

**TOWN OF MAYFIELD PLANNING BOARD
FEBRUARY 17, 2021
6:00 P.M.
TOWN OF MAYFIELD TOWN HALL**

MEETING NOTES

PRESENT:

**JOHN KESSLER, CHAIRMAN
AARON HOWLAND, VICE CHAIRMAN
JERRY MOORE
RICHARD MILES
RALPH DESIDERIO, ALTERNATE**

**SEAN M. GERAGHTY, CONSULTANT
DAMON CURLEY, CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFICER**

OTHERS PRESENT:

**DAVE BOGARDUS, NORTHEAST LAND SURVEYING
CHRIS FOSS, SURVEYOR
TRAVIS MITCHELL, P.E., ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN PARTNERSHIP
PAT VANHAVERBEKE, MAZUR CONSULTING
JUNELL PASQUARELLI**

I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER:

The meeting was called to order at 6:01 p.m.

II. APPROVE MINUTES OF LAST REGULAR MEETING:

MOTION: To approve the minutes to the September 16, 2020 meeting.

MADE BY: Richard Miles

SECONDED: Aaron Howland

VOTE: 4 in favor, 0 opposed

(Planning Board Alternate Ralph Desiderio arrived at the meeting.)

MOTION: To approve the minutes to the October 21, 2020 meeting.
MADE BY: Jerry Moore
SECONDED: Richard Miles
VOTE: 5 in favor, 0 opposed

MOTION: To approve the minutes to the November 18, 2020 meeting.
MADE BY: Aaron Howland
SECONDED: Richard Miles
VOTE: 5 in favor, 0 opposed

III. MICHAEL HUSEK AND CHRISTINE TABERSKI-HUSEK – PUBLIC HEARING ON SUBDIVISION ALONG NYS ROUTE 30 AND KETTLE ROAD:

A. Background:

Michael Husek and Christine Taberski-Husek own a piece of property along the east side of NYS Route 30 that goes all the way through to Kettle Road (Tax Map Parcel No. 152.-6-32). According to the subdivision plat, the existing parcel is approximately 3.5 acres in size. The applicants would like to split the property to create a building lot around each of the homes on the existing lot. Lot #1 will be approximately 2.2+/- acres in size, while Lot #2 will be approximately 1.35+/- acres in size.

B. November 18, 2020 Meeting:

During its November 18, 2020 meeting, the Town of Mayfield Planning Board began reviewing Michael Husek and Christine Taberski-Husek's subdivision application for a piece of property extending between NYS Route 30 and Kettle Road in the Town of Mayfield. At that time, the Planning Board asked that the following information be provided on a final plat prior to the public hearing:

1. A location map should be superimposed on the subdivision plat.

STATUS: Provided.

2. The Tax Map Parcel Number should be identified as 152.-6-32 in the title block.

STATUS: Provided.

3. The location of the wells and septic systems that currently serve each of the residences on the applicant's property should be identified.

STATUS: The approximate location of the septic area for Lot #1 has been identified. A proposed septic area has been shown for Lot #2. However, there are no percolation and pit test results for that septic system.

DISCUSSION: Planning Board members agreed that the percolation and pit test results for Lot #2 will need to be provided on the final plat.

4. Some type of notation should appear on the final plat indicating that there will be an easement for the chain link fence that surrounds the pool on what will be Lot #1 in the proposed subdivision and extends over the common boundary line to Lot #2.

STATUS: A notation has been added to the final plat.

5. The standard Health Department notation must be added to the drawing.

STATUS: Provided.

6. The Town's standard Right To Farm language should be added to the final plat.

STATUS: Provided.

C. State Environmental Quality Review:

During its November 18, 2020 meeting, the Town of Mayfield Planning Board authorized the filing of a negative declaration under SEQR for this proposed action. Consequently, unless new additional information has been provided, no further SEQR action is necessary.

D. Public Hearing:

1. The public hearing was opened at 6:04 p.m.

2. Speakers:

There was no one to speak regarding the Husek subdivision application.

3. The public hearing was closed at 6:05 p.m.

E. Planning Board Action:

In accordance with Section 1008(C) of the Town of Mayfield Zoning Law, the Planning Board shall issue its final decision within sixty-two (62) days from the date the public hearing is closed. Consequently, does the Planning Board wish to issue its final decision on the Husek subdivision application for a piece of property between NYS Route 30 and Kettle Road at this time?

