

**TOWN OF MAYFIELD PLANNING BOARD
MAY 20, 2015
6:00 P.M.
TOWN OF MAYFIELD TOWN HALL**

MEETING NOTES

PRESENT:

**ROBERT PHILLIPS, CHAIRMAN
MARILYN SALVIONE
JOHN KESSLER
AARON HOWLAND
ROBERTA RICCIARDI**

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

OTHERS PRESENT:

**DARRIN ROMEYN, P.E.
NICOLE BATTISTI
MARIO GRECO
STEVE SMITH, P.E.
ROBERT KAZMIERSKI
ART DAHL
CHRISTIAN KLUEG
TRAVIS MITCHELL, P.E.**

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 April 15, 2015 meeting.
MADE BY:	John Kessler
SECONDED:	Roberta Ricciardi
VOTE:	5 in favor, 0 opposed

III. CHARLES HENRY – SUBDIVISION ALONG BUTTER STREET:

A. Background:

Charles Henry owns a piece of property along the east side of Butter Street in the Town of Mayfield along the Great Sacandaga Lake (Tax Map Parcel No. 88.12-1-11.1). The existing parcel is approximately 2.2 acres in size. There are two (2) homes on the property. The first home is situated very close to Butter Street, while the second residence is situated along the Great Sacandaga Lake. Mr., Henry would like to create a 1.5 acre lot around the home near Butter Street and leave approximately .7 acres for the home on the Great Sacandaga Lake.

B. Planning Department and Code Enforcement Office 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. However, the driveway in the northwest portion of the site is shown on the County Tax Map records as a separate road. This issue should be clarified on the subdivision drawings.

DISCUSSION: Planning Board Chairman Robert Phillips explained to the applicant that his engineer will need to find out why Tax Map records show his driveway as a separate parcel.

Mr. Henry seemed confused by the request and asked for some clarification.

County Senior Planner Sean Geraghty pointed out that the surveyed plat that has been submitted to the Planning Board shows the driveway as part of the applicant's property. However, the tax map that has been superimposed on the corner of the plat shows the driveway as a separate parcel and possibly a public thoroughfare. He stated that this needs to be clarified.

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 shown on the subdivision plat.

DISCUSSION: Planning Board Member John Kessler indicated that he didn't feel it was necessary to show topographic features on the map given the fact that there is no new construction proposed as part of the subdivision.

There was a general consensus among Board members that the topographic features would not need to be shown on the 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 applicant is proposing that Lot #2 be .7 acres in size, which is smaller than the required minimum lot size for the District. Mr. Henry indicates in the application package that the smaller lot size is to prevent the future owner of the lot along the Lake from planting trees that would block the view from the house on the upper end of the property. Is there a reason why 1 acre of land cannot be set aside for Lot #2 and a covenant placed in the deed for the property indicating that trees cannot exceed a certain height on the property?

DISCUSSION: Mr. Henry explained that he would rather not provide additional acreage for Lot #2 because he felt that it would create two (2) odd-shaped lots from the original tract of land, and he didn't feel that covenants would be effective in the long term. He indicated that if the property ever leaves his family's ownership, someone with deeper pockets than his could easily get provisions in the covenants overturned

by hiring good legal representation. Mr. Henry pointed out that, of the 12 lots along the Lake near his property, seven (7) of them are already smaller than the lot he is proposing to create at .7 acres. He therefore did not feel he was changing the character of the area.

Mr. Phillips explained that the Planning Board will need to send Mr. Henry's application to the Town of Mayfield Zoning Board of Appeals as an administrative referral to see if that Board is willing to grant him an Area Variance for Lot #2 in the proposed subdivision. Mr. Phillips suggested that the Planning Board continue with its review of items it would like to see on the revised plat.

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

STATUS: Lot #2 will not have direct access onto Butter Street which would be a violation of Section 511.1 of the Residential Code of New York State. However, the Code indicates that homes "hereafter" constructed shall have direct access to a fire apparatus access road or public street, not homes that already exist.

