

**TOWN OF MAYFIELD PLANNING BOARD
FEBRUARY 21, 2018
6:00 P.M.
TOWN OF MAYFIELD TOWN HALL**

MEETING NOTES

PRESENT:

**JOHN KESSLER, CHAIRMAN
AARON HOWLAND, VICE CHAIRMAN
JERRY MOORE
ADAM LANPHERE
RICHARD MILES
FREDERICK CASTIGLIONE, ALTERNATE
ADRIEN ZAMBELLA, ALTERNATE**

**MICHAEL STEWART, CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFICER
SEAN M. GERAGHTY, SR. PLANNER**

OTHERS PRESENT:

**RICHARD SMITH
CHARLES CAMPIONE
JOSEPH AMMIDURI
KAREN AMMIDURI
CHRIS SAPIA
JON CLOSE
DAVID CLOSE
BRUCE BECKER
ROBERTI RICCIARDI
JACK PUTMAN
STEVEN SMITH, P.E.
CHARLES ACKERBAUER, P.E.
LAURI HARRINGTON
GERALD RICHARDSON
SANDRA SPARKS
JOSEPH PAWLOSKI
JOSEPH IANNUZZI
SANDRA IANNUZZI
WILLIAM LAWSON
ROSE LAWSON**

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 January 17, 2018 meeting.

MADE BY: Aaron Howland

SECONDED: Adam Lanphere

VOTE: 5 in favor, 0 opposed

III. JOHN PAPA – PUBLIC HEARING ON A SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR RV PARK/CAMPGROUND ALONG LAKESIDE DRIVE:

A. Background:

John Papa owns a piece of property along the north side of Lakeside Drive in the Town of Mayfield (Tax Map Parcel No. 104.-2-39). Mr. Papa's property is approximately 9+/- acres in size. There is an existing home and garage on the property. Mr. Papa would like to establish a 4-lot RV Park/Campground on the property.

B. January 17, 2018 Meeting:

During its January 17, 2018 meeting, the Town of Mayfield Planning Board continued its review of Mr. Papa's Special Permit application. At that time, the Planning Board asked that the following information be provided on the final Site Plan drawing prior to the public hearing:

1. Any additional landscaping improvements to be made on the project site should be identified on the revised drawing.

STATUS: There is no additional landscaping shown on the Site Plan drawing.

2. The Fulton County 9-1-1 Coordinator must be contacted so that an address for the RV Park/Campground can be established.

STATUS: ?

DISCUSSION: Mr. Geraghty asked Mr. Papa if he had reached out to Fulton County's 9-1-1 Coordinator yet?

Mr. Papa indicated that he has not. He indicated that the address for the project is 373 Lakeside Drive. He also noted that he will eventually be providing a name to the County's 9-1-1 office for the private road that will service the four (4) pad sites.

3. A garbage collection area with screening should be shown on the revised drawing.

STATUS: Provided.

DISCUSSION: The Planning Board had no comments concerning the location and screening of the small dumpster.

C. State Environmental Quality Review:

During its January 17, 2018 meeting, the Town of Mayfield Planning Board proposed that it serve as the Lead Agency for the purpose of issuing a determination of significance under SEQR. A copy of the completed Environmental Assessment Form, along with a Site Plan drawing for the project, was forwarded to the NYS Office of Park, Recreation and Historic Preservation (OPRHP). That Agency was given until Friday, February 16, 2018, to comment on the Planning Board's proposal to act as Lead Agency or offer comments and concerns regarding the project itself.

STATUS: In a letter dated February 15, 2018, OPRHP has indicated that the project will have no impact on archeological and/or historic resources listed or eligible for the New York State or National Registers of Historic Places.

DISCUSSION: The Planning Board had no comments regarding the correspondence from OPRHP.

MOTION: Declaring the Town of Mayfield Planning Board the Lead Agency for the purpose of issuing a determination of significance under SEQR.

MADE BY: Jerry Moore

SECONDED: Aaron Howland

VOTE: 5 in favor, 0 opposed

DISCUSSION: Mr. Geraghty suggested that the Planning Board wait until after the public hearing to conclude the SEQR process.

The Planning Board felt that this was a good idea.