MOTION: To conditionally approve Michael Husek and Christine Taberski- Husek's subdivision application for a piece of property between NYS Route 30 and Kettle Road with the stipulation that the percolation and pit test results for Lot #2 in the proposed subdivision be provided on the final plat.

MADE BY: John Kessler
SECONDED: Aaron Howland
VOTE: 5 in favor, 0 opposed

**IV. JACOB AND MAKIKO CICHY – PUBLIC HEARING ON SUBDIVISION
ALONG BROWER ROAD:**

A. Background:

Jacob and Makiko Cichy own a 21+/- acre lot along the south side of Brower Road in the Town of Mayfield (Tax Map Parcel No. 120.-2-70). There is an existing residence on the property. The applicants would like to create a 3-acre lot around the existing residence.

B. November 18, 2020 Meeting:

During its November 18, 2020 meeting, the Town of Mayfield Planning Board began reviewing Jacob and Makiko Cichy's subdivision application for a piece of property along Brower Road. At that time, the Planning Board asked that the following information be provided on the final subdivision plat prior to the public hearing:

1. The standard Health Department notation should be added to the drawing.

STATUS: Provided.

2. The standard notation concerning the Town's Right To Farm Law should be added to the drawing.

STATUS: Provided.

C. State Environmental Quality Review:

During its November 18, 2020 meeting, the Town of Mayfield Planning Board authorized the filing of a negative declaration under SEQR for this proposed action. Consequently, unless new additional information has been provided, no further SEQR action is necessary.

D. Fulton County Agricultural District No. 1:

In accordance with Section 305-a of Article 25AA of the Agriculture and Markets Law of New York State, a subdivision application for a piece of property within an Agricultural District containing a farm operation or on property within 500' of a farm operation located in an Agricultural District must include an Agricultural Data Statement. All Agricultural District property owners within 500' of the project site must receive notice of the proposed action.

The Fulton County Planning Department forwarded a letter, along with an Agricultural Data Statement and map, to Agricultural District property owners within 500' of the property asking that they submit any comments or concerns regarding the proposal, in writing, to the Fulton County Planning Department by Friday, December 4, 2020.

STATUS: To date, the Planning Department has received no comments regarding the application.

E. Public Hearing:

1. The public hearing was opened at 6:07 p.m.

2. Speakers:

There was no one to speak regarding Jacob and Makiko Cichy's subdivision application for a piece of property along Brower Road.

3. The public hearing was closed at 6:08 p.m.

F. Planning Board Action:

In accordance with Section 1008(C) of the Town of Mayfield Zoning Law, the Planning Board shall issue its final decision within sixty-two (62) days from the date the public hearing is closed. Consequently, does the Planning Board wish to issue its final decision on Jacob and Makiko Cichy's

subdivision application for a piece of property along Brower Road at this time?

MOTION: To approve Jacob and Makiko Cichy's subdivision application for a piece of property along Brower Road as presented.

MADE BY: Aaron Howland

SECONDED: Richard Miles

VOTE: 5 in favor, 0 opposed

**V. KAREN AND EUGENE JOUBERT – PUBLIC HEARING ON SUBDIVISION
ALONG NYS ROUTE 29:**

A. Background:

On August 14, 2019, PV Engineers, P.C. (Borrego Solar) received a Special Permit approval for a Solar Farm Project on Karen and Eugene Joubert's property along NYS Route 29. The Jouberts' property is approximately 136+/- acres in size. There is an existing residence on the property along with two (2) Solar Farm systems that are 2.5 megawatts and 4.0 megawatts in size respectively.

National Grid is now requiring Borrego Solar to subdivide the property in order to separate the residence and the individual solar systems onto their own parcels. The majority of the Jouberts' property is located on the south side of NYS Route 29. However, a portion of the parcel extends to the north side of NYS Route 29. The Jouberts' proposal is to create four (4) separate lots on the parcel. The parcel on the north side of NYS Route 29 will be approximately 36.14+/- acres in size. The parcel around the existing residence will be approximately 4.72+/- acres in size. There will then be a parcel around the 2.5 megawatt system that is approximately 32.24+/- acres in size and a parcel around the 4.0 megawatt system that is approximately 63.21 acres in size. All of the parcels will have direct road access.

