parties on each side should meet and reach a compromise, not be enemies.

Drayton Grant, Attorney for Michael Rohatyn: Felt that what Mr. Lore said had a lot of merit. Also felt that the law pertaining to noise would apply to this situation, and distributed a copy of Chapter 143-25 of the zoning law. This section states: "No use shall be established or maintained ..." unless it is in compliance with this law. It then establishes a noise level of 60 decibels in the daytime and 50 decibels at night (although doesn't believe the Club would be shooting at night except for a rare occasion). Then reviews exemptions from the noise law (e.g. construction, farm activities, church bells, etc.) Feels because there is a noise law and it is in the zoning ordinance, and because the Cease & Desist Order states the Club is to come into compliance with the zoning ordinance in full, this noise standard applies. A book in the New York State laws, entitled the New York State Statutes Law, is about how to interpret statutes. It says that when the law expressly sets out what it applies to (as the zoning code does) and lists what it does not apply to, it is an irrefutable inference that must be drawn that what is omitted or not included was intended to be omitted or not included. Therefore, since the Gun Club is not listed as an exemption from the law, the noise standard applies to it. They can continue those uses that fall within the standard (assuming provisions of expansion of use do not apply). Thus, this law may provide the means to address the neighbor's concerns.

Peter Klose, Attorney to Carlos Gonzalez and Katherine Stewart: With regard to expansion of use, cites a case in Westchester in which property that had been formerly used for sporadic, recreational airplane flights could not be used by the present owner for daily commuting with a helicopter. This was deemed an expansion of use and in violation of zoning law and was upheld in appellate court. Expansion of use is also the issue before the ZBA, not the right to bear arms or have a turkey shoot. Since (probably about 1998) range members were permitted at the Club to shoot at the range from dawn to dusk. Another issue is the health and safety of his client and her property, which borders the rear of the Gun Club. (He then presents photos of the rear of his client's yard, taken by his client. The photos show several trees with bullet holes. He also gives to the Board, for the record, several bullets that were dug out of the trees that afternoon). He notes that these trees are behind the berm, which the Gun Club says the members shoot in to. The bullets are not .22 caliber bullets. (Rob Latimer interjects and asks how do we know these bullets did not come from her side of the tree? The photos are not dated.) Mr. Klose says his client will testify to the fact that she took the photos today and they are available for inspection by anyone on the Board. This is an important health and safety issue that the Board needs to consider. The use has expanded and all the evidence points to the fact that since at least 1998 the use has expanded to include much more shooting and intense use of the Club's property. Believes the Board should uphold the Cease & Desist Order and that the target shooting should stop until the Club obtains a special permit and any variances needed. Then a full and fair record can be developed as to why this use is not appropriate for this five-acre parcel. (Corinne Weber asks about pictures of the shooting range, which were provided to offer perspective.)

William Mansfield, Milan: In reference to the Daily Freeman article Mr. Ogden discussed, he read it, too. The article said that a police report would indicate if automatic weapons were fired. He has the police report and it does not say automatic weapons were fired. All the weapons listed are legal. The deputy who investigated the noise complaint at the Club looked at all their names,

residences, licenses, pistol licenses, serial numbers and makes of firearms. He is also a veteran and still serving in the National Guard. He's a small arms instructor in the National Guard. His friend, Jeremy Pink, is in the National Reserve. Both train regularly. He, himself, has been training for 30 years. When they go to the Gun Club, together with another member, they have "stuff" that is loud. If they fire simultaneously it could very easily be mistaken for automatic fire. He deals with automatic weapon fire all the time, it's his job, and you really can't tell the difference. Had they known it was an issue with the neighbors, it could have easily been toned down. He agrees with Mr. Lore that a compromise would be prudent. As for safety, he's a NRA certified instructor, works with the Boy Scouts (Troop 128 in Rhinebeck) and is a merit badge counselor for them.

Jeremy Pink, Hyde Park: If they had been using fully automatic weapons when the sheriff showed up, they'd be in prison now since those weapons are illegal. When shooting, the rounds come out only as fast as you pull the trigger. With a fully automatic weapon, you hold the trigger and it dumps the entire magazine in seconds. There's a big difference between fully automatic weapons and ones that aren't fully automatic. Our guns are legal. He then asks if anyone present is a police officer or in the military.

Michael Horkan, Red Hook: States he is a police officer and respects their service in the military, and believes they are being honest. Indicates that the police were not called to the Club for automatic gunfire. He had been advised by the ZEO and Building Inspector to call if what he heard was extreme. But, he has heard automatic gunfire there. States that Mr. Mansfield and Mr. Pink may not be aware, but there are a couple of members...there's an investigation into the people who own the automatic weapons. You are not being accused of that.

