

**TOWN OF MAYFIELD PLANNING BOARD
FEBRUARY 19, 2014
6:30 P.M.
TOWN OF MAYFIELD TOWN HALL**

MEETING NOTES

PRESENT:

**ROBERT PHILLIPS, CHAIRMAN
MALCOLM (RICK) SIMMONS, VICE CHAIRMAN
MARILYN SALVIONE
JOHN KESSLER
AARON HOWLAND**

**GARY MAZZARELLI, ALTERNATE
ROBERTA RICCIARDI, ALTERNATE
MICHAEL STEWART, CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFICER
SEAN M. GERAGHTY, SR. PLANNER**

OTHERS PRESENT:

**VINCE COLLETTI, COUNCILMAN
JON CLOSE
HERBERT VANGUILDER, SURVEYOR**

I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER:

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m.

Planning Board Chairman Robert Phillips welcomed Roberta Ricciardi as the new Alternate Member for the Planning Board.

II. APPROVE MINUTES OF LAST REGULAR MEETING:

MOTION: To approve the minutes to the December 18, 2013 meeting.

MADE BY: Rick Simmons

SECONDED: John Kessler

VOTE: 5 in favor, 0 opposed

III. JON CLOSE – LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT ALONG LAKEVIEW ROAD:

A. Background:

Jon Close owns parcels along both the east and west side of Lakeview Road in the Town of Mayfield. Tax Map Parcel No. 88.-4-25 is located on the east side of Lakeview Road and is approximately 3.46+/- acres in size. Tax Map Parcel No. 88.-4-26 is located on both the west and east side of Lakeview Road and is approximately 41.1+/- acres in size. Mr. Close would like to take that portion of Tax Map Parcel No. 26 on the east side of the road and add it to Parcel No. 25 to create a 5.39+/- acre parcel on the east side of Lakeview Road.

B. Issues:

1. Mr. Close has not submitted a letter to the Planning Board requesting the lot line amendment.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Phillips noted that Mr. Close has now submitted a letter requesting the lot line amendment. A copy of the letter was distributed to each of the Planning Board members prior to the start of the meeting.

2. Does the Planning Board wish to see a notation on the survey map indicating that only the portion of Tax Map No. 26 that is located on the east side of Lakeview Road will be combined with Tax Map Parcel No. 25?

DISCUSSION: After a brief discussion, there was a general consensus that the notation indicating that only the portion of Tax Map Parcel No. 26 on the east side of the road will be combined with Tax Map Parcel No. 25 would not need to be provided.

3. The title of the map should read Lot Line Adjustment for Lands of Jon H. Close.

DISCUSSION: The Planning Board felt that the title of the map should be corrected.

4. A notation should be made to the map indicating that the portion of Tax Map No. 26 that is located on the east side of Lakeview Road will be combined with Tax Map Parcel No. 25 to create one (1) single undivided lot.

DISCUSSION: Town Code Enforcement Officer Mike Stewart pointed out that the Planning Board's regulations for lot line adjustments stipulate that this type of notation be made on a lot line adjustment.

There was a general consensus amongst Board members that a notation should be made on the revised drawing.

MOTION: To approve Jon Close's lot line adjustment along Lakeview Road.

MADE BY: Aaron Howland
SECONDED: Marilyn Salvione
VOTE: 5 in favor, 0 opposed

Mr. Geraghty indicated that he would send a letter to Mr. Close identifying the two (2) changes that need to be made on the drawing for the Planning Board's records.

IV. SOUTH EAST PRICE CORPORATION – LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT ALONG NYS ROUTE 30:

A. Background:

South East Price Corporation owns an 11.6 acre 4-lot subdivision along the east side of NYS Route 30 on the Great Sacandaga Lake (Tax Map Parcel No. 88.-4-15.12). The subdivision was determined to be exempt from the Town's Subdivision Regulations in 2012. However, the Adirondack Park Agency has determined that Lot No. 1 in the subdivision is a "non-shoreline lot" and must have a minimum area of 2.75 acres. In order to provide Lot No. 1 with 2.75 acres, 15,466+/- sq. ft. of land from Lot No. 2 will be added to Lot No. 1. Lot No. 2, which is a shoreline lot, will be reduced in size from 2.82+/- acres to 2.46+/- acres.

B. Issues:

All of the information that is required under Section 404 B of the Town of Mayfield Land Subdivision Regulations has been included on the survey drawing.