B. November 18, 2020 Meeting:

During its November 18, 2020 meeting, the Town of Mayfield Planning Board began reviewing Karen and Eugene Joubert's subdivision application for a piece of property along NYS Route 29. At that time, the Planning Board determined that no additional information would need to be provided prior to the public hearing.

C. State Environmental Quality Review:

During its November 18, 2020 meeting, the Town of Mayfield Planning Board authorized the filing of a negative declaration under SEQR for this proposed action. Consequently, unless new additional information has been provided, no further SEQR action is necessary.

D. Public Hearing:

1. The public hearing was opened at 6:09 p.m.

2. Speakers:

There was no one to speak regarding the Joubert subdivision.

3. The public hearing was closed at 6:10 p.m.

E. Planning Board Action:

In accordance with Section 1008(C) of the Town of Mayfield Zoning Law, the Planning Board shall issue its final decision within sixty-two (62) days from the date the public hearing is closed. Consequently, does the Planning Board wish to issue its final decision on Karen and Eugene Joubert's subdivision application for a piece of property along NYS Route 29 at this time?

MOTION: To approve Karen and Eugene Joubert's subdivision application for a piece of property along NYS Route 29.

MADE BY: John Kessler

SECONDED: Jerry Moore

VOTE: 5 in favor, 0 opposed

**VI. MICHAEL VANNOSTRAND AND HEATHER JULIAN-VANNOSTRAND –
PUBLIC HEARING ON A SUBDIVISION ALONG RICEVILLE ROAD:**

A. Background:

Dennis VanNostrand and Dawn Bruse own an 8.2+/- acre parcel along Riceville Road in the Town of Mayfield (Tax Map Parcel No. 119.-8-23.111). They intend to take a 2-acre portion of that parcel and transfer it to Michael VanNostrand and Heather Julian-VanNostrand who own an adjacent 4.05+/- acre property (Tax Map Parcel No. 119.-8-23.112). The property transfer will give Michael and Heather VanNostrand frontage on the Mayfield Creek. The applicants would then like to subdivide their 6.05+/-

acre parcel to create a new building lot around an existing trailer on the property.

B. November 18, 2020 Meeting:

During its November 18, 2020 meeting, the Town of Mayfield Planning Board continued its review of the VanNostrand's subdivision application which was initiated in January 2020 as a lot line adjustment. At that time, the Planning Board asked that the following information be provided on a final subdivision plat prior to the public hearing:

1. The approximate location of a driveway to service the new building lot on Riceville Road.

STATUS: A notation has been added to the drawing indicating that an access easement will be deeded to the applicant's property over an existing driveway that will be situated on the lot that is being created around the existing trailer.

2. Percolation and pit test results for the proposed septic system must be provided.

STATUS: Provided.

3. The location of the existing septic and well servicing the trailer on the property must be identified.

STATUS: Provided.

4. Any covenants or easements to go along with the property must be identified.

STATUS: A notation has been added to the drawing indicating that access to the new building lot will be over an existing driveway on the applicant's adjacent property.

DISCUSSION: The Planning Board was satisfied with the information that was provided on the revised plat.

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 subdivision 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: The Planning Board did not ask for any additional information.

3. Section 617.6 (b) of 6 NYCRR states that, when a single agency is involved, the agency will be the lead agency when it proposes to undertake, fund or approve a Type 1 or Unlisted Action that does not involve another agency. If the agency has received an application for funding or approval of the action, it must determine the significance of the action, within twenty (20) calendar days of its receipt of the application, an Environmental Assessment Form or any additional information reasonably necessary to make that determination, whichever is later. Therefore, does the Planning Board wish to issue a Determination of Significance under SEQR at this time?

MOTION: To file a negative declaration under SEQR for the proposed action since:

1. The applicants have sufficient acreage available to create two (2) building lots from the original tract of land.
2. There will be no traffic implications resulting from the proposed action.
3. Public utilities are readily available to service the new building lot.