William Mansfield: Was under the impression the newspaper article and police report referred to them.

Kathy Stewart: Thanks the previous speaker for his frankness. The pictures do not truly convey what the trees are really like. Invites anyone who wishes to come with her to see the trees. The bullets given to the ZBA were found in five minutes. Notes that trees heal over and so the bullets found in the trees must have been shot within the last two years. Can get an arborist to corroborate. Concerned there has been an expansion, on to her property.

Peter Klose: The top of her hill is 600 yards more than the 600 yard long shooting range, so it's over 1,000 yards.

Unidentified: The range isn't 600 yards.

Diane Horrocks, Red Hook: Reminded everyone that Club members come and go; the residents are there all day long. Doesn't have a problem with gunfire, but all day is a little tedious.

Gus Truan, Tivoli: Explained that paintball game guns can be put on automatic, without paint in them, and sound like automatic fire. He has seen his son do it in mock battles and suggests that this may be what is being heard.

Mickey Steiman, Attorney to Jean Horkan: Agrees with Mr. Rothschild statements about how to interpret "quiet enjoyment" in the deed. However, it doesn't mean the Horkan's are prohibited from interfering with the Gun Club, all it means is that the Horkan's can't do anything inconsistent with the ownership by the Gun Club. There's an old trial lawyer maxim: you don't leave your common sense at the courthouse door. You don't leave common sense at the Town Hall door, either. Pointed out that the Gun Club members' descriptions of activities at the Club indicate that the use has changed. It was a hunting and fishing club. No one described, after 1993, hunting and fishing activities. They shoot at the range. Mr. Hopeler described how they used to have

turkey shoots, girl scouts, etc., those things have stopped or diminished. Everyone now calls it a gun club. Its use has changed and it is no longer and hunting and fishing club. Doesn't understand how difficult it would be for the Cokertown Rod & Gun Club to provide its membership list, by year and category, to show that it hasn't changed. This has not been offered, nor has anyone explained when the range member category went into effect. Mr. Rothschild is correct in that they cannot be told what type members they can have, but you can tell by an increase and change in membership numbers that they have expanded their nonconforming use. In court a judge will instruct jurors that if a party has information that which will help the trier of fact, and withholds, neglects or fails to produce that information, one should be able to draw a negative inference. In other words, if the information wasn't produced it must mean that it would have been helpful, and the fact it wasn't produced can then be construed against the other party. He attended the last two ZBA meetings and believes the board requested the membership list. Remembers commenting on the fact they said they had approximately so many members. Said they should know how many members they have, not approximately. This issue is of great importance to the Club, the board, and the Town. They should have produced the list. What harm would it do? Active members vs. range members. According to their own charter they have only 20 active members with the full benefits of membership. All the other ones are range members and, therefore, it is a gun club. It was a hunting and fishing club but its use has now changed. The board must work from the assumption that all other town officials are carrying out their job responsibilities appropriately. The building permit applied for in 1997 for the shooting shed was for 1800 square feet. That is 50% more than the floor area of the existing buildings. That, in and of itself, is an indicator of an expansion of use. (Showing an aerial photograph) explains that the Club encroaches onto his client's property (Tim Ross interjects that the board has a certified survey of the area, supplied by Mr. Horkan, and that the board is familiar with the encroachment). Mr. Steiman then questions how the shooting shed was constructed given that it does not even meet setback requirements for a house. How was a building permit issued in 1997 when the Gun Club said it completed the shed in 1993? One should not assume regularity of everything since 1993, the proof of which is the aerial photo and the certified survey. The board must determine what the Club was Feb. 7, 1993. If it was a hunting and fishing club, but is now a gun club (as its members describe it) then the use has changed. They will have then forfeited their right to non-conforming, pre-existing use and must apply for a special permit.

Jeff Rothschild: Wishes to correct Mr. Steiman. The Club has a Certificate of Occupancy for the building (verified by Bob Fennell); it's not about a building. The expansion of use is the use of the property. Look at Section 143.125 of the zoning code, it doesn't just address the building, it's either/or. What's being discussed is the use of the land, not the expansion of a building. The use of the land and expansion of its non-conforming use is what is being examined. Has the whole 5.2 acres been used as a Rod and Gun Club? That's the question. Also, it's not important what the Club is called, it's what was the use were prior to Feb. 9, 1993. (Tim Ross interjects that the entire board understands that the question is what was the use prior to and following February 1993.)

