

# TOWN OF MAYFIELD

## PLANNING BOARD

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 2025  
6:00 P.M.

### MEETING NOTES

#### PRESENT:

- X JOHN KESSLER, CHAIRMAN
- AARON HOWLAND, VICE CHAIRMAN
- X RICHARD MILES
- X JERRY MOORE
- X GRANT RAUCH
- X DAVID JANKOWSKI, ALTERNATE
- X BONNIE VANPATTEN, ALTERNATE
  
- X NORMAN BARBOSA, CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFICER
- X AARON ENFIELD, FULTON COUNTY SENIOR PLANNER
- X MIKE HARRINGTON, LAMONT ENGINEERING

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Carol Jabonski, Carol Coloney, Lori DeVoe, Jacob Gaito, Michael Angus, Christy S. Gifford, Marie-Anne Santore, Peter Stearns, Cathy Stearns, Bob Johnson, Mark Deyle, Jason Dell, Chris Skotnicki, Holly Fisk, Eileen Rovito, Louis Stutke

#### AGENDA ITEMS:

- Sunset Bay RV Park – Special Use Permit for Sunset Bay RV Park Expansion along Paradise Point Road (88.-4-37.12, 88.-4-18, 88.-4-21, 88.-4-53, 88.-4-20)
- Jacob Gaito – Site Plan Review for a Storage Facility at 111 Woods Hollow Road (136.-9-1)
- Louis Stutzke – Site Plan Review for expansion of a Commercial Business (Food & Fuel) at 3006-3008 NY-30 (120.-1-10 and 120.-1-11)

#### I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER:

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 pm.

#### II. APPROVE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING:

DISCUSSION: Mr. Enfield stated received a comment from Nancy Parker, Town Clerk, who mentioned that Christy Gifford's name was misspelled. He also noted that Norm Barbosa, Code Enforcement Officer, provided him with information regarding a statement Chairman Kessler made at the start of the meeting.

Planning Board members unanimously agreed to make the changes.

#### MOTION:

To approve the minutes of the previous meeting with the changes to Christy Gifford's name and the addition of the statement by Chairman Kessler.

MADE BY: Rich Miles  
SECONDED: Grant Rauch  
VOTE: Unanimous

**III. SUNSET BAY RV PARK – SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR AN RV PARK EXPANSION ALONG NY ROUTE 30 & PARADISE POINT ROAD:**

**A. Background:**

Sunset Bay RV Park, LLC is proposing to expand its RV Park along NYS Route 30 (Tax Map Parcel Nos. 88.-4-18, 88.-4-37.12, and 38.-4-21). The current Park has 299 sites, a water treatment plant, a wastewater treatment plant, a marina with docks, an office building, and a community building. The proposal will include an entrance along NYS-30, where a curb cut is currently located. As a result of wetlands identified by the APA, the scope of the RV sites has decreased in size. The new site will have a total of 656 RV Units.

The project is to be connected to Sewer District #5 along NYS Route 30.

The properties are located within the Mixed-Use and Agricultural 2 Zoning Districts, and an RV Park/Campground is an allowed use in both Zoning Districts. According to the Town of Mayfield 2017 Zoning Ordinance, a RV Park/ Campground is defined as “Any parcel of land which is planned or improved for the placement of 3 or more RVs or three or more campsites for tents or any other similar form of outdoor accommodations, which are used as temporary living quarters.” Given the Town’s Zoning for RV Parks, the applicant is well below the maximum number of RV sites within the RV Park.

The project is located within the Adirondack Park and is classified under Moderate Intensity Use by the Adirondack Park Agency. The Planning Board classified the project as a Type II Action under SEQRA, as there is a special provision for Class A and Class B Actions within the APA. This project is a Class A project.

One of the parcels is currently enrolled in Fulton County Agricultural District #1. In the spring of 2025, the owner requested to be removed as part of the 8-year review from NYS Department of Agriculture and Markets.

**B. August 2025 Planning Board Meeting:**

During the August 2025 Planning Board meeting, the Planning Board reconvened the Public Hearing for a third time. The Planning Board closed the Public Hearing, marking the start of the 62-day time frame. Items that were brought up include:

1. Waiting until all permits are approved

DISCUSSION: Mr. Enfield indicated that the previous application related to RV parks did not have this criteria, but was listed as a condition. He stated that allowing for this to occur would set a precedent for other projects that may hinge on a determination from the Planning Board.

The Planning Board unanimously agreed and stated that it was a non-issue.