DISCUSSION: County Senior Planner Sean Geraghty indicated that he had a conversation with Town Code Enforcement Officer Mike Stewart regarding this access driveway issue. He noted that both he and Mr. Stewart believe that since there are no new homes to be constructed on either lot, the applicant's proposed subdivision will not be in violation of the Residential Code of New York State.

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: The approximate location of the existing wells and septic fields for the two (2) homes have not been identified.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Henry indicated that he would have his engineer Charlie Ackerbauer, P.E. identify the approximate location of wells and septic systems on both lots.

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.

DISCUSSION: The Planning Board asked Mr. Henry if he had contacted the Adirondack Park Agency (APA) concerning this proposed action?

Mr. Henry indicated that he has an old letter from the APA indicating that it recognizes no jurisdiction for a previous subdivision of the property involving one (1) acre lots. He explained that he has forwarded a second letter to the APA asking if the Agency has any jurisdiction over his new proposal to create a 1.5 acre and a .7 acre lot. He indicated that he has not yet received a response from the APA.

Planning Board Member Marilyn Salvione indicated that the APA may require him to provide at least 1 acre for Lot #2.

Mr. Henry indicated that he understood that the APA may require a 1-acre minimum lot size. However, he indicated that he would like to pursue his current proposal as presented.

C. Planning Board Action:

In accordance with Article V of the Town of Mayfield Subdivision Regulations, the Planning Board, within sixty-two (62) days from the time it determines a preliminary plat for a proposed subdivision to be complete shall hold a public hearing on the subdivision application. Consequently, does the Planning Board wish to schedule a public hearing on Charles Henry's subdivision application at this time.

MOTION: To table any further action on Charles Henry's subdivision application for a piece of property along Butter Street in the Town of Mayfield until the Town of

Mayfield Zoning Board of Appeals has rendered its decision regarding an Area Variance.

MADE BY: Marilyn Salvione
SECONDED: Roberta Ricciardi
VOTE: 5 in favor, 0 opposed

IV. MARIO AND ANN GRECO – SITE PLAN FOR SELF-STORAGE FACILITY ALONG RICEVILLE ROAD:

A. Background:

Mario and Ann Greco own a piece of property at 382 Riceville Road in the Town of Mayfield (Tax Map Parcel No. 103.4-1-16.113). The property has access off of Riceville Road and is adjacent to NYS Route 30. The applicant's property is approximately .93 acres in size. They would like to install seven (7) various sized storage units on the property with access driveways and additional landscaping provided.

Darrin Romeyn, P.E. gave Board members a brief presentation of his clients' self-storage project along Riceville Road. He pointed out that his clients would like to maximize the size of the storage buildings on the property. He pointed out that there is a 7-8% grade on the property which needed to be considered when he designed the access driveways. Mr. Romeyn indicated that he put a great deal of thought into the appearance of the self-storage units from NYS Route 30. He indicated that his clients intend to use appealing colors for the storage units, which will be a brown with a red roof. He pointed out that screening will be provided at the end of each access aisle for aesthetic purposes and to protect vehicles from driving off the edge of the access aisles. He talked about the reverse crown on the access aisles that will allow stormwater to drain properly from the site.

Planning Board Member Roberta Ricciardi asked if any signage will be placed along Riceville Road?

Mr. Romeyn indicated that he would like to place a small sign along Riceville Road where the business is located. He indicated that he intends to use a small brown sign similar to the one used for Jim's Bait Shop.

Planning Board Member John Kessler then talked about the limited space on the property and indicated that he didn't believe there was enough room to back a U-Haul Truck in and out of the access aisles to the storage units.

Mr. Romeyn pointed out that he provided 30' turning radiuses in his design and felt that U-Haul type vehicles could access each of the storage units.

There was then a brief discussion regarding how a truck with a trailer would be able to access the building.

Mr. Phillips suggested that the Board go through the Agenda items and identify any additional information it would like to see on a revised set of drawings.

