

**TOWN OF MAYFIELD PLANNING BOARD
NOVEMBER 19, 2014
6:00 P.M.
TOWN OF MAYFIELD TOWN HALL**

MEETING NOTES

PRESENT:

**ROBERT PHILLIPS, CHAIRMAN
JOHN KESSLER
AARON HOWLAND
ROBERTA RICCIARDI, ALTERNATE
MICHAEL STEWART, CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFICER
SEAN M. GERAGHTY, SR. PLANNER**

OTHERS PRESENT:

**VINCE COLLETTI, TOWN COUNCILMAN
ROBERT FRANK, APPLICANT
STEVEN SMITH, P.E.
WALLY HART, LEXINGTON CENTER
JACK PUTMAN**

I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER:

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

II. APPROVE MINUTES OF LAST REGULAR MEETING:

MOTION: To approve the minutes to the September 17, 2014 meeting.

MADE BY: John Kessler
SECONDED: Roberta Ricciardi
VOTE: 4 in favor, 0 opposed

III. ROBERT FRANK – SITE PLAN FOR RMF MOTOR SPORTS EXPANSION:

A. Background:

Robert Frank currently operates RMF Motor Sports from his property at 338 Riceville Road in the Town of Mayfield (Tax Map Parcel No. 103.4-1-16.111). RMF Motor Sports is a custom detailing business. Mr. Frank's clients include mostly high-end vintage car owners. The parcel is approximately 1.92 acres in size. There is an existing building on the site that houses the business. Mr. Frank would like to construct a second 42' x 105' building to expand his operation to include painting and body work.

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. Is any new signage proposed for the business expansion?

DISCUSSION: Mr. Frank indicated that he will be providing no signage for the second building. He indicated that he likes to keep his business somewhat inconspicuous.

2. Is any buffering provided around the existing dumpster and will additional dumpster space be necessary as a result of the proposed expansion?

DISCUSSION: Mr. Frank indicated that he doesn't even fill the existing dumpster and will not likely need a second dumpster for the new building.

3. The location and design of any new lighting on the property should be identified.

DISCUSSION: Planning Board members pointed out that there is a notation on the drawing indicating that area lighting will be mounted on the building.

Mr. Geraghty pointed out that the actual location of that lighting has not been identified.

Mr. Frank indicated that he would put the lighting on the new building in the same locations as the existing building.

The Planning Board did not feel any additional information regarding the lighting was necessary.

4. Percolation and pit test results for the new septic system must be provided.

DISCUSSION: Town Code Enforcement Officer Mike Stewart pointed out that the proposed septic field location is in the same spot as the septic field location for the existing building. Mr. Stewart indicated that he believed John King, P.E. did the septic system design for the first building.

Planning Board Chairman Robert Phillips asked if a new well would be necessary?

Mr. Frank indicated that he didn't have a definitive answer to that question but hoped to use the same well.

Planning Board Member John Kessler asked if an Elgin type system would need to be installed for the second building?

Mr. Stewart indicated that he believed just a pipe and stone system was used for the existing building.

Eventually, the Planning Board felt that percolation and pit test results for the new septic field location should be provided.

Mr. Stewart indicated to Mr. Frank that he would check his records to see what type of design was used on the first system.

5. Will any landscaping be provided as part of this project?

DISCUSSION: Mr. Frank indicated that there are a few trees shown on the Site Plan drawing that will be new plantings.

Mr. Geraghty suggested that those trees be labeled as new plantings.

6. The locations for employee parking and pedestrian access on the site should be noted.

DISCUSSION: The Planning Board held a lengthy discussion concerning the grading plan for the property.

Mr. Kessler indicated that he would like to know how the stormwater will reach the drainage swale that is shown on the drawings.

Mr. Geraghty agreed that the drawing does not have enough information for the Board to determine how stormwater will flow to the drainage swale.

Mr. Frank indicated that his existing building is actually elevated about 5 feet above the grade shown on the drawing and that he intends to elevate the second building which will provide a natural drainage swale between the two (2) buildings.

Mr. Geraghty pointed out that the finished floor elevations of both buildings, along with any grading that is done around the buildings, should be shown on the drawings. Eventually, the Planning Board agreed that the finished floor elevations of both buildings should be identified on the drawing along with contours showing the grading near the buildings so that the Planning Board can determine how stormwater will reach the drainage swale.

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 felt that the Short Environmental Assessment Form had been completed adequately.

2. Does the Planning Board feel that any additional information should be provided as part of the SEQR process?

DISCUSSION: Mr. Geraghty asked Mr. Frank if he had talked to anyone at NYSDEC regarding an Air Permit for the painting operation?