MADE BY: John Kessler
SECONDED: Aaron Howland
VOTE: 5 in favor, 0 opposed

D. Public Hearing:

1. The public hearing was opened at 6:12 p.m.

2. Speakers:

Heather VanNostrand asked if the property north of the subdivided parcels would be included as part of the subdivision application?

Mr. Geraghty explained that the background information outlined in the Planning Board's Agenda clearly notes that the subdivision application also involves a lot line adjustment with the adjacent property.

3. The public hearing was closed at 6:14 p.m.

E. Planning Board Action:

In accordance with Section 1008(C) of the Town of Mayfield Zoning Law, the Planning Board shall issue its final decision within sixty-two (62) days from the date the public hearing is closed. Consequently, does the Planning Board wish to issue its final decision on Michael VanNostrand and Heather Julian-VanNostrand's subdivision application for a piece of property along Riceville Road at this time?

DISCUSSION: Planning Board Member Jerry Moore raised a question concerning the 150' lot width requirement in the Town of Mayfield?

Town Code Enforcement Officer Damon Curley explained that this particular provision has been removed from the Town Code.

Mr. Geraghty explained that the 150' width requirement can be found in many local zoning codes. He stated that the language typically states that 150' of width is needed at the building line and not necessarily on the road right-of-way. Mr. Geraghty pointed out that requiring 150' of road frontage on a cul-de-sac lot would result in one (1) building lot using up most of the road frontage.

MOTION: To approve Michael VanNostrand and Heather Julian VanNostrand's subdivision application including a lot line adjustment for a piece of property along Riceville Road.

MADE BY: Aaron Howland

SECONDED: Richard Miles

VOTE: 5 in favor, 0 opposed

VII. TERRY JR. AND DIANE GRAUDONS - SUBDIVISION ALONG COUNTY HIGHWAY 102:

A. Background:

Terry and Diane Gaudons own a piece of property along the north side of County Highway 102 in the Town of Mayfield (Tax Map Parcel No. 119.-4-42.1). The existing property is approximately 4.41+/- acres in size. The applicants would like to create a 2.985+/- acre lot around an existing home and garage and create a new 1.425+/- acre building lot.

B. Code Enforcement Office/County Planning Department Review:

Section 501 of the Town of Mayfield Subdivision Regulations outlines the information an applicant is required to submit to the Planning Board for a proposed subdivision. Upon review of the proposed preliminary plat by the Town Code Enforcement Office and the Fulton County Planning Department, the following issues have been raised:

1. The location of that portion which is to be subdivided in relation to the entire tract and the distance to the nearest existing street intersection.

STATUS: Provided.

2. All existing structures, wooded areas, streams and other significant physical features within the portion to be subdivided and within 250' thereof. If topographic conditions are significant, contours shall also be indicated at intervals of not more than 5'.

STATUS: There are no topographic features identified on the subdivision plat.

DISCUSSION: The Planning Board felt that topographic features did not need to be shown on the final plat.

3. The name of the owner and all adjoining property owners as disclosed by the most recent municipal tax records.

STATUS: Provided.

4. The tax map sheet, block and lot number.

STATUS: Provided.

5. All available utilities on all existing streets.

STATUS: Provided.

6. The proposed pattern of lots, including lot width and depth, street layout, recreation areas, systems of drainage, sewer and water supply within the subdivided area.

STATUS: The location of the percolation and pit tests have not been identified on the plat.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Foss indicated that he would find out the location for the percolation and pit test results.

7. All existing restrictions on the use of land including easements, covenants and zoning lines.

STATUS: There are no existing easements or covenants identified on the subdivision plat.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Foss indicated that there were no easements or covenants to go along with the subdivision plat.

8. An actual field survey of the boundary lines of the tract giving complete descriptive data by bearings and distances made by a certified or licensed engineer or land surveyor.

STATUS: Provided.

9. All onsite sanitation and water supply facilities shall be designed to meet the minimum specifications of the Department of Health and a note to this effect shall be stated on the plat and signed by a licensed engineer.

STATUS: Not provided.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Geraghty stated that he would get the standard Department of Health language to Mr. Foss.

10. The proposed subdivision name and the name of the Town and County in which it is located.

STATUS: Provided.

11. The date, north arrow, map scale, name and address of record owner and subdivider.

STATUS: Provided.

12. A Short Environmental Assessment Form with Part 1 completed by the applicant.

STATUS: Provided.