D. Public Hearing:

1. The public hearing was opened at 6:05 p.m.
2. Speakers:

John Papa

Mr. Papa explained that his project is situated along the north side of Lakeside Drive on a piece of property approximately 14 acres in size. He stated that the property was formerly a quarry owned and operated by Harold Verklie. He indicated that his family purchased the property from Mr. Verklie. He pointed out that the beach area across from his property has boat slips that have been used by 26 customers since the 1960's. He indicated that many of those customers have asked for permission to stay overnight in tents or recreational vehicles. He pointed out that, unfortunately, he has had to tell those individuals that they are not allowed to pitch tents or park recreational vehicles on the property.

Mr. Papa stated that it has taken him a year and a half working with the Adirondack Park Agency (APA) to get through their permit process. Mr. Papa then explained some of the components of the project. He noted that there will be no onsite sewage disposal, but tenants will be required to pump out their RV's on a biweekly basis. He indicated that there is some common space on the property that will be used for overflow parking to get traffic off of Lakeside Drive. He indicated that he will only be renting spaces in the RV Campground on a seasonal basis, most likely from April 15th through October 15th, at which time the tenants will be required to remove their RV's from the sites. He pointed out that there will be no need to plow the private access driveway during the winter months since there will be no units on the property.

Richard Smith
432 Lakeside Drive

Mr. Smith stated that although Mr. Papa is only proposing to create four (4) spots in his RV Park, he is concerned that the Park may expand in the future. He questioned whether garbage will be picked

up on a regular basis and if any stormwater drainage improvements will be made as part of the project. He pointed out that there is already a drainage problem in front of Mr. Papa's property along Lakeview Drive. Mr. Smith then asked if outdoor fires will be allowed on the property?

Mr. Geraghty asked Town Code Enforcement Officer Mike Stewart if there were any local laws limiting outdoor fires?

Mr. Stewart explained that there are no local laws but there are State regulations that prohibit outdoor fires from exceeding a certain size.

Mr. Smith then asked if dogs will be required to be kept on a leash in the Park?

Mr. Stewart indicated that the Town of Mayfield does have a leash law which will apply to anyone within the Park.

Mr. Smith then indicated that he felt the RV Park could cause his property to decrease in value.

Joseph Ammiduri
115 Lakeside Drive

Mr. Ammiduri questioned why Mr. Papa's proposed project was being considered an RV Park? He indicated that he didn't believe the placement of four (4) RV's on a property would have anywhere near the impact of a typical RV park that provides sites for dozens of recreational vehicles. He indicated that, in his opinion, Mr. Papa's project will do no harm to adjacent property owners.

Chris Sapia
338 Lakeside Drive

Mr. Sapia indicated that he was friends with many of the individuals in the room this evening. He indicated that he felt RV Parks had a connotation of providing space for mobile vehicles that will be moved in and out. He indicated that he didn't believe the intent of Mr. Papa's proposal was to be a typical trailer park operation. He indicated that he did not feel the proposal would hurt property values along Lakeview Drive. He indicated that if the Planning Board is concerned with Mr. Papa's proposal, they should limit or cap the number of RV's that can eventually be placed on the site.

Charles Campione
343 Lakeside Drive

Mr. Campione indicated that he had reviewed Mr. Papa's Special Permit application along with Mr. Papa's APA application and that based on the current regulations of the Town of Mayfield and the APA, the Planning Board had no legal reason to deny Mr. Papa's application. Mr. Campione indicated that he was not necessarily opposed to Mr. Papa's proposal. He indicated that he has purchased the adjacent property and would like to eventually construct his retirement home on that parcel. He indicated that his main concern is that the Park not be expanded in the future because he felt that his property value could be hurt if that happens.

Mr. Geraghty pointed out that Mr. Papa has presented an application to the Town of Mayfield Planning Board for a 4-lot RV Park/Campground. He indicated that any expansion of that RV Park/Campground beyond four (4) lots would require Mr. Papa to file new applications with both the Town of Mayfield and the APA and essentially start the process over from scratch.