Bob Fennell, Zoning Enforcement Officer: Wishes answer Mr. Rothschild question about what the Cease and Desist Order meant when referring to change of use: It was about the volume of use. Researched case law and used the case referred to by Mr. Klose (*Town of Bedford vs. Pelz*) regarding the daily use of a helicopter vs. periodic airplane use on a parcel. It's the same sort of thing. Can't start firing machine guns at the Club and say the use hasn't changed.

Jeff Rothschild: The Cease & Desist Order included a definition of expansion of use. A zoning code is in derogation of a common law right to use one's property. To change the definition the zoning code needs to be changed or amended.

Susan Simon, Red Hook: Said that by the description of the Gun Club it sounds like a cool place. When it started, though, guns were a particular way. Over time they have developed and become

more powerful and have greater impact. The Club has a small amount of property, the guns are more powerful and more people are shooting, so things are expanding. The ZBA should consider certain restrictions. For example, the Taconic State Parkway was designed for cars going 45 mph and now there are people speeding on it because they have big, new cars that were not around when the road was first built. Then, accidents happen. Hopes the board will take into consideration how the community would be affected should the shooting remain the way it is.

Jeremy Pink: Wanted to point out that guns are not getting more powerful; the rounds have been the same since WWII. Pistols and semi-automatic weapons can shoot the same bullet, but one is not more powerful, the semi-automatic can hold more rounds.

Susan Elias, Red Hook: Applauds Kathy Stewart and all the neighbors. Believes the most important thing is that someone could get hurt or killed. Five acres isn't big enough. She can hear the shooting and it bothers her. Her main concern is that someone could die.

William Mansfield: Believes the general feeling is that people just don't want guns around here. If deaths are the concern, there's a lot more deaths from homicides or motor vehicle accidents. If the issue is that they don't want guns then people should be genuine about it.

Susan Elias: From 1997-2002 more than 1,324 children were killed in firearm incidents.

Jeremy Pink: Asked what document legally defines the difference between hunting and fishing club and gun club. Hunters use guns.

Mickey Steiman: Said it was the Club's own charter and by-laws. Also stated that there is a rule of construction: for words that have no specific meaning their ordinary meaning is used. For example, if one was asked to go hunting, one would not go shooting at the range.

Chairman Ross closed the public hearing at 9:47 p.m., but indicated the Board will accept brief letters if anyone has new information. Would also be interested in visiting Kathy Stewart's property which borders the Club. Also asked the gun club to provide a detailed breakdown of the membership for 1992, 1993, 1994, 2004, 2005 and 2006 and this should include the total number of members in each category of membership, by year. He asked if the Club had log-in forms, but it does not. He also reminded the Club and its counsel that they need to prove the activity at the Club prior to and after February 1993 so that the Board can understand if this was a change in use/expansion, or not. More detailed records would be helpful.

Jeff Rothschild asks what more can be provided; the club is offering eyewitness who were there prior to 1993. John Hopeler states the Club does not have records such as how many shooters were in attendance on a particular date. Rob Latimer asks if they have attendance figures for an annual meeting. An audience member asks if there are records of who pays dues. Tim reiterates that the Club will provide numbers by membership category and year. Town Attorney Christine Chale states that it would be helpful to get copies of whatever building records they have. Tim asks them for any documents they have on the construction. Attorney Rothschild asks the ZEO to forward any records he may have. Tim noted he saw some records when he visited the Club and would need copies of that for the Board's record. John Hopeler asks what law it was that the Club is to have broken. Tim said it was a perceived increase in use. That is the perception of the ZEO and the Club is here asking the Board whether his interpretation was correct. Jeff Rothschild said that the Board must first decide how they will define an expansion of use. Peter Klose suggested that since the Board will be provided with new information the public hearing should not be closed. Chairman Ross was not opposed to continuing the hearing but would not entertain any new personal data at the next meeting. Would like that information prior to that meeting and rescinded his earlier decision to close the hearing. A continuation of the public hearing was then scheduled for Sept. 13, 2006 at 8:00 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

As there was not further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 9:59 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,
Lea Cassarino
Clerk of the Board

FINDINGS AND DECISION

Appeal #06-15 David Marshall application for an area variance of 13 ft. from side yard setback requirements per the District Schedule of Area and Bulk Regulations Section of the Zoning Law, Code of the Town of Red Hook.