B. Code Enforcement Office/County Planning Department Review:

The Town 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. The zoning of the property should be identified on the drawing.

DISCUSSION: The Planning Board felt that the zoning of the property should be identified on a revised drawing.

2. The depth of the 8" drainage pipe near Station +00 appears to be mislabeled.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Romeyn indicated that he would correct the labeling on the 8" drainage pipe.

Mr. Phillips initiated a discussion concerning the drainage plan on the site. He questioned how much additional runoff would leave the property?

Mr. Romeyn explained that, given the layout of the site and the amount of grassed area and gravel surfaces, he did not believe a significant amount of additional stormwater would leave the site. He noted that the outlet pipe will drain into NYSDOT's right-of-way.

Planning Board Member Aaron Howland noted that the only problem with allowing sheet flow in the access aisles will be the possibility that erosion will take place. He then questioned the location of Robert Frank's septic field on an adjacent parcel.

Town Code Enforcement Officer Mike Stewart indicated that there was enough separation between the proposed location of Mr. Frank's septic field and the applicant's property line.

Mr. Phillips then questioned how snow would be removed from the access driveway and access aisles. He noted that the trees shown along the perimeter of the buildings will be in the way. He indicated that it might be difficult during the winter months to access the end units if a lot of snow builds up in the aisles.

Mr. Romeyn agreed and indicated that he may need to look at this issue and change the placement of the trees.

Mr. Howland noted that if snow builds up at the end of the access aisles, water may pond on the access aisles during the spring months.

Mr. Phillips indicated that he had no issues with the colors of buildings as proposed by the applicants.

Mr. Stewart asked if the plantings were even needed?

Mr. Phillips indicated that he felt the plantings should be provided in order to add a buffer along NYS Route 30.

Mr. Romeyn talked about possibly creating a shelf in the slope for the trees.

Eventually, the Planning Board asked Mr. Romeyn to examine this issue and come back with a revised proposal for its next meeting.

3. Vehicular access and internal traffic circulation for larger vehicles may be very difficult given the 14' wide gravel access driveway with a 6% slope.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Phillips recognized that the Planning Board had already discussed the vehicular access issues on the site.

4. Will electric service be provided to each of the storage buildings?

DISCUSSION: Mr. Romeyn indicated that electric service would be provided to the site. He indicated that the electric service will be run underground from a pole on the northeast corner of the property. He indicated that electric service would not be provided to individual units.

5. The size and design of the existing sign along NYS Route 30 should be identified on the drawings. Also, is any additional signage going to be

provided along Riceville Road besides the directional signs shown on the drawing?

DISCUSSION: Mr. Romeyn distributed a photo showing the existing sign along NYS Route 30 and the new lettering that will be provided on that sign.

Mr. Phillips asked if “no parking” signs would be placed on the buildings so that tenants did not leave vehicles parked in front of someone else’s storage unit?

Mr. Romeyn indicated that he did not intend to put “no parking” signs on the building.

Mrs. Salvione indicated that she hoped common sense would dictate that tenants would not leave vehicles in front of other storage units.

Mr. Phillips asked if the property would be gated?

Mr. Romeyn indicated that it would not.

6. The illumination pattern for the high-pressured sodium lights has not been described on the Site Plan application.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Romeyn indicated that he could provide a cut sheet showing the photometrics of the sodium lights.

Mrs. Salvione asked if any security system would be provided for the storage units?

Mr. Romeyn indicated that there would be no security system.

7. The 20’ driveway easement over the lands of Mayfield Historical Society needs to be clarified. The Mayfield Historical Society property is listed on the National Register of Historic Places and will need to be recognized as part of the State Environmental Quality Review process.

DISCUSSION: The Planning Board and Mr. Romeyn recognized that the Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation would need to be notified regarding this project and may offer comments regarding this proposal.

8. A signature line should be provided for the Chairman of the Planning Board on the final Site Plan drawings.

DISCUSSION: There were no comments regarding this issue.

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 Full Environmental Assessment Form, provided by the applicant, has been completed adequately?