Jon Close
105 Lakeside Drove

Mr. Close stated that he has known John Papa for a very long time. He indicated that he has had some experience with an adjacent RV Park and knows that property boundaries can be a very important issue. He indicated that, in the past, he has had experience with motor bikes running over his fields and individuals trespassing on his property, as well as individuals skeet shooting and leaving shell casings on his property that pose a danger to his cows. He suggested that some rules or standards be placed on Mr. Papa's application limiting the types of activities that can occur on his property so that he doesn't have to contend with individuals trespassing on his property. He also pointed out that, as a local farmer, he gets up early in the morning and will typically be out in the field with a tractor before the tenants in the RV Park get up for the day. He indicated that he would like Mr. Papa's Lease Agreement to point out to the tenants that there will be dust, dirt and noise associated with agricultural operations on adjacent properties and that if this is not acceptable then they shouldn't enter into a Lease Agreement. He pointed out that the Town of Mayfield has a strong tourism economy and he hoped that Mr. Papa's proposal would bring more money into the community.

Bruce Becker
114 Boblin Marina Drive

Mr. Becker stated that he has known Mr. Papa for a very long time. He indicated that he felt Mr. Papa would run a topnotch RV Park. He indicated that he felt Mr. Papa would address any problems that would arise as a result of this operation. He talked about a past experience with Mr. Papa that he felt was handled very quickly and professionally. He pointed out that, to his knowledge, the police have never been called to deal with any customers or tenants of Mr. Papa.

Planning Board Member Aaron Howland asked Mr. Papa if he would be opposed to including verbage in his Lease Agreement letting his tenants know that there are adjacent agricultural properties that will produce noise, dust and smells that are part of normal farming operations? He also indicated that he would like to see some language in the Lease Agreement prohibiting skeet shooting or trespassing by tenants on adjacent properties.

Mr. Papa indicated that he already has a very long Lease Agreement that is very self policing. He indicated that he would not be opposed to adding any language that the Planning Board wishes to see in the document. He pointed out that anyone violating provisions of that Lease Agreement simply doesn't get a contract the following year.

Planning Board Member Richard Miles asked where vehicles would park if there was no overflow parking on Mr. Papa's property?

Mr. Papa indicated that the only other parking along Lakeside Drive is on the road itself. He indicated that, in the past, the parking along the road has never created a safety issue. He indicated that any time anyone along Lakeside Drive has a party, there are numerous vehicles parked along the road. He indicated that, during the 4th of July weekend, there isn't a space available along Lakeside Drive.

Mr. Geraghty pointed out that there were two (2) letters offered to the Planning Board by Charles Campione and Sean Oakey and Ericka Migliaccio-Oakey that will be entered into the public hearing record and become a part of this evening's minutes.

3. The public hearing was closed at 6:25 p.m.

E. State Environmental Quality Review Continued:

DISCUSSION: Mr. Geraghty asked if Planning Board members felt there were any significant adverse environmental impacts that still need to be addressed by the applicant?

There was a general consensus among Board members that there were no significant impacts that could result from Mr. Papa's proposal.

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

1. The applicant's proposed RV Park/Campground will occupy a very small portion of his parcel.
2. There are public utilities readily available to service the RV Park/Campground.
3. There are no onsite septic systems required as part of the action.
4. There will be no traffic impacts resulting from the proposed action.

MADE BY: Aaron Howland
SECONDED: Adam Lanphere
VOTE: 5 in favor, 0 opposed

F. Planning Board Action:

In accordance with Article XI, Section 1102(B)(8) of the Town of Mayfield Zoning regulations, the Planning Board within sixty (60) days of completion of the public hearing, shall approve, disapprove, approve with modification the application for a Special Use Permit.

DISCUSSION: Planning Board Member Rich Miles asked Mr. Papa if he would ever consider going to weekly rentals in the RV Park/Campground sites?

Mr. Papa indicated that he did not have the time to collect money and have tenants moving in and out on a weekly basis. He indicated that the four (4) spots in the RV Park will only be leased on a seasonal basis.

Planning Board Member Jerry Moore asked if the Planning Board needed to make its decision this evening?

Mr. Geraghty pointed out that the Planning Board has sixty (60) days to issue its decision if there are additional pieces of information the Board would like to see or additional research that needs to be done.

Mr. Papa urged the Planning Board to offer its decision this evening. He indicated that he has been at this project for approximately three (3) years and would like to get started as soon as possible.

MOTION: To conditionally approve John Papa's Special Use Permit for an RV Park/Campground along Lakeside Drive with the following stipulations:

1. The Fulton County 9-1-1 Coordinator must be contacted so that the address for the RV Park/Campground can be established.
2. The private access road for the RV Park/Campground must be named.
3. Language should be added to the RV Park Lease Agreement stipulating that:
 - Tenants are prohibited from trespassing on adjacent properties.
 - There is no skeet shooting or other target practice allowed on the RV Park/Campground.
 - There will be no unauthorized motor bikes or 4-wheeler operations on the RV Park/Campground site.
 - A disclosure notice informing tenants that farming activities occur on adjacent properties and that those activities may include, but not be limited to, activities that cause noise, dust and odors.