DISCUSSION: The Planning Board felt that all of the required information had been provided on the lot line adjustment and that no further information was needed from the applicant.

MOTION: To approve South East Price Corporation's lot line adjustment along NYS Route 30.

MADE BY: Rick Simmons
SECONDED: Aaron Howland
VOTE: 5 in favor, 0 opposed

V. ROBERT STONE – SITE PLAN FOR HARDWARE STORE ALONG NYS ROUTE 30:

A. Background:

Robert Stone owns a piece of property along the west side of NYS Route 30 in the Town of Mayfield. The property is approximately 21.4 acres in size (Tax Map Parcel No. 88.-3-3). Mr. Stone would like to use an existing building on the front portion of the property as a hardware store. His future plans for the site call for the construction of a 30' x 50' outdoor storage building behind the existing building. Three (3) off-street parking spaces are proposed in front of the hardware store, while seven (7) additional spaces are proposed behind the building.

B. Code Enforcement Office/Planning Department Review:

The Town of Mayfield Code Enforcement Office and the Fulton County Planning Department have reviewed the Site Plan application in accordance with the Town of Mayfield Zoning Regulations and would like to offer the following comments:

1. A project narrative describing the proposal and any future plans for the hardware store should be provided for the Planning Board's review.

DISCUSSION: The Planning Board felt that a project narrative would be helpful and should be provided by the applicant.

2. Tax Map Parcel No. 88.-3-3 has not been shown on the Site Plan drawing.

DISCUSSION: The Planning Board felt that a tax map of the property should be superimposed on the Site Plan drawing so that the Planning Board can see the shape of the property and understand what portion of the site will be used for the business.

3. The creek/water course shown on the Site Plan drawing should be labeled or identified.

DISCUSSION: The Planning Board felt that the creek/water course shown on the Site Plan should be labeled. There was a brief discussion regarding the nature of the water course. Planning Board Member Rick Simmons questioned what one of the symbols (box) on the water course stood for?

Mr. Geraghty indicated that he did not know what the symbol meant but speculated that it could identify a culvert or even a small bridge over the water course. The Planning Board felt that the symbol should be identified on a revised Site Plan drawing.

4. Measurements for the driveway access point to the property should be noted on the Site Plan drawing.

DISCUSSION: The Planning Board felt that the actual dimensions of the driveway access point must be shown on the revised Site Plan drawing.

Mr. Phillips noted that he felt it may be difficult for tractor trailers to enter and exit the site. He noted that loading and unloading areas on the property will need to be identified.

Mr. Stewart pointed out that the three (3) parking areas in front of the building will require drivers to back onto NYS Route 30A when leaving the site.

5. A loading area for the hardware store should be identified on the Site Plan drawing.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Simmons asked if the applicant had provided a design for the septic system that has been installed on the property?

Mr. Stewart indicated that the septic system is relatively new and that he has a copy of the septic system plan in his office.

Mr. Simmons stated that he felt the distance between the proposed propane station and the building to be used for the hardware store should be identified.

Mr. Stewart pointed out that the applicant has submitted a jurisdictional inquiry form to the Adirondack Park Agency to find out if that Agency will be issuing any permits for the project.

Mr. Geraghty explained that given the driveway access point on NYS Route 30 and the location of the property in the Adirondack Park, the Planning Board will need to coordinate a SEQR review with other Involved Agencies in order to find out what other permits and stipulations may be placed on this type of project.

6. Any screening to be provided around the dumpster area should be noted.

DISCUSSION: The Planning Board felt that screening for the dumpster should be noted.

7. The location of utilities servicing the building on the property should be identified.

DISCUSSION: The Planning Board noted that the location of utilities servicing the building on the property should be identified.

8. The design of the proposed sign advertising the business should be included on the Site Plan drawing.

DISCUSSION: After a brief discussion, the Planning Board felt that the design of the proposed sign for the business should be included on the Site Plan drawing.

9. A proposed planting schedule for the landscaping plan should be identified.

DISCUSSION: The Planning Board asked that a planting schedule for the landscaping plan be identified.

10. The location and design of any new outdoor lights on the property must be identified.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Stewart pointed out that the applicant has shown four (4) flood lights around the perimeter of the building.

Mr. Geraghty indicated that the illumination pattern for the lights on the front portion of the building may need to be provided.

Mr. Simmons asked if lights would be provided near the propane filling station or in the back parking lot?

Mr. Stewart indicated that he did not know what the applicant intended to do.