Mr. Frank indicated that he had not touched base with NYSDEC.

Planning Board Member Aaron Howland noted that he has a body shop operation and explained that there is an Air Permit that may be needed for this aspect of the business.

Mr. Geraghty suggested that the Planning Board coordinate the SEQR review with the NYSDEC in order to get that agency to identify, in writing, any permits that are needed.

Mr. Stewart asked if the Planning Board should change Question #2 dealing with other Agency Permits to a “Yes” answer?

Mr. Geraghty noted that if a permit is needed, NYSDEC will note that the form needs to be changed.

3. Section 617.6 (b)(3) of 6 NYCRR states that, when an agency proposes to directly undertake, fund or approve a Type 1 or Unlisted Action undergoing a Coordinated Review with other agencies, it must, as soon as possible, transmit Part 1 of the Environmental Assessment Form, completed by the Project Sponsor, or a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and a copy of any application that has been received to all Involved Agencies and notify them that a Lead Agency must be agreed upon within thirty (30) calendar days of the date the Environmental Assessment Form or DEIS was transmitted to them.

MOTION: To classify the proposed project as an Unlisted Action and to propose that the Town of Mayfield Planning Board act as the Lead Agency for the purpose of issuing a Determination of Significance under SEQR and to offer the other Involved Agencies twenty-five (25) calendar days to comment on the proposed action or the Planning Board’s proposal to act as Lead Agency.

MADE BY: Roberta Ricciardi
SECONDED: Aaron Howland
VOTE: 4 in favor, 0 opposed

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 Frank's site plan for RMF Motor Sports Expansion along Riceville Road?

MOTION: To schedule a public hearing on Robert Frank's Site Plan for RMF Motor Sports Expansion for 6:00 p.m., Wednesday, December 17, 2014.

MADE BY: John Kessler
SECONDED: Roberta Ricciardi
VOTE: 4 in favor, 0 opposed

VII. OTHER BUSINESS:

A. Lexington Center – Concept Plan for Project at the Intersection of NYS Route 30 and 30A:

Steven Smith, P.E. explained that Lexington Center is in the process of buying Tim Delaney's former building which is now owned by Tetra Tech near the intersection of NYS Route 30 and 30A. He indicated that Lexington will use the building for a number of programs. He indicated that there won't be very many Site Plan ramifications that will result from Lexington's proposal. He explained that Lexington will have assembly space, show space and student classrooms in the building. He indicated that parking for larger events may be an issue that needs to be addressed. He pointed out that there are currently two (2) septic systems servicing the buildings on the property. He indicated that the size of the systems may not be sufficient to handle the number of students and employees that will be located in the buildings so that a new septic system may need to be designed. He indicated that, given the sandy soils on the property, there is plenty of room for the new system. He showed Board members the existing drawings of the site and indicated that Lexington would like to come back to the Board on December 17, 2014 with a preliminary Site Plan submittal.

Wally Hart indicated that Lexington's proposal for the Tetra Tech building will serve two (2) purposes. First, Lexington will build the Paul Nigra Center for Creative Arts inside the facility. He indicated that there will be community space inside this portion of the building. He explained that existing offices will be retrofitted into art studies. He noted that the open area inside the structure would be left alone. He then indicated that the two-story building on the property will

serve as a college and career preparatory program facility. He indicated that Lexington would like to use the building to attract students to two (2) programs. He explained that the first program will be a summer program in partnership with Fulton-Montgomery Community College. He indicated that Lexington will conduct three (3) 3-week sessions for students that have either attention deficit disorders or various forms of autism and will teach them life skills such as time management that will allow them to function at the College level. He indicated that Lexington will rent dormitory facilities at Fulton-Montgomery Community College (FMCC) to house the students.

Secondly, Mr. Hart indicated that, throughout the year, Lexington would like to partner with FMCC to provide extra skills to students that would otherwise not be able to attend FMCC. He indicated that there are no plans to change the outside of the Tetra Tech building. He indicated that there will be 25 new positions created for the project. He indicated that, for large events at the facility, there will need to be some extra space for parking identified on the site.

Planning Board Chairman Bob Phillips asked if there were any plans for the other building on the property?

Mr. Hart indicated that Lexington is still negotiating with Tetra Tech to continue leasing the other building. Otherwise, he indicated that there are no other plans for the building.

Planning Board Member Aaron Howland asked if the property would then be tax exempt because it will be owned by a not-for-profit?

Mr. Hart indicated that it would be tax exempt but pointed out that he has had conversations with the Town's assessor and noted that if Lexington leases out a portion of the site to a commercial entity, then a portion of the site will generate tax revenues.