13. It is the policy of this state and this community to conserve protect and encourage the development and improvements of agricultural land for the production of food and other products and also for its natural and ecological value. This disclosure notice is to inform prospective residents that farming activities occur within the Town. Such activities may include but not be limited to activities that cause noise, dust and odors.

STATUS: Not provided.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Geraghty stated that he would get the Town of Mayfield's Right-To-Farm language to Mr. Foss.

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 subdivision 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: The Planning Board did not ask for any additional information.

3. Section 617.6 (b) of 6 NYCRR states that, when a single agency is involved, the agency will be the lead agency when it proposes to undertake, fund or approve a Type 1 or Unlisted Action that does not involve another agency. If the agency has received an application for funding or approval of the action, it must determine the significance of the action, within twenty (20) calendar days of its receipt of the

application, an Environmental Assessment Form or any additional information reasonably necessary to make that determination, whichever is later. Therefore, does the Planning Board wish to issue a Determination of Significance under SEQR at this time?

MOTION: Authorizing the filing of a negative declaration under SEQR for Terry and Diane Graudon's subdivision application since:

1. There is sufficient acreage available to create an additional building lot from the original tract of land.
2. Public utilities are readily available to service the new building lot.
3. There will be no traffic impacts resulting from the proposed action.

MADE BY: John Kessler
SECONDED: Aaron Howland
VOTE: 5 in favor, 0 opposed

D. Fulton County Agricultural District:

In accordance with Section 305-a of Article 25AA of the Agriculture and Markets Law of New York State, a subdivision application for a piece of property within an Agricultural District containing a farm operation or on property within 500' of a farm operation located in an Agricultural District must include an Agricultural Data Statement. All Agricultural District property owners within 500' of the project site must receive notice of the proposed action.

DISCUSSION: County Planning Consultant Sean Geraghty indicated that he would make sure a letter goes out to all adjacent Agricultural District property owners.

E. Planning Board Action:

Section 1008(B) of the Town of Mayfield Zoning Law indicates that the Planning Board shall hold a public hearing on a subdivision application within sixty-two (62) days from the time the Planning Board determines that the preliminary plat is complete. Consequently, does the Planning Board feel that enough information has been provided by the applicant to schedule a public hearing on the subdivision application?

MOTION: To schedule a public hearing on Terry and Diane Graudon's subdivision application for a piece of property along County Highway 102 for 6:00 p.m., Wednesday, March 17, 2021.

MADE BY: John Kessler
SECONDED: Richard Miles
VOTE: 5 in favor, 0 opposed

VIII. GARETT AND AMANDA REED - SUBDIVISION ALONG COUNTY HIGHWAY 106:

A. Background:

Garett and Amanda Reed own a piece of property along the south side of County Highway 106 (Black Street) in the Town of Mayfield (Tax Map Parcel No. 152.-5-15.11). The existing parcel is approximately 26.6+/- acres in size. The applicants would like to create a 2.0+/- acre parcel around the existing home on the property and retain the remaining 24.6+/- acres.

B. Code Enforcement Office/County Planning Department Review:

Section 501 of the Town of Mayfield Subdivision Regulations outlines the information an applicant is required to submit to the Planning Board for a proposed subdivision. Upon review of the proposed preliminary plat by the Town Code Enforcement Office and the Fulton County Planning Department, the following issues have been raised:

1. The location of that portion which is to be subdivided in relation to the entire tract and the distance to the nearest existing street intersection.

STATUS: Provided.

2. All existing structures, wooded areas, streams and other significant physical features within the portion to be subdivided and within 250' thereof. If topographic conditions are significant, contours shall also be indicated at intervals of not more than 5'.

STATUS: There are no topographic features identified on the subdivision plat.

DISCUSSION: The Planning Board felt that topographic features did not need to be shown on the final plat.

3. The name of the owner and all adjoining property owners as disclosed by the most recent municipal tax records.

STATUS: Provided.

4. The tax map sheet, block and lot number.

STATUS: Provided.

5. All available utilities on all existing streets.

STATUS: Provided.

6. The proposed pattern of lots, including lot width and depth, street layout, recreation areas, systems of drainage, sewer and water supply within the subdivided area.