DISCUSSION: The Planning Board felt that the Full 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)(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 a Type 1 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: Aaron Howland
SECONDED: Roberta Ricciardi
VOTE: 5 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 Mario and Ann Greco's Site Plan for storage buildings on their property?

MOTION: To schedule a public hearing on Mario and Ann Greco's Site Plan for storage buildings along Riceville Road for 6:00 p.m., Wednesday, June 17, 2015.

MADE BY: John Kessler
SECONDED: Marilyn Salvione
VOTE: 5 in favor, 0 opposed

V. **CHRISTIAN KLUERG (CMK LLC) – SITE PLAN FOR OFFICE BUILDING
ALONG NYS ROUTE 30:**

A. Background:

Christian Klueg would like to build a new 4,320 sq. ft. office building along the west side of NYS Route 30 at its intersection with Black Street (Tax Map Parcel No. 152.-10-2). The project site is approximately 1.885 acres in size and is currently owned by William Murphy. As part of the project, several structures and two (2) foundations will be removed from the property. The project will also involve the construction of internal driveways, parking areas for 23 vehicles and landscaping.

Travis Mitchell, P.E., representing Mr. Klueg, gave Board members a brief overview of the project. He pointed out that Mr. Klueg's proposed project will be situated within the commercial corridor of the Town of Mayfield. He indicated that two (2) existing curb cuts on NYS Route 30 and Black Street will be reused. He pointed out that the Town of Mayfield Zoning Code requires that 22 off-street parking spaces be provided for this project and his proposal is to provide 23 spaces. He indicated that the office building project complies with all setbacks for the Town of Mayfield. He explained that his client would like to reuse the Vails Mills

sign and restore the structure. He indicated that an onsite septic system will be constructed and an existing well will be reused as part of the project.

Board members asked if there was any lighting in the existing sign?

Mr. Klueg indicated that it was lit with shoebox-style LED lights.

Mr. Mitchell showed Board members elevation drawings for the project which depicted an Adirondack-themed exterior for the building with timber beams and earth-tone siding. He indicated that the signage will include all of the building's tenants.

Mr. Stewart asked if the sign would be lit?

Mr. Mitchell indicated that it would be.

Mr. Mitchell explained that he has a letter from the NYS Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation (OPRHP) indicating that the site is clear even though it is located in an archeologically sensitive area. He also indicated that there are no wetlands or endangered species that have been identified by the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC). However, he indicated that his office has flagged the site and feels that there are federally-protected wetlands along the southern boundary of the property. Consequently, all development on the site will remain outside of that area.

Mr. Mitchell briefly reviewed the tentative schedule for the project.

B. Code Enforcement Office/County Planning Department Review:

The Town 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. The width of both access driveways should be labeled on the Site Plan drawing.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Mitchell indicated that the driveways are approximately 24' in width. He indicated that he would label the widths on a revised drawing.

2. The location of any outdoor storage areas on the property should be identified.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Klueg indicated that he will be removing a shed from his existing property on the other side of Route 30 and placing it on the new site.

Mr. Mitchell indicated that he would find out where that building will be located and show it on the revised drawing.

3. The design of the existing sign which is to remain should be noted on the Site Plan drawings. Additionally, the location and design of any new signage to be provided on the site should be noted on the drawings and specification sheets.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Klueg indicated that window decals will be used.

4. The location and design of all outdoor lighting to be provided on the site should be identified.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Phillips asked that the photometrics of the outdoor lighting be provided on the revised drawing.

5. The happy return day lilies are mislabeled in the planting schedule on Sheet 6 of 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Mitchell indicated that he would relabel the planting schedule.

6. An estimated Project Construction Schedule should be included with the Site Plan drawings.

DISCUSSION: The Planning Board asked that a copy of the tentative Construction Schedule be included with the revised Site Plan drawing.

7. The plan for extending energy distribution facilities into the project site should be identified on the Site Plan drawings.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Mitchell indicated that he would show how electric services will be extended into the site.