MADE BY: Aaron Howland
SECONDED: Richard Miles
VOTE: 5 in favor, 0 opposed

(NOTE: Mike Stewart pointed out that, under the Town's definition, space for three (3) or more recreational vehicles on a property is classified as an RV Park/Campground.)

IV. OLBRYCH REALTY, INC. - SITE PLAN FOR EQUIPMENT STORAGE/WASH BAY ALONG COUNTY HIGHWAY 157:

A. Background:

Olbrych Realty owns a piece of property along County Highway 157 in the Town of Mayfield (Tax Map Parcel No. 119.-10-22.1). School House Pools has its warehousing operation on the property which is approximately 70+/- acres in size. The applicant is proposing to construct a 69' x 100' equipment storage/wash bay along the northeast corner of the warehousing operation.

Steven Smith, P.E., representing the applicant, pointed out that Olbrych Realty simply would like to construct a small wash bay building with some storage capacity. He pointed out that during the winter months the tractor trailers get pretty messy and Olbrych Realty would like to have a place to wash those trucks on its property. He indicated that the applicant would also like to have a covered area to park tractors. He indicated that the structure will be located on the back side of the property and will not be very visible. He indicated that the wash water from the facility will be collected in tanks and trucked to the sewage treatment plant.

B. Code Enforcement Office/County Planning Department Review:

Article IX, Section 904 of the Town of Mayfield Zoning Regulations outlines the information that must be included on a Site Plan application. After reviewing the application submittal and based on the nature of the project, the Town Code Enforcement Office and County Planning Department would like to offer the following comments:

1. There are no topographic features shown on the Site Plan drawing or any indication of how potential drainage from the facility will be handled.

DISCUSSION: After a brief discussion, the Planning Board did not feel that topographic features needed to be shown on the Site Plan drawing since all of the wash water is going to be collected within the building.

2. The location of the existing septic system for the warehouse facility must be identified.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Smith indicated that he wasn't sure where the septic system was located.

Mr. Stewart indicated that he thought it was on the pond side of the warehouse.

After a brief discussion, the Planning Board decided that the location of the septic field was not pertinent to the applicant's proposal.

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: 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 this proposal action since:

1. There is sufficient acreage available on the applicant's property to construct a 6,900 sq. ft. building.
2. Public utilities are readily available to service the building.
3. There will be no traffic implications resulting from the proposed action.

MADE BY: John Kessler
SECONDED: Jerry Moore
VOTE: 5 in favor, 0 opposed

D. Planning Board Action:

In accordance with Article IX, Section 906 of the Town of Mayfield Zoning Regulations, 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 enough information to schedule a public hearing on Olbrych Realty's Site Plan application at this time?

MOTION: To schedule a public hearing on Olbrych Realty's Site Plan application for an equipment storage/wash bay along County Highway 157 for 6:00 p.m., Wednesday, March 21, 2018.

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

V. **PATRICK EMRICK - SUBDIVISION ALONG DIAMOND HILL ROAD AND CHRISTIE ROAD:**

A. Background:

Patrick Emrick owns a piece of property at the intersection of Diamond Hill Road and Christie Road in the Town of Mayfield (Tax Map Parcel No. 88.-1-16). The applicant's property is approximately 90+/- acres in size. He would like to subdivide the parcel into four (4) building lots ranging in size from 5.33+/- acres to 69.69+/- acres. There is already an existing

home on Lot #3 in the proposed subdivision which is 9.16+/- acres in size.

B. Code Enforcement Office/County Planning Department Review:

Section 1008 of the Town of Mayfield Zoning Law outlines the submittal requirements for a minor subdivision. After reviewing the application submittal, the Town Code Enforcement Office and County Planning Department would like to offer the following comments:

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 feet thereof. If topographic conditions are significant, contours shall also be indicated at intervals of not more than five (5) feet.

STATUS: There are no topographic contours shown on the subdivision plat.

DISCUSSION: John Kessler noted that the applicant's property is relatively flat.