Mr. Miles asked that a condition be added to the approval process.

2. Concerns with the USPS

DISCUSSION: Mr. Enfield stated that the comment originated from a resident who was unaware of the project's existence and had not received a mailing. Mr. Enfield stated that

those within 500 feet received two (2) certified mail return receipt. He noted that the zoning ordinance allows for one (1) per the Special Use Permit process.

Chairman Kessler stated that if there is documentation.

Mr. Barbosa stated that he has a copy.

Mr. Enfield also stated he has a copy.

Mr. Barbosa stated there was an issue with a returned letter. He mentioned he hand delivered it.

Mr. Enfield stated that the Planning Board cannot regulate the United States Postal Service and that this project has been under review with the new engineer for almost a year.

Planning Board members agreed that issues with the USPS are not within the Planning Board's jurisdiction.

3. Increased Traffic on Paradise Point Road

DISCUSSION: Mr. Enfield reiterated the fact that, as a result of the project, no new traffic will be incurred on Paradise Point Road due to the Route 30 entrance and the gates between the current and proposed sections. He also pointed out that traffic would only increase in the event of an evacuation, when the gates would open.

Planning Board members concurred with Mr. Enfield, stating that this issue had been discussed at several Planning Board meetings and did not see it as a concern, given the work the applicant had done to mitigate it.

4. Speculation on aquifer serving Dennie Loop and Paradise Point Road/water testing 12 months out of the year

DISCUSSION: Mr. Mitchell stated that this would be determined during the test with the hydrogeologist.

Ms. VanPatten requested that testing be done during the summer months.

Mr. Mitchell stated that if the project received a final determination before the summer, they would have been able to do this. He indicated that testing will be at the schedule of the hydrogeologist.

5. Concerns about Town's Emergency Services

DISCUSSION: Mr. Enfield stated that, in speaking with Fulton County EMO, the Mayfield Volunteer Fire Department participates in a county-wide Mutual Aid Plan.

Mr. Rauch stated that the Mutual Aid Plan is national and is at the discretion of the fire chief of the fire department to make the request.

Planning Board members had no further comments on this issue that were brought up during the Public Hearing.

6. Phased approval

DISCUSSION: Mr. Enfield stated that the Planning Board has not approved phases before this and that doing so would set a precedent.

Mr. Jankowski requested that Phases 1B and 1C be switched, as it would allow the applicant to start the new entrance along Paradise Point Road.

Planning Board concurred with Mr. Jankowski, citing that this was better for the project.

7. Campers living in the expansion area

DISCUSSION: Mr. Enfield stated that, during his visits to the site several times this summer, he did not see anyone living in the expansion area. He asked Ms. DeVoe, General Manager, if there were individuals living on the property.

Ms. DeVoe stated there are not.

The Planning Board did not see this comment as a concern.

*POST MEETING NOTE: The dumpster for the current section is located on the proposed expansion. Residents of Paradise Point Road may have noticed residents throwing their rubbish away.*

8. Invalid year for campfire smoke testing

DISCUSSION: Mr. Enfield asked the Planning Board to comment on this. He stated that during the summer months there were wild fires from Canada that were visible on the Great Sacandaga Lake.

After some back-and-forth discussion, the Planning Board felt that the effort made to provide data about this concern exceeded what was required for other applications.

9. Owner will sell the property

DISCUSSION: Mr. Enfield indicated that it is not within the scope of the Planning Board to dictate the sale of property. He mentioned that other projects, such as solar, are bought and sold, and the Planning Board cannot dictate those sales.

Planning Board agreed that this is a non-issue.

10. 267 Paradise Point Road

DISCUSSION: Chairman Kessler noted that during the Public Hearing, the owner, Tanya Moore, had requested a fence along the property line. He stated that the applicant should meet with them and obtain a sign-off if that is the case.

Planning Board members engaged in a back-and-forth conversation about whether a fence would be installed and whether trees would need to be cleared to accommodate it.

Mr. Enfield reminded Planning Board members that a concern with their other RV project had been cited, and the Code Enforcement Office had received several complaints.

Mr. Mitchell stated he would work with the applicant.

Ms. VanPatten indicated that written verification from each adjacent property owner should be provided to the Planning Board, so there are no issues in the future.

C. Draft Conditions:

To approve the 357 additional RV units (totaling 656) for Sunset Bay RV Park along NY-30 and Paradise Point Road, with the following conditions:

1. There shall be specific performance of the approved Site Plan, last revised on \_\_\_\_\_, 2025, consisting of \_\_\_\_ plan sheets prepared by Environmental Design Partnership, and all other specifications, renderings, design reports, and related project submissions as of their last revision date.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Harrington indicated that this is a standard condition and a catch-all for the project.