1. The property is located in the R1.5 Zoning District at 38 Apple Tree Drive, Rhinebeck, NY.
2. Tax Map #15-6172-19-727029.
3. The zoning law requires side yard setback of 20 feet.
4. The applicant wishes to erect a storage shed in his back yard, reducing his side yard set back to 7 feet.
5. There were no objections from the audience.
6. A variance would be of benefit to the applicant with no detriment to the community.
7. There will be no change in the character of the neighborhood.
8. There will be no impact on the health, welfare or safety of the community.

Decision: Corrine Weber made a motion to grant the variance based upon the above findings. The motion was seconded by Tim Ross and carried by a 4-0 roll call vote.

Dated: August 9, 2006

FINDINGS AND DECISION

Appeal #06-13A Margarita Carreras request for interpretation of the Town of Red Hook Zoning Law, Article 1, Section 143-4 regarding the definition of Home Occupation and its applicability to an artist's studio.

1. The property is located in the RD 3 zoning district at 460 W. Kerley Corners Road, Tivoli.
2. Tax Map #15-6274-00-811356
3. The zoning law defines a home occupation as: “Any limited personal service, professional service or business use customarily conducted within a dwelling or customary accessory building and carried on by the residents thereof, which is clearly incidental and secondary to the use of the premises for residential purposes and does not alter the residential character thereof, and which use shall be fully consistent with use limitations stated in Section 143-32 of this chapter...” The area for a home occupation is limited to 500 square feet.
4. The applicant wishes to build a 2700 square foot artist's studio.
5. There was a letter of objection to the building of the structure, indicating that the area is not zoned for small business.

Decision: Tim Ross made a motion to interpret the business as a home occupation based upon the above findings. The motion was seconded by Corinne Weber. The roll call vote of 2-2 resulted in a split decision. As the Board was unable to overturn the Zoning Enforcement Officer's decision, the decision stands.

Dated: August 9, 2006

FINDINGS AND DECISION

Appeal #06-13B Margarita Carreras application for an area variance of 2200 square feet from the home occupation requirements per the District Schedule of Area and Bulk Regulations Section of the Zoning Law, Code of the Town of Red Hook.

1. The property consists of 8 acres, is uniquely shielded from adjoining properties, and is located in the RD 3 zoning district at 460 W. Kerley Corners Rd., Tivoli.
- 2, Tax Map ##15-6274-00-811356
3. The zoning law requires that home occupations be limited to 500 square feet.
4. The applicant wishes to build an artist's studio of 2700 square feet to allow occasional work on larger projects/mediums.
5. There were no objections from the audience.
6. A variance would be of benefit to the applicant with no detriment to the community.
7. There will be no change in the character of the neighborhood.
8. There will be no impact on the health, welfare or safety of the community.

Decision: Tim Ross made a motion to grant the variance based upon the above findings and with the understanding that it would be Ms. Carreras and her husband and no employees at the site, and goods will not be marketed directly from the residence or the studio. The motion was Robert Latimer and carried by a 4-0 roll call vote.

Dated: August 9, 2006

FINDINGS AND DECISION

Appeal #06-14 Ralph Franceschi application for an area variance of 12 ft. from side yard setback requirements per the District Schedule of Area and Bulk Regulations Section of the Zoning Law, Code of the Town of Red Hook.

1. The property is located in the RD3 Zoning District at 139 Spring Lake Road, Red Hook, NY.
2. Tax Map #15-6373-00-572906.
3. The zoning law requires side yard setback of 20 feet.
4. The applicant wishes to erect a storage shed in his back yard, reducing his side yard setback to 8 feet.
5. There were no objections from the audience.
6. A variance would be of benefit to the applicant with no detriment to the community.
7. There will be no change in the character of the neighborhood.
8. There will be no impact on the health, welfare or safety of the community.

Decision: Corrine Weber made a motion to grant the variance based upon the above findings. The motion was seconded by Tim Ross and carried by a 4-0 roll call vote.

Dated: August 9, 2006

Klose & Associates

Peter Klose, Esq.
(Woody N. Klose 1938-2004)

Attorneys At Law

35 East Market Street Red
Hook, New York 12571 ft
(845)758-8871 (fax) (845)
758-0516
peter@kloselaw.com
www.kloselaw.com

*Nyack ft(845)
727-7727*

*White Plains
ft(914) 948-1008*

August 9, 2006

Town Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA)
Town of Red Hook
7340 South Broadway
Red Hook, NY 12571

Attn: Tim Ross, Chairperson zba@redhook.org
zba@redhook.org 758-4623

Re: Public Hearing Appeal 06-11 Cokertown Rod & Gun Club
application for interpretation of Town of Red Hook Zoning Law
Chapter 143, Article VIII regarding non-conforming use.