Aaron Howland talked briefly about a stormwater plan for the site. He pointed out that the water course shown on the drawing may be a classified trout stream. He also noted that there is a DEC-regulated wetland on the property that could be impacted by stormwater runoff.

Mr. Geraghty explained that if a total of one (1) acre of land is not disturbed as part of this project, then a stormwater plan will not need to be filed with NYSDEC. He noted that the applicant intends to use an existing building and create two (2) small parking areas which may not exceed one (1) acre of land. He pointed out that the outdoor display area could add to the amount of disturbance.

Mr. Stewart noted that he didn't believe the 30' x 50' outdoor display area involved the construction of any building, but was simply an area that would be designated for outdoor storage of materials.

There was a general consensus amongst Board members that the revised Site Plan drawing will need to clarify what the outdoor storage area will be used for and that the screening of the area may need to be shown on the revised plans.

Mr. Howland pointed out that a significant amount of clearing and excavation has already taken place on the property.

Mr. Geraghty indicated that the applicant will need to be careful about moving too much material on the site before any permits are issued. He cited a project along NYS Route 29A where a developer was fined by NYSDEC for removing trees and excavating a portion of the property prior to subdividing residential building lots.

Mr. Stewart noted that the applicant has attempted to clean up the property and has done a nice job of fixing it up.

11. The location of any existing or proposed easements, deed restrictions or covenants should be noted on the Site Plan drawing.

DISCUSSION: The Planning Board agreed that any easements, deed restrictions or covenants will need to be noted on the revised Site Plan.

C. State Environmental Quality Review:

Section 617.1 of 6 NYCRR states that, the basic purpose of SEQR is to incorporate the consideration of environmental factors into the existing planning, review and decision making processes of State, regional and local government agencies at the earliest possible time. To accomplish this goal, SEQR requires that all agencies determine whether the actions they directly undertake, fund or approve may have a significant effect on the environment, and if it is determined that the actions may have a significant effect, prepare or request an environmental impact statement. Under these terms, the review of a site plan application is subject to SEQR. Therefore, the following issues must be addressed:

1. Does the Planning Board feel that the Short Environmental Assessment Form, provided by the applicant, has been completed adequately?

DISCUSSION: The Planning Board agreed that given the amount of information that still needs to be provided by the applicant, the SEQR process should not be initiated.

D. Planning Board Action:

In accordance with Section 906 of the Town of Mayfield Zoning Law, the Planning Board shall fix a time within sixty-two (62) days from the day the Planning Board determines an application for Site Plan review to be complete for a public hearing on the application for site plan approval. Consequently, does the Planning Board feel that it has sufficient information to schedule a public hearing on Robert Stone's site plan application at this time?

MOTION: To table any action on Robert Stone's Site Plan application for a new hardware store along NYS Route 30 until additional information has been provided.

MADE BY: Marilyn Salvione

SECONDED: Rick Simmons

VOTE: 5 in favor, 0 opposed

VI. NEW YORK SOLAR SMART PROGRAM:

A. Background:

The US Department of Energy's Sunshot Initiative is a national effort that focuses on making solar energy cost competitive with other forms of electricity by the end of the decade. The Department of Energy has funded multiple programs under this Sunshot Initiative including the Rooftop Solar Challenge that focuses on the permitting costs of installing solar systems.

In New York State, the NY-Sun Initiative has committed \$1.5 billion dollars over the next ten (10) years to quadruple the amount of new solar systems installed over 2011 levels by reducing the cost of residential solar installations.

In 2006, solar energy production in New York City was negligible due to extensive barriers that included technical and policy requirements, a lack of incentives, standardization or confusion among agencies and utilities. City University of New York (CUNY) took on a lead role and convened stakeholders to collaborate on drafting and implementing a strategic solar plan for New York City. The work included multiple reports, the development of new tools such as the world's largest interactive solar map for New York City's 1 million rooftop analytics and the creation of solar empowerment zones. The result of CUNY's collective efforts with its partners has been an exponential increase in solar production and solar jobs. New York City went from producing

approximately 1 megawatt of solar power to 25 megawatts of solar power and this capture of solar energy continues to grow.