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. There was a brief discussion concerning the signature on the Short Environmental Assessment Form since Mr. Klueg is not the current owner. Mr. Klueg indicated that he has an agreement with William Murphy to purchase the property once his Site Plan is approved by the Planning Board. The Planning Board did not ask for any further clarification on this issue.

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)(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: Marilyn Salvione
VOTE: 5 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 Christian Klueg's Site Plan for an office building along NYS Route 30?

MOTION: To schedule a public hearing on Christian Klueg's Site Plan for an office building along NYS Route 30 for 6:00 p.m., Wednesday, June 17, 2015.

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

VI. ROBERT KAZMIERSKI – SITE PLAN FOR EXPANSION OF WILDLIFE SPORTS AND EDUCATIONAL MUSEUM:

A. Background:

Robert Kazmierski is proposing to construct a 13,000+/- sq. ft. addition to the Wildlife Sports and Educational Museum along the east side of NYS Route 30 in the Town of Mayfield (Tax Map Parcel No. 152.-6-1.12). As part of the project, an additional 97 parking spaces will be constructed. A 7,100 sq. ft. pond will also be constructed with a 12' x 12' sprinkler pump building to supply a sprinkler line to the proposed addition.

Steven Smith, P.E., representing Mr. Kazmierski, indicated that he intended for this evening's submittal to be treated as a sketch plan. He explained that he did not want to spend a significant amount of time on the drawings for this proposed expansion until the Planning Board endorsed the concepts that are being put forth by Mr. Kazmierski. He noted that, for example, there are no septic system details available at the moment. He also pointed out that the 97 future spaces shown on the drawing will not be constructed unless they become necessary at some future date. He indicated that there are no parking standards for this type of use in the Town's Zoning Code but felt that given the fact that the Visitors Center has approximately 1,000 visitors annually, the 127 spaces that currently exist on the property should be sufficient.

Mr. Phillips asked how much additional capacity the proposed addition will provide?

Mr. Smith indicated that it will double the size of the building. He indicated that the space will be used for additional displays and dioramas.

Mr. Smith talked about the size of the existing septic system that was once used for the grocery store. He indicated that he has found three (3) tanks on the property, which means it was a fairly significant system. Mr. Smith also talked about the need to eventually construct a pond on the property that will be used for the sprinkler system and be a component of the Stormwater Drainage Plan. He indicated that Mr. Kazmierski may also use the pond for fishing demonstrations.

Mr. Phillips asked if there were any wetlands on the property?

Mr. Smith indicated that he believed there are some wetlands on the back portion of the property. Mr. Smith also pointed out that he has sent a letter to the Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation since the property is located in an archeologically-sensitive area but has not heard back from that agency yet.

Mr. Smith then indicated that no additional lighting will be provided on the property. He pointed out that the facility is not open at night and, therefore, his client did not feel any additional lighting would be necessary.

Mr. Phillips asked if fill had been added to the north side of the property?

Mr. Kazmierski indicated that he has brought some fill into the property for the proposed addition.

Mr. Phillips asked if there would be any outdoor exhibits?

Mr. Kazmierski indicated that there are none planned at the moment. However, he may eventually create some trails in the wooded area on the south side of the property.

Mrs. Salvione asked Mr. Kazmierski if he had any plans to eventually remove the tractor trailers that are on the Wildlife Museum property?

Mr. Kazmierski indicated that he has sold a few of the tractor trailers as he emptied them out. He indicated that he still has some displays that he recently purchased stored in those trailers.

Mrs. Salvione explained that the Planning Board has asked property owners to be very diligent about keeping the aesthetic appearance of their properties acceptable. She hinted that the Planning Board would like to see the trailers removed permanently from the property.

Mr. Kazmierski then talked about a potential sign he would like to place at the southern end of his property which is up the road from the museum. He talked about the number of mounts he has in the museum. He pointed out that his Wildlife Museum has more mounts than three (3) State museums combined. Mr. Kazmierski then talked about the exterior of the building which will be a simulated wood panel with an imitation stone veneer.