Dear Mr. Ross:

As you know from my prior letter dated July 13,2006, I represent Katherine G. Stewart and Carlos Gonzalez, who reside and own the property directly behind the Cokertown Rod & Gun Club (the "Gun Club"). Please allow this letter to highlight some of the relevant facts and law that the Zoning Board of Appeals (the "ZBA") must consider in deciding whether to uphold the Zoning Enforcement Officer's ("ZEO") interpretation of the situation.

Facts

On or about April 17, 2006 the Zoning Enforcement and Code Enforcement Officers for the Town, issued a cease and desist order preventing the Gun Club from continuing their operations at the site (the "Order"). The April 17, 2006 Order specifically indicated that, "It is our belief and understanding that the Cokertown Rod & Gun Club Inc. has expanded or extended

the nonconforming use on the above referenced parcel in violation of the Town of Red Hook Zoning Law Chapter 143, Article VIII."

During two subsequent public hearings, the Zoning Board of Appeals heard specific testimony relating to the significant expansion of such use from a relatively benign "hunting and fishing" club, to what is, ostensibly, a commercial, pay to shoot target range. The ZBA should uphold the findings of the Zoning Enforcement Officer and continue the cease and desist order, particularly with respect to the Outdoor Target Range.

The relevant law supports the Zoning Enforcement Officer's interpretation of the Town Zoning Code ("Code").

**The Cokertown Rod & Gun Club Has Impermissibly
Enlarged Their Nonconforming Use**

The right to continue a nonconforming use does not include the right to extend or enlarge it. *See, Incorp. Vill. of Laurel Hollow v. Owen*, 247 A.D.2d 585, 586, 669 N.Y.S.2d 222, 223 (2nd Dep't 1998); *Town of Bedford v. Peltz*, 283 AD.2d 568,570, 727 N.Y.S.2d 119, 121 (2nd Dep't 2001); *See Country Sam Inc. v. Bennett*, 192 AD.2d 448,597 N.Y.S.2d 13 (Pl Dep't 1993); *Tier Oil Corp. v. Egan*, 99 AD.2d 903,903,472 N.Y.S.2d 504, 505 (3d Dep't 1984). The law is replete with examples of cases where a change in volume or intensity of a particular use results in the impermissible expansion, variation or alteration of a non-conforming use, thereby rendering such use a "violation." *Rosbar Company v. Bd. of Appeals of the City of Long Beach, Nassau County, N.Y.*, 77 A.D.2d 568, 569, 429 N.Y.S.2d 910, 911 (2nd Dep't 1980); *Laurel Hollow*, 247 A.D.2d at 586, 669 N.Y.S.2d at 223.

For example, in *Rosbar*, the conversion of a seasonal summer hotel to a year-round facility resulted in a significant increase in demand for municipal services. *Rosbar*, 77 A.D.2d at 569,429 N.Y.S.2d at 912. In holding that the landowner had lost his nonconforming status, the court drew a distinction between a "sudden up-swing" in its summer clientele, and in broadening its operation by converting to a full year facility. *Rosbar*, 77 A.D.2d at 569, 429 N.Y.S.2d at 912. Specifically, the court stated, "While the mere increase in the volume in one's business may not constitute a change in use, a distinction is to be drawn where there has been a purposeful expansion of the nature of operation." *Rosbar*, 77 A.D.2d at 569,429 N.Y.S.2d at 912.

Similarly, landowners lose their "non-conforming" status by changing the intensity of use, especially when (as here) such use is more frequent and intrusive. *See Town of Bedford v. Pelz*, 283 AD.2d 568, 727 N.Y.S.2d 119 (2nd Dep't 1991). In *Pelz*, the Town sought declaration that a property owners' use of the property as an aircraft takeoff and landing area violated zoning ordinance. The Supreme Court (Nicolai, J.) denied summary judgment for town, and appeal was taken. The Second Department reversed the Supreme Court and held that sporadic recreational airplane flights by the property owner's predecessor did not create a pre-existing nonconforming

use such that it would permit the present owner to use a helicopter to commute to and from the property.

In essence, the appellate court held that because the prior landowner had only used the property for sporadic, recreational airplane flights, the present owner could not "expand" such use to permit daily commuting with a helicopter. *Id.* at 570, 727 N.Y.S.2d at 121. The use of a helicopter to commute was a significant and impermissible enlargement of the prior landowner's recreational airplane use in violation of the zoning ordinance.