Mr. Geraghty pointed out that given the size of the proposed building lots, it may not be necessary to have the applicant provide topographic features.

Planning Board Member Jerry Moore asked what APA Land Use classification the property fell within?

Mr. Charles Ackerbauer, P.E., representing the applicant, pointed out that the land use classification is shown on the subdivision plat. He indicated that the property is located in a rural use area.

Both Mr. Geraghty and Mr. Stewart indicated that rural use area requires a 3.2 acres per principal building.

After a brief discussion, the Planning Board agreed that topographic features did not need to be shown on the subdivision plat.

Mr. Kessler asked how far the Town maintains Diamond Hill Road?

Mr. Ackerbauer indicated that the subdivision plat shows the edge of pavement on Diamond Hill Road, which is where he believes the Town plows to. He indicated that the access road shown from that point will be a lengthy driveway serving Lot #4.

Mr. Geraghty noted that there is a driveway detail provided on the subdivision plat.

Board members pointed out that if the driveway extends beyond 500', then a turnoff area will need to be provided.

3. The name of the owner(s) 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, if available.

STATUS: Provided.

5. All available utilities and 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.

7. All existing restrictions on the use of land including easements, covenants, and zoning lines. A copy of such covenants or deed restrictions that are intended to cover all or part of the tract shall be included.

STATUS: Provided.

DISCUSSION: The Planning Board had no questions or comments concerning the proposed deed or covenant restrictions for the building lots.

8. An actual field survey of the boundary lines of the tract giving complete descriptive data by bearings and distance made and certified by a licensed land surveyor. The corners of the tract shall also be located on the ground and marked by monuments as described in

Article III of this document, and shall be referenced and shown on the plat.

STATUS: Provided.

9. All on-site sanitation and water supply facilities shall be designed to meet the minimum specifications of the State 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 sub-divider.

STATUS: Provided.

12. A Short Environmental Assessment form with Part I completed by the applicant. The Planning Board may require a Full Environmental Assessment Form if circumstances are warranted.

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: ?

DISCUSSION: Mr. Ackerbauer indicated that he would add the language pertaining to agricultural operations. Mr. Ackerbauer pointed out that all of the home sites are located within fields away from the wetland areas that have been delineated on the subdivision 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: Planning Board Member Jerry Moore asked where the application process with the APA stands?

Mr. Ackerbauer indicated that the APA has already visited the site and performed soil tests. He indicated that he was waiting for the Planning Board's preliminary review of the plat before sending the final application to the APA.

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 authorize the filing of a negative declaration under SEQR for Patrick Emrick's subdivision application for a piece of property along Diamond Hill and Christie Roads in the Town of Mayfield since:

1. There is sufficient acreage available to create four (4) building lots from the original tract of land.
2. Public utilities are readily available to serve each of the building lots.
3. There will be no traffic impacts resulting from the proposed action.
4. No home construction or onsite sewage disposal system construction is proposed within 100' of any delineated wetland.

MADE BY: Adam Lanphere
SECONDED: Aaron Howland
VOTE: 5 in favor, 0 opposed

D. 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 Patrick Emrick's subdivision application for a piece of property along Diamond Hill Road and Christie Road for 6:00 p.m., Wednesday, March 21, 2018.

MADE BY: Adam Lanphere
SECONDED: Jerry Moore
VOTE: 5 in favor, 0 opposed

**VI. ADRIEN ZAMBELLA - SITE PLAN FOR BOAT REPAIR BUSINESS
ALONG PARADISE POINT ROAD:**

A. Background:

Adrien Zambella owns a piece of property at 182 Paradise Point Road in the Town of Mayfield (Tax Map Parcel No. 104.-2-14.2) in a Mixed Use 1

Zone. There is currently a home and garage on the property. The applicant is proposing to construct a new 36' x 44' garage that will be used for boat and motor repair.

B. Code Enforcement Office/County Planning Department Review:

Article IX, Section 904 of the Town of Mayfield Zoning Regulations outlines the information that must be provided on a Special Permit Application. After reviewing the Application submittal, the Town Code Enforcement Office and County Planning Department would like to offer the following comments:

1. The side yard setback for buildings in the Mixed Use 1 Zone is 15'. The applicant is proposing a 5' building setback and has already appeared before the Town of Mayfield Zoning Board of Appeals and received an Area Variance.