STATUS: Provided. However, there are no percolation or pit test results shown for the remaining 24.6+/- acres of the applicant's property.

DISCUSSION: Planning Board Member Rich Miles stated that the applicant is simply trying to create a 2-acre parcel around an existing home.

Planning Board Chairman John Kessler asked if the remaining acreage will be landlocked?

Dave Bogardus, representing the applicants, explained that the parcel has almost 375' of road frontage along County Highway 106 and actually has another 25' of road frontage further to the east along County Highway 106. He pointed out that, in order to access the remaining acreage, a driveway may need to be constructed over a stream, which will require coordination with other agencies.

7. All existing restrictions on the use of land including easements, covenants and zoning lines.

STATUS: There are no existing easements or covenants identified on the subdivision plat.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Bogardus confirmed that there are no easements or covenants to go along with the subdivision plat.

8. An actual field survey of the boundary lines of the tract giving complete descriptive data by bearings and distances made by a certified or licensed engineer or land surveyor.

STATUS: Provided.

9. All onsite sanitation and water supply facilities shall be designed to meet the minimum specifications of the Department of Health and a note to this effect shall be stated on the plat and signed by a licensed engineer.

STATUS: Provided.

10. The proposed subdivision name and the name of the Town and County in which it is located.

STATUS: Provided.

11. The date, north arrow, map scale, name and address of record owner and subdivider.

STATUS: Provided.

12. A Short Environmental Assessment Form with Part 1 completed by the applicant.

STATUS: Provided.

13. It is the policy of this state and this community to conserve protect and encourage the development and improvements of agricultural land for the production of food and other products and also for its natural and ecological value. This disclosure notice is to inform prospective residents that farming activities occur within the Town. Such activities may include but not be limited to activities that cause noise, dust and odors.

STATUS: Not provided.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Geraghty indicated that he will get the Town's standard Right-To-Farm language to Mr. Bogardus.

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 subdivision 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: The Planning Board did not ask for any additional information.

3. Section 617.6 (b) of 6 NYCRR states that, when a single agency is involved, the agency will be the lead agency when it proposes to undertake, fund or approve a Type 1 or Unlisted Action that does not involve another agency. If the agency has received an application for funding or approval of the action, it must determine the significance of the action, within twenty (20) calendar days of its receipt of the application, an Environmental Assessment Form or any additional information reasonably necessary to make that determination, whichever is later. Therefore, does the Planning Board wish to issue a Determination of Significance under SEQR at this time?

MOTION: Authorizing the filing of a negative declaration under SEQR for this action since:

1. The applicant is simply creating a new building lot around the existing home and leaving the remaining acreage undeveloped.
2. There will be no traffic implications resulting from the proposed action.

MADE BY: Aaron Howland
SECONDED: John Kessler
VOTE: 5 in favor, 0 opposed

D. Fulton County Agricultural District:

In accordance with Section 305-a of Article 25AA of the Agriculture and Markets Law of New York State, a subdivision application for a piece of property within an Agricultural District containing a farm operation or on property within 500' of a farm operation located in an Agricultural District must include an Agricultural Data Statement. All Agricultural District

property owners within 500' of the project site must receive notice of the proposed action.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Geraghty stated that he would get a letter out to all adjacent Agricultural District property owners.

E. Planning Board Action:

Section 1008(B) of the Town of Mayfield Zoning Law indicates that the Planning Board shall hold a public hearing on a subdivision application within sixty-two (62) days from the time the Planning Board determines that the preliminary plat is complete. Consequently, does the Planning Board feel that enough information has been provided by the applicant to schedule a public hearing on the subdivision application?

MOTION: To schedule a public hearing on Garrett and Amanda Reed's subdivision application for a piece of property along County Highway 106 for 6:00 p.m., Wednesday, March 17, 2021.