Mr. Phillips reiterated the Planning Board's desire to see the tractor trailers removed from the property.

Mr. Kazmierski indicated that he would like to get a public hearing scheduled immediately so that he could get the shell of the facility built this year.

The Planning Board asked what type of building would be used?

Mr. Smith indicated that he would be using Munter buildings for the proposed addition.

Mr. Stewart, again, tried to explain that the Planning Board would like to see Mr. Kazmierski mimic the appearance of other buildings in the area by creating an Adirondack-style façade.

Mr. Phillips agreed and noted that the Planning Board will eventually be the entity that has to answer to the public if the proposed addition does not turn out as planned.

There was then a lengthy discussion between Board members and Mr. Kazmierski regarding the appearance of the building.

B. Code Enforcement Office/County Planning Department Review:

The Town 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. There are no topographic features shown on the Site Plan drawing.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Smith indicated that he would provide topographic features on a revised Site Plan.

2. The Stormwater Drainage Plan for the site will need to be provided.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Smith indicated that the Stormwater Drainage Plan would be shown on the revised plan.

3. The drawings indicate that only 7,260 sq. ft. of the proposed addition will be usable floor area for assembly. A description of what the proposed addition is to be used for should be provided.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Kazmierski indicated that the additional space will be used for display areas but he did not give the Planning Board any idea how the extra space in the addition would be used.

4. The location of outdoor storage areas on the site should be identified.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Kazmierski indicated that he would not need any outdoor storage areas.

5. A description of how the proposed pond will be created should be provided with the Site Plan drawings.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Smith indicated that he would provide an explanation on the revised Site Plan drawings of how the pond will be constructed.

6. The final design of the proposed onsite septic system will need to be provided along with percolation and pit test results.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Smith indicated that he would provide the septic system details on the revised drawing.

7. The size and design of the existing sign should be noted on the drawings. The location and design of any additional signage on the property should also be noted.

DISCUSSION: The Planning Board, once again, held a brief discussion with Mr. Kazmierski concerning signage on the property.

Mr. Smith indicated that he would talk with his client about what type of signage he would like to eventually provide on the property.

8. The location and design of any additional lighting to be provided in the new parking area and along the exterior of the proposed addition should be noted.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Smith indicated that any additional lighting that is to be provided on the property will be noted on a revised drawing.

9. Will any additional landscaping be installed as part of this proposed addition?

DISCUSSION: Mr. Smith indicated that there is no additional landscaping currently proposed.

Mrs. Salvione indicated that the Planning Board has been consistent with its efforts to get applicants to provide landscaping as an investment in their properties.

Mr. Smith agreed and indicated that he would look at the parking lot area to possibly provide landscaped islands around the light poles. He indicated that landscaping may also be a possibility along the northern border of the property.

10. An estimated Project Construction Schedule for the proposal should be provided.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Smith indicated that he would have to speak with his client about the Project Construction Schedule. However, he indicated that his client would like to get the shell of the structure up this fall and work on the façade in the spring of 2016.

Mrs. Salvione reminded him that this is not a piece-meal process and that the Planning Board expects the entire project to be presented for approval.

Mr. Smith explained that the majority of the façade will likely be worked on by Mr. Kazmierski's Board members. He also indicated that his client will need to examine how many improvements he can afford on the property.

C. 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 Kazmierski's Site Plan for expansion of the Wildlife Sports and Educational Museum?

DISCUSSION: The Planning Board recognized that no further review can take place at this time until additional information has been provided on the Site Plan drawings.

MOTION: To table any further action on Robert Kazmierski's Site Plan for an addition to the Wildlife Museum until additional information is available for the project.

MADE BY: Marilyn Salvione

SECONDED: John Kessler

VOTE: 5 in favor, 0 opposed

VII. CLOSE OF THE MEETING:

MOTION: To close the meeting at 8:23 p.m.

MADE BY: Marilyn Salvione

SECONDED: John Kessler

VOTE: 5 in favor, 0 opposed