Now CUNY is reaching out beyond New York City to seek out community partners interested in adopting a New York State Unified Solar Permit that will offer an expedited solar permit process for small-scale photovoltaic systems. CUNY is partnering with the NYS Energy Research Development Authority (NYSERDA) in an effort to continue New York State's surge in solar production. CUNY has worked with 16 local governments in the State, including Clifton Park, and has surveyed 93 communities throughout the State. The survey results have shown that the permitting process varies throughout New York State and presents an area where the costs associated with developing and installing more solar panels can be reduced by streamlining the permitting processes.

B. Program Focus:

Since 2007, the cost of the physical components of photovoltaic systems has decreased notably. However, the costs associated with individual municipal permitting of these systems has increased. CUNY has attempted to develop a permit system that targets standardization for residential rooftop installations of 12 kilowatts or less. CUNY is attempting to develop a NYS Unified Solar Permit that would standardize the permitting process for residential rooftop installations of 12 kilowatts or less and hopefully begin to reduce the costs associated with the permitting process. As the costs of the physical components have decreased, the bureaucratic costs associated with permitting these types of systems has grown to represent a larger percentage of the total project costs. The NYS Unified Solar Permit would be issued by local Code Enforcement Officers. The Permit System incorporates guidelines for expediting and improving the solar permitting process. The permit system will include training for Code Enforcement Officers in solar installations through New York Sun Trainers Network (NY-SUN) funded by NYSERDA.

(See attachments.)

C. Cleaner Greener Communities Funding:

Municipalities that adopt the New York State Unified Solar Permit System by September 2014 will be eligible through the Consolidated Funding Application process to receive a \$2,500 grant.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Geraghty briefly explained the New York Solar Smart Program that is being pursued by City University of New York (CUNY) and NYSERDA. He indicated that Mr. Stewart will need to look at the proposed Unified Solar Permit System and see if he has any

concerns with the Town adopting this type of permit. Mr. Geraghty encouraged Board members to review the information that was handed out and to discuss this matter at their March meeting.

VII. OTHER BUSINESS:

A. Henry Whipple - Water Testing for Sand Hill Road Subdivision:

(See attached letter.)

DISCUSSION: Mr. Phillips read Mr. Whipple's letter to Planning Board members. He indicated that he felt the Planning Board was very reasonable with its request that Mr. Whipple drill a test well on the lot closest to the former Mayfield landfill and have the water tested under NYSDEC Guidelines. After a brief discussion, there was a general consensus amongst Board members that Mr. Whipple should not be allowed to provide any other form of testing other than what the Planning Board has requested him to do.

MOTION: To deny Mr. Whipple's request to test neighboring property owners' wells.

MADE BY: Rick Simmons
SECONDED: John Kessler
VOTE: 5 in favor, 0 opposed

B. Chairman's Update:

Mr. Phillips noted that there will be a SEQR training opportunity on Wednesday, February 26th, at Fulton-Montgomery Community College (FMCC). He encouraged Board members to register if they intend to attend the training session.

Mr. Geraghty added that this training session will provide four (4) hours of training for those in attendance. He indicated that officials have estimated that the sessions will probably conclude around 8:15 p.m. However, Mr. Geraghty pointed out that he encouraged those officials to take their time during the presentations and allow those in attendance plenty of opportunity to ask questions regarding the new SEQR forms.

C. Code Enforcement Update:

1. Mr. Stewart indicated that Lorraine Diamond (Clubs-N-Suds) intends to demolish the former Holland House Restaurant on the corner of NYS Route 29A and 29. He speculated that once the building has been removed from the site, Ms. Diamond may reappear before the Planning Board with a new project for the property.

2. Mr. Stewart indicated that Michael O'Brien, who recently received a Site Plan approval from the Planning Board to expand his insurance company along NYS Route 30, will no longer be undertaking the project. Mr. Stewart indicated that Mr. O'Brien has purchased the old City National Bank building and will be moving his business to that site. Mr. Stewart indicated that Mr. O'Brien has not indicated what he intends to do with the building on NYS Route 30.
3. Mr. Stewart handed out a copy of proposed Sign Regulation amendments that will be discussed at the next Town Board meeting. He encouraged Board members to review those changes so that they can discuss the issue at their next regularly-scheduled Board meeting.
4. Mr. Stewart indicated that Atlantic Realty has contacted his office regarding a property near the former Alvord's Leather Store on NYS Route 30. He indicated that the company seems very interested in the property but has not indicated what type of project they will pursue.

VIII. CLOSE OF THE MEETING:

MOTION: To close the meeting at 6:47 p.m.

MADE BY: Rick Simmons

SECONDED: John Kessler

VOTE: 5 in favor, 0 opposed