MADE BY: Richard Miles

SECONDED: Jerry Moore

VOTE: 5 in favor, 0 opposed

IX. PROPERTY TRANSACTION BETWEEN DINA ROTUNDO AND ROCCO ROTUNDO ALONG CRANBERRY CREEK ROAD:

A. Background:

Dina Rotundo and Rocco Rotundo own adjacent parcels along Cranberry Creek Road in the Town of Mayfield. Dina Rotundo's property is approximately 7,086 sq. ft. in size (Tax Map Parcel No. 74.9-3-19). Rocco Rotundo's parcel is approximately 6,993 sq. ft. in size (Tax Map Parcel No. 74.9-3-20). Dino Rotundo intends to transfer ownership of approximately 823 sq. ft. of her property to Rocco Rotundo and, at the same time, Rocco Rotundo will transfer approximately 339 sq. ft. of his property to Dina Rotundo. The net result of the property transaction is that Dina Rotundo's parcel will now be 6,602 sq. ft. in size, while Rocco Rotundo's parcel is 7,477 sq. ft. in size.

PLANNING BOARD DISCUSSION: Mr. Geraghty quickly explained the property transaction between Dina Rotundo and Rocco Rotundo.

Mr. Curley pointed out that the proposed transaction will give both parcels direct lake frontage.

Junell Pasquarelli explained that both properties already have separate Hudson River Black River Regulating District permits.

MOTION: Recognizing that the Rotundo's property transaction is not subject to the Town's Subdivision Regulations and to approve the transaction as a lot line adjustment.

MADE BY: Jerry Moore
SECONDED: Aaron Howland
VOTE: 5 in favor, 0 opposed

X. LANE WINNEY – CONCEPT PLAN FOR WOODS HOLLOW CAMPGROUND:

A. Background:

Lane Winney would like to develop a Recreational Vehicle Park and Campground on five (5) parcels he owns along the north side of NYS Route 30 south of Woods Hollow Road in the Town of Mayfield (Tax Map Parcel Nos. 137.-4-56, 137.-4-55, 137.-4-51, 137.-4-52 and 137.-4- 54.11). The overall size of the project site will be approximately 83.4+/- acres. The project will involve the creation of RV lots, camp home lots, glamping and tents. There will be restrooms/shower facilities, playgrounds, picnic pavilions, a swimming pool, kayak/canoe rental, dock system, boat slips, boat launch and beach access.

Travis Mitchell, P.E. gave Planning Board members an overview of the Woods Hollow Campground proposal. He pointed out that the project is located in the Commercial zone and will require not only local approval but approvals from the NYSDOH, NYSDEC, the Adirondack Park Agency and the Hudson River Black River Regulating District. Mr. Mitchell stated that, while only a portion of the property is located within the Adirondack Park, there is no shoreline within the Agency's boundaries.

Mr. Mitchell then reviewed some of the Town's zoning requirements for Recreational Vehicle Parks. He pointed out that the Woods Hollow Campground Project will provide approximately 5,000 sq. ft. per Recreational Vehicle space which is about twice what the Town Zoning Law requires. He stated that language regarding camping cabins may need to be added to the Town's Zoning Law in order to allow that type of development within the Campground. He pointed out that the project will use an existing curb cut along NYS Route 30 as a secondary entrance, while the main entrance to the campground will be off of Woods Hollow Road, which is where the check-in point will be located.

Mr. Mitchell explained that the NYSDOH requires this type of project to have bath houses approximately every 500' within the Campground. He speculated that the location of those bath houses will likely change. He

then showed Board members a series of photos depicting the architecture and the types of features that the Woods Hollow Campground will have.

Planning Board Member Jerry Moore pointed out that the Campground access road will need to cross beneath the National Grid power lines.

Mr. Mitchell stated that he has already reached out to National Grid regarding the road crossing that will be necessary in order to develop the project. He explained that National Grid has a process that has to be followed, but he expressed confidence that a permit will eventually be issued by National Grid.

Mr. Moore stated that the NYS Route 30 right-of-way is fairly large in the vicinity of the proposed project. He asked if the applicants have completed a boundary survey to show how much area beyond the pavement surface is actually in NYSDOT's hands?

Mr. Mitchell agreed and stated that a boundary survey is being done for the property that will clearly show how far back from the NYS Route 30 pavement surface the project will need to be situated.

Mr. Moore asked how the significant contour changes in the existing sand and gravel bank on the property will be addressed?

Mr. Mitchell stated that he was in the process of getting updated topographic information for the sand and gravel bank.

Mr. Moore asked if the Remediation Plan for that sand and gravel bank will be addressed?

Mr. Mitchell stated that, as part of the closeout of the mining permit for that sand and gravel bank, remediation will have to be performed before the property can be developed.