Fair and intelligent land use planning tolerates nonconforming uses partly because property owners would otherwise suffer undue financial hardship if precipitously faced with discontinuance of an existing nonconforming use and loss of investment due to re-zoning. *Pelham Esplanade, Inc. v. Bd. of Trustees of Vill. of Pelham Manor*, 77 N.Y.2d 66, 70, 565 N.E.2d 508, 510, 563 N.Y.S.2d 759, 761 (1990); *Town of Bedford*, 283 A.D.2d at 570, 727 N.Y.S.2d at 121. This is not the case here.

Here, the evidence establishes that the Cokertown Rod & Gun Club has impermissibly enlarged the prior nonconforming use. For example, by the Gun Club's own written submissions (letter dated July 3, 2006) to the Zoning Board of Appeals, and testimony at the public hearings on this issue, it is clear that the Gun Club experienced an unexplained increase of approximately thirty-two (32%) percent of its membership, expanding from 119 in 2003 to 157 in 2004. Although the Gun Club has not provided sufficient information on this point, it appears that these increases can be attributed to the addition of fee-based "Range Members." These so-called "Range Members" have none of the trappings of full membership, except the right to discharge their firearms at the firing range after paying their club "dues and fees." [See letter from Cappillino & Rothchild, dated July 3, 2006].

In fact, the existing Gun Club constitution permits only twenty (20) "Voting Members," with full privileges. Logically, the social rod and gun club has been expanded to outside paying members who, by the terms of the Gun Club's own constitution, do not enjoy the full benefits of voting.

That the membership has swelled over the last two years is corroborated the fact that the Gun Club's Constitution and By-Laws were amended twice in 1993, and by the noise emanating from since 2004. In that regard, various homeowners have testified that the nature and duration and strength of the firearm noise increased dramatically over the past two years to become a constant disturbance. [See letters from the local community (including Perry, Rohatyn/Scobi, Miller, Horkan), testimony by the gun club members, and oral testimony from the adjoining property owners].

As in *Pelz*, the Gun Club has recently evolved from its roots as a social club established in 1955 to provide like-minded individuals a place to relax and socialize, to a pay-to-shoot target range, where none of the Range Members have the right or privilege to vote, to relax to socialize or use the other facilities offered by the Gun Club. Under the law in *Rosbar*, the purposeful expansion of its core operation is impermissible.

In this case, the Gun Club established as a "hunting and fishing club" did not contemplate the use of its property as a fee-based, pay to shoot "Outdoor Target Range" where non-voting limited access members discharge all types of weapons from "dawn to dusk." Indeed, by passing specific zoning ordinances concerning "Outdoor Target Ranges [Code Section 143-71(D)]," the Town Board specifically required all such "Outdoor Target Ranges" to be located on a property with at least fifty (50) acres and no closer than 500 feet from any property boundary. To permit the expanded use in this case would be to ignore the very law which the Town Board adopted.

Moreover, to permit the Gun Club to resume operation as a pay to shoot Outdoor Target Range would be an explicit violation of the Town of Red Hook noise ordinance. In that regard, by letter dated July 12, 2006, members of the Zoning Board of Appeals were advised by attorneys for Michael Rohatyn (199 Feller-Nemark Road), Grant & Lyons, that the Gun Club's discharge of firearms violates Zoning Code, Section 143-25 (A), concerning noise emanating from the Gun Club's property. [See copy Grant & Lyons letter dated July 12,2006, ZBA record].

Summary

I write to you express my client's request that the Zoning Board of Appeals issue an order which upholds the enforcement of the zoning regulations cited in the cease and desist order dated April 17, 2006. Specifically, it is my client's position that the Zoning Board of Appeals should prohibit any Outdoor Target shooting on the ground that the Gun Club has impermissibly expanded its non-conforming use.

Should the Gun Club wish to resume Outdoor Target shooting on the grounds it has the legal right to apply for a Special Permit under Article VI (Special Permit Uses), and a variance from such Special Permit Use. It is our firm belief that any ruling to the contrary would specifically ignore Code Section 143-71(D), as well as the spirit of the law concerning the expansion of non-conforming uses.

Sincerely,



Peter Klose

Cc: Lea Cassarino, Clerk of the ZBA
zba@iJredhook.org

Susan McCann
[smccann\(@redhook.org\)](mailto:smccann@redhook.org)

Christine M. Chale, Esq.
Rapport, Meyer, Whitbeck, Shaw & Rodenhausen **LLP**
35 Main Street, Suite 541
Poughkeepsie, New York 12601
f(845) 473-7790 and E-Mail (845) 473-7766

Jeffrey Rothchild
[cappillino\(@cappillino.com\)](mailto:cappillino@cappillino.com)

Mickey Steinman, Esq.