Mr. Geraghty asked Town Code Enforcement Officer Mike Stewart why the project is coming before the Planning Board?

Mr. Stewart indicated that any change of occupancy in a commercial building requires a Site Plan review.

Steve Smith indicated that there may be a few more exits provided on the building.

Mr. Geraghty asked for a clarification on the number of students that will be attending the three (3) 3-week programs during the summer?

Mr. Hart indicated that Lexington hopes to attract 20 kids to each of the programs that is conducted during each 3-week session. He indicated that a total of 60 students would then attend each 3-week session for a total of 180 students during the summer. He talked about Lexington's partnership with the University of Washington on a curriculum for the program and its work with Savannah College of Arts and Design. He pointed out that this is a private pay institution that will help bring additional revenues into the community.

Town Councilman Vince Colletti asked if the facility would be operated five (5) or seven (7) days per week?

Mr. Hart indicated that these types of students need "down time" and, therefore, there are days when they are in the classrooms and other days when they will be going on various excursions in the community.

Mr. Colletti asked what age group Lexington would be targeting?

Mr. Hart indicated that the programs are designed for 11th and 12th graders and individuals up to 25 years old. He noted that some of the students that will be targeted for these programs are individuals who attend college later in life. Mr. Hart explained that one of the reasons Lexington is working with FMCC is that Lexington can offer medical support to students who need this type of assistance.

Mr. Phillips asked if Lexington has any type of relationship with Nathan Littauer Hospital?

Mr. Hart indicated that Lexington does have an ongoing relationship with Nathan Littauer Hospital and actually has two (2) group homes that are located adjacent to the Hospital. He indicated that one of the marketing assets for the program is that the new facility will be located in close proximity to Nathan Littauer Hospital.

Planning Board Member Roberta Ricciardi asked if students will be recruited from all over the country?

Mr. Hart indicated that Lexington will be marketing the program throughout the U.S.

Mr. Stewart asked if there were any other expansion plans for the program?

Mr. Hart indicated that there are 60+ acres of land available for Lexington Center and the agency will have to consider its options for

future development of the site. He pointed out that Lexington is in the early stages of considering a program that would provide training to parents of students who have a variety of learning disabilities. Mr. Hart indicated that the Lexington Foundation is prepared to raise the money that is necessary to purchase the property and develop the new program on the site. He indicated that Lexington has submitted a Consolidated Funding Application to New York State and expects a decision on that application by December 10, 2014.

Mr. Geraghty pointed out that given the limited number of physical changes that will occur on the project site, Lexington's submittal for the December 2014 Planning Board meeting will need to include a narrative specifically outlining how the new facility will be operated. Mr. Geraghty suggested that a variety of notations be included on the Site Plan submittal that will give the Planning Board an idea of how the facility will be used by Lexington.

B. Code Enforcement Update:

Mr. Stewart indicated that the Dollar General Store Project in the Village of Mayfield should begin in the near future. He pointed out that the project in the new Marina District in the Village of Mayfield is also getting started. He indicated that the property owner has taken out a demolition permit for three (3) buildings.

Mr. Phillips asked what the status was for the driveway permit for the Dollar General Store? He questioned whether NYSDOT would be issuing a driveway cut for the project.

Mr. Stewart indicated that he believed NYSDOT would require Dollar General to push the driveway cut to the southern end of the property.

Mr. Stewart indicated that Robert Stone has been working with the Adirondack Park Agency, Army Corps of Engineers and NYSDEC on the mitigation he is expected to perform on his property before opening a hardware store along NYS Route 30. He indicated that Mr. Stone has been working on relocating the stream that he previously moved and is hoping to be open by Memorial Day.

Mr. Phillips then talked about a used car sales lot along NYS Route 30 that is causing site distance concerns for motorists. He indicated that he felt the cars on the property need to be moved further back on the lot.

Mr. Stewart indicated that the issue is strictly a NYSDOT matter since there is no approved Site Plan for the project.

C. Training:

Mr. Geraghty indicated that this year's training sessions at Fulton-Montgomery Community College (FMCC) are tentatively scheduled for Wednesday, February 11, 2014. He indicated that this year's topics will be Historic Preservation and Open Space Planning. He indicated that as details for the sessions are finalized, he will pass those along to Board members.

VIII. CLOSE OF THE MEETING:

MOTION: To close the meeting at 7:14 p.m.

MADE BY: Roberta Ricciardi

SECONDED: Aaron Howland

VOTE: 4 in favor, 0 opposed