DISCUSSION: The Planning Board had no comments or questions regarding Mr. Zambella's appearance before the Town's Zoning Board of Appeals.

2. Will the new structure be tied into the existing septic system on the applicant's property?

DISCUSSION: Mr. Zambella indicated that he will not be tying the new garage into a septic system or well.

3. A notation on the Site Plan drawing indicates that the driveway will be widened and lengthened to access the new building. These improvements should be shown on a revised Site Plan.

DISCUSSION: The Planning Board agreed that the actual driveway improvements will need to be shown on the final Site Plan drawing.

4. A notation should be added to the Site Plan drawing specifically identifying the maximum number of boats/trailers to be stored in the proposed storage area on the back side of the property.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Geraghty confirmed that the boat and trailer storage area will not only be used for boats that are going to be repaired, but will also be a business component where the boats and trailers are stored year round.

Mr. Zambella confirmed that the boat and trailer storage area will be used for both purposes.

Mr. Geraghty asked Mr. Stewart if that would change the review process of the application?

Mr. Stewart indicated that both uses still require a Site Plan review.

There was a lengthy discussion between Mr. Geraghty, Mr. Zambella and Board members concerning the number of boats/trailers that could conceivably be stored on the back side of the property. Mr. Geraghty indicated that he examined aerial photos of the site and was somewhat confused by the location that the applicant identified as the boat/trailer storage area. He noted that a significant amount of clearing will need to take place in order to place boats or trailers on that portion of the property. Eventually, the Planning Board agreed to allow Mr. Zambella to identify a specific acreage that will be used for boat and trailer storage.

5. The proposed screening of the boat/trailer storage area must be identified.

DISCUSSION: Rich Miles asked Mr. Zambella how big his boat trailer storage area was going to be?

Mr. Zambella indicated that he did not have an exact figure but could provide that on a revised drawing. Mr. Zambella went on to explain that he would like to plant some cedar trees on the back portion of the property to provide some screening.

6. If any signage is proposed for the business, its location, size and design must be shown on the revised Site Plan.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Zambella indicated that he did not intend to have any signage advertising the business.

7. An estimated project construction schedule should be included with the Site Plan application.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Zambella indicated that he would like to start the project in the spring and that it would take about three (3) months to complete the project.

Jerry Moore asked if the well for the Sanborn property could be shown on the final Site Plan drawing?

Mr. Miles asked if the business will be conducted in a closed garage?

Mr. Zambella indicated that the garage will have doors that can be closed.

Mr. Miles asked if boats will be washed in the building?

Mr. Zambella indicated that he will be washing boats outside of the building on a gravel area.

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: 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 proposed action since:

1. There is sufficient acreage available on the applicant's property to construct the 36' x 44' building.
2. Public utilities are readily available to service the new building.
3. There will be limited traffic impacts resulting from the proposed project.

MADE BY: Richard Miles
SECONDED: Adam Lanphere
VOTE: 5 in favor, 0 opposed

D. Planning Board Action:

In accordance with Article IX, Section 906 of the Town of Mayfield Zoning Regulations, 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 enough information to schedule a public hearing on Mr. Zambella's Site Plan application at this time?

MOTION: To schedule a public hearing on Adrien Zambella's Site Plan application for a boat repair business along Paradise Point Road for 6:00 p.m., Wednesday, March 21, 2018.

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

VII. OTHER BUSINESS:

A. Code Enforcement Update:

Mr. Stewart explained that a Mr. Charzan recently discovered that his neighbor's home, well and septic is actually located on his property. Mr. Stewart explained that Mr. Charzan will need to eventually subdivide the property so that his own home is on a separate parcel and so that his neighbor will have his own parcel which can then be taxed by the Town. Mr. Stewart pointed out that, given the lot width

of the new parcel, Mr. Charzan will need to seek an Area Variance from the Town Zoning Board of Appeals before he's able to subdivide the property.

B. Training:

Mr. Geraghty indicated that the February 7, 2018 training sessions at FMCC that were cancelled due to a snowstorm have been moved to March 14, 2018. He indicated that anyone who already signed up for those sessions is still registered to attend. He indicated that if anyone has to remove their name or add their name to the registration list to please contact his office.

VIII. CLOSE OF THE MEETING:

MOTION: To close the meeting at 7:10 p.m.

MADE BY: Adam Lanphere

SECONDED: Jerry Moore

VOTE: 5 in favor, 0 opposed