Planning Board Member Aaron Howland talked about the magnitude of work that will need to be undertaken in order to provide adequate septic systems throughout the site.

Mr. Mitchell pointed out that the intent is to provide septic fields every few sites. He noted that there will be a water distribution system throughout the Campground. He also pointed out that the soils on the project site are very sandy.

Mr. Howland agreed but noted that the soils may actually need to be treated because the percolation tests will be too fast.

Mr. Moore asked if the placement of docks in the lake will require dredging given the water level fluctuation late in the season?

Mr. Mitchell stated that the project is actually located in a channel that has a reasonable water depth late into the season. Mr. Mitchell stated that there is also consideration being given to moving the docks further north along the shoreline.

Mr. Moore agreed that the water depth is greater as you go further north along the shoreline.

Planning Board Member Richard Miles asked how visible the project will be from NYS Route 30?

Mr. Mitchell pointed out that the backs of the RV sites will be clearly visible from NYS Route 30. He indicated that the project will probably require some type of screening along the road frontage.

Mr. Miles pointed out that, depending upon how close the RV sites are located to NYS Route 30, it may be beneficial to somehow limit how close people can get to that road, given how busy it can be during the summer months.

County Planning Consultant Sean Geraghty asked if any traffic analysis for the project has been undertaken?

Mr. Mitchell indicated that a traffic analysis has not been performed yet.

Mr. Geraghty stated that, given the number of total units within the Campground, it will be important for the Planning Board to have a clear understanding of the potential traffic impacts along Woods Hollow Road, especially at the intersection with NYS Route 30.

Mr. Howland then talked about some of the significant topographic disparities on the site and pointed out that there may need to be a tremendous amount of cut and fill on the north side of the property.

Mr. Mitchell stated that it is the applicant's intent to disturb as little of the existing vegetation as possible and to minimize the amount of material that has to be moved.

Mr. Moore stated that he felt the overall project will be very positive for the Town.

Mr. Miles agreed and asked if a tentative timeline for the project has been established?

Mr. Mitchell stated that, given all of the approvals that will be needed from various State agencies, he is hoping that the applicants can begin construction on the project in the spring of 2022.

XI. OTHER BUSINESS:

A. Code Enforcement Update:

Mr. Curley pointed out that there is nothing major going on in the community at the moment.

Mr. Geraghty stated that, earlier in the day, Planning Board Alternate Ralph Desiderio sent an e-mail out to Board members concerning the County's recent decision to purchase a software module from Host Compliance company that will help monitor short-term rentals throughout the County.

Mr. Desiderio stated that he was asked by Town Supervisor Rick Argotsinger to reach out to Host Compliance to find out what it would cost for the Town of Mayfield to add modules that could help the Town more effectively address the short-term rental issue in the community. He indicated that because the County is purchasing the software, the Town has an opportunity to purchase additional modules at a reduced cost, which he estimated to be approximately \$1,725 per year.

Mr. Curley added that the Town could increase the fee on short-term rental registrations to \$500 per year.

There was then a very lengthy discussion between Mr. Curley, Planning Board members and County Planning Consultant Sean Geraghty concerning the efficacy of the Town purchasing additional modules in order to address its short-term rental issue. Mr. Geraghty and a couple of Board members expressed some concern that they did not have a handle on how the process would work if additional modules were purchased from Host Compliance and whether or not the effort would legitimately address the Town's regulatory concerns.

Mr. Geraghty indicated that he would like to find out what was purchased by the County and get a better understanding of how it could help the Town of Mayfield. At the same time, he indicated that he would like to look at what some other communities in Upstate New York are doing to address this issue.

Mr. Curley, again, expressed his frustration with the fact that he cannot keep up with the volume of work that is required in the Town Code Enforcement Office and stated that Host Compliance's software will at least take some of that work off of his plate.

Conversely, a few Board members expressed concern that the Planning Board is being asked to offer a recommendation on the Town's purchase

of a software package for the Town Code Enforcement Office, which really should be a decision made by the Town Board.

XII. CLOSE OF THE MEETING:

MOTION: To close the meeting at 7:17 p.m.

MADE BY: John Kessler

SECONDED: Richard Miles

VOTE: 5 in favor, 0 opposed