Drayton Grant
Grant & Lyons

I am a resident of Upper Red Hook on 62 Old Post Rd. near the junction with Spring Lake Road. I have three children.

I am very disturbed to hear that semi-automatic weapons are being fired down the road from us.

I ask what about the welfare of all the children in this neighborhood? Most folks have no idea this activity is taking place. And if they did, I can assure you the entire hamlet would be outraged.

Hasn't Red Hook seen enough tragedy already ~~before~~ because of accidents with firearms? Why are we playing the odds with fate? For some bit of sport?

This really makes no sense. Let us use our intelligence and create a safe neighborhood. That is the mission of our governing bodies. I hope the gunfire stops. Vicky

7/11/06

To Whom It May Concern:

I am a property owner at 171 Feller-Newmark Rd. I am concerned about the situation with the Cokertown Rod and Gun Club. My property is within hearing distance of the Gun Club. Over the past several months I have noticed an increase in the amount of gun shot noise from northeast of my property. I'm concerned for safety, noise disturbance and property value. I never realized the gun shot noise was coming from the Club. The topographical photos showing my property and the Gun Club made me question the traveling distance of a bullet. Enclosed is a page from a book on Physics. A single bullet can travel as far as 6000 yards. I'm not sure about the direct line distance between my property and the Gun Club but it makes me leery about exploring my property. Although at this time my house is not on the Real Estate market, I do understand how this directly affects the overall value of my property and ease of selling. I would like to see a more controlled environment at the Gun Club, (i.e.: to conform to **and** comply with town code).

Sincerely,

David Miller

Speed of a Bullet

The Physics Factbook™

Edited by Glenn Elert -- Written by
his students An educational, [Fair](#)
[Use website](#)

[topic index](#) | [author index](#) | [special index](#)

Bibliographic Entry	Result (w/surrounding text)	Result															
Cutnell, John D. & Johnson, Kenneth W. <i>Physics.3rd ed.</i> New York: Wiley, 208-209.	"With this value for v_x , it is now possible to determine the speed of the bullet .. , +896 m/s"	896 m/s															
Ballistics. The <i>World Book Encyclopedia</i> . New York: World Book, 1998.	"With modern propulsion techniques, the projectile's initial velocity may be as high as 4000 feet (1200 meters) per second for some rifles and 5000 feet (1500 meters) per second for some large guns."	1200 - 1500 mls															
Bullet The <i>World Book Encyclopedia</i> . New York: World Book, 1998.	"The <i>velocity</i> (speed) of rifle bullets varies between 600 and 5000 feet (180 and 1500 meters) per second. Some bullets can hit targets as far away as 6000 yards (5000 meters)."	180 - 1500 m1s															
Petzal, David E. "How fast is a speeding bullet." <i>Field and Stream</i> . 97 (1992): 23 .	<table border="0"> <tr> <td>.22 rimfire cartridge</td> <td>1200 - 1500 fps</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>.22 centerfire cartridge</td> <td>2400 - 3000 fps</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>.22 Swift</td> <td>4000fps</td> <td>180 - 1220 mls</td> </tr> <tr> <td>.38 Special</td> <td>600fps</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>.221 Fireball</td> <td>2650fps</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	.22 rimfire cartridge	1200 - 1500 fps		.22 centerfire cartridge	2400 - 3000 fps		.22 Swift	4000fps	180 - 1220 mls	.38 Special	600fps		.221 Fireball	2650fps		
.22 rimfire cartridge	1200 - 1500 fps																
.22 centerfire cartridge	2400 - 3000 fps																
.22 Swift	4000fps	180 - 1220 mls															
.38 Special	600fps																
.221 Fireball	2650fps																

Everyone knows that Superman is faster than a speeding bullet, but how fast does a speeding bullet travel? Speeds fluctuate and depend upon several factors.

Gravity makes a projectile fall toward the earth while in flight. The projectile's size, shape, and the air density affect the speed by which it travels. Air resistance slows the speed of a bullet and reduces the distance by which it travels.

The velocity of a bullet is given in feet per second (fps) in the United States. The 0.22 rimfire cartridge, which has a very small powder charge, sends its bullets on their way at between 370 *m/s* and 460 *m/s*. Cartridges in rifles - centerfire cartridges - propel their bullets at a much faster rate. The 0.220 Swift, which drives a very small bullet at over 1220 *mis*, is the cartridge with the highest velocity.

Shotgun pellets vary very little in velocity. The slowest speed at 335 *mis*, while the fastest travel at close to 427 *m/s*.

Cokertown Shooting events Prior to and after 1993.

Red Hook Police and DEC used range for qualifying - not sure of all dates (picture) There was a

least one cannon (civil war type) shoot. (picture)

See pictures from 1982 - 1990 and unknown dates

1989

Open Trap & Target shooting - Rifle, Pistol & Shotgun Turkey
shoots - public - Spring, Summer & Fall
Coon Club Events - 2 to 3 per year
Trout & Pheasant Stocking
Family Day - member families Shooting & BBa
Hunter safety classes 3 per year
Hunting - fishing On & off Property

1990

Open Trap & Target shooting - Rifle, Pistol & Shotgun Turkey
shoots - public - Spring, Summer & Fall
Coon Club Events - 2 to 3 per year
Trout & Pheasant Stocking
Hunter safety classes 3 per year
Hunting - fishing On & off Property

1991

Open Trap & Target shooting - Rifle, Pistol & Shotgun Turkey
shoots - public - Spring & Fall
Coon Club Events - 2 to 3 per year
Trout & Pheasant Stocking
Family Day
Hunter safety classes 3 per year Hunting
- fishing On & off Property

1992

Open Trap & Target shooting - Rifle, Pistol & Shotgun Turkey
shoots - public - Spring & Fall
Coon Club Events - 2 to 3 per year
Trout & Pheasant Stocking
Family Day
Hunter safety classes 3 per year Hunting
- fishing On & off Property monthly trap
shoots
Sight-ctay

1993

Open Trap & Target shooting - Rifle, Pistol & Shotgun Turkey
shoots - public - Spring & Fall
Coon Club Events - 2 to 3 per year
Trout & Pheasant Stocking
Family Day
Hunter safety classes 3 per year
Hunting - fishing
monthly trap shoots
Sight-day

1994 -1995

Open Trap & Target shooting - Rifle, Pistol & Shotgun Turkey
shoots - Spring & Fall
Coon Club Events - 2 to 3 per year
Trout & Pheasant Stocking
monthly trap shoots
Hunter safety classes 3 per year
Sight-day

1996 -1999

same as above - (No Coon Club)plus
Bowling pin shoots
Steel plate shoots
Trap team
Sporting rifle league
Team Challenge with other clubs Pistol
team - Shoots in Pougkeepsie.

2000 -2005

Turkey shoots - Spring & Fall Hunter
safety classes 2 per year Sight-day
22 Cal Metallic Silhouette Shoots 3 per year

2006 CLOSED

Descriptions

Turkey Shoot. - 15 to 30 targets set-up per "line". When "line" is full 15 to 30 people shoot at once. This is done 30 to 40 times from 1 0:00am to about 5:00pm. Alternating "lines between Shotguns, rifles and pistols.

Coon Club events - monthly meetings + 2 or three coon hunts with dogs on ours and nearby properties.

Stocked trout in our stream at our expense for our members use.

Stocked Pheasant at our expense on land accessible for public hunting.

Family day - all day event for members and families - shooting events rifle, pistol & shotgun + BBQ.

Hunter safety classes - taught by volunteer certified instructors - 2 class room sessions - with a final day of shooting rifles and shotgun to qualify for hunting license. 3 time a year with 20 to 30 in attendance.

Bowling pin & steel plate shoots - are similar 5 or six shooters using shoot gun or pistols shoot at the same time fastest to hit all targets wins.

Team challenge (copy or rules included) misc rifle shotgun & pistol events in competition with other clubs.

Sporting rifle league - Qualification rounds 40 to 80 shots per shooter - training to develop marksmanship and safety. Once a week spring thru fall - attended by 6 to 10 shooters.

Metalic Silhouette 22 cal - 6 to 16 shooters shooting at 5 targets at the same time. Total of 40 targets at different ranges. High score wins. Run from 9:00am to 1 :00pm - 3 times a year. Rules included.

Monthly trap shoots - 5 stand spring thru fall Sat mom 9:00am to 1:00pm. 8 to 10 shooters shot 3 or 4 rounds (25 clays each round) with shot guns.

Pistol Team shot in Poughkeepsie DCPA. practiced on our range.

Sight -day Sunday before deer season open range to public to allow them to sight in the guns they will hunt with.

Hunting - Turkey and deer hunting can be done by any member, but is usually left for older members who are not able to hunt in rugged terrain