Planning Board members agreed to include this condition.

2. Applicant shall adequately address outstanding Planning Board comments identified at the final Planning Board meeting and incorporated in the Town Engineer's subsequent comment memo.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Harrington mentioned that if something is brought up at the meeting that requires a final determination and the project moves forward, this condition will address it.

Planning Board members agreed to include this condition.

3. NYSDOH will review and approve the new well and water supply system. Property owners within 1500 feet of the existing and proposed well shall be allowed to have their wells monitored during the Applicant's hydrogeological testing of the new well to confirm that there will not be a significant impact on the adjacent water supplies.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Miles inquired about the significance of the impact.

Mr. Harrington indicated that the hydrogeologist would determine it.

The Planning Board agreed to add this as a condition.

4. Only seasoned hardwood shall be approved for use in campfires. Applicant shall add this provision to the campground policies. Related to this, the Air Quality Index (AQI) shall be posted at various locations within the RV Park to indicate poor weather conditions for campfires.

DISCUSSION: The Planning Board agreed that seasoned hardwood will be required within both parts of the campground, as well as the Air Quality Index (AQI) provision

Mr. Enfield inquired where the Planning Board would like to have these within the RV Park?

Planning Board members requested that the gates and community buildings, as decided by Sunset Bay management, be placed.

Ms. DeVoe stated that she will also post it on the social media page they manage.

Planning Board members agreed to the proposed changes to the condition.

5. Access Gate data shall be sent annually at the end of the season to the Town of Mayfield Code Enforcement Office and the Fulton County Planning Department, starting after completion of the first phase and continuing for 5 years after the full build-out of the project. Data shall be in the format requested by the Town of Mayfield Code Enforcement Office.

DISCUSSION: Planning Board members concurred that this information should be sent to both the Town and the County.

6. Vegetative screening and fencing shall be provided, as shown on the Site Plan, along the new campground expansion area on the Paradise Point Road frontage.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Harrington inquired about the timing the Planning Board would like for this.

The Planning Board requested that this be done before construction.

Mr. Enfield said this way, the trees will have a chance to establish themselves, and if there is an issue, the Code Enforcement Office can be contacted.

7. Vegetative screening and fencing of the existing campground area shall be provided on the Paradise Point Road frontage. The fence shall be in accordance with the drawing details on the Site Plan. Any necessary field changes due to site conditions shall be approved by the Code Enforcement Officer.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Mitchell provided an elevation of the Site Plan showing the agreed-upon fencing.

Mr. Enfield requested that the fencing for the new, and current sections be labeled on the Site Plan. He also asked that, should fencing be required for the neighboring properties, it be labeled accordingly.

Mr. Harrington inquired when they would like the installation to commence.

After a back-and-forth conversation, the Planning Board agreed to allow the application for the construction of the fencing following a final determination.

8. A barrier shall be placed between the existing and new campground sections to minimize traffic from the new campground section to the existing section. Vehicular movements through the barrier shall only be allowed for special situations (e.g., boat docking, etc.).

DISCUSSION: Planning Board members agreed that these items have already been provided on the Site Plan and should be removed.

9. Site signage shall be formally reviewed during the building permit application process. This shall also include reviewing the required off-site signage to direct campers and visitors to the proper access gates.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Harrington stated that the Code Enforcement Office can review interior signage for emergency services.

The Planning Board was ok with adding this condition and letting the Town's Code Enforcement Office handle it.

10. Within the new section, the access gates along Paradise Point Road shall be used only for emergency or staff purposes.

DISCUSSION: The Planning Board felt that keeping this in its current condition made sense, given the concerns that the public has raised regarding traffic.

11. There shall be no on-site disposal or burning of clearing, construction, and demolition debris.

DISCUSSION: The Planning Board also felt that maintaining this condition was warranted, given the concerns about campfires.

12. All notes on the Site Plan documents constitute conditions of approval.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Harrington indicated this is a standard catch-all for approvals.

The Planning Board felt that this made sense to include as a condition.

13. The Applicant shall obtain all necessary permits and approvals for the Project, including payment of all application fees and any outstanding fees or expenses, such as review escrow fees.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Harrington stated that this would also be a catch-all condition from a financial standpoint.

Planning Board members agreed with this.

14. Provided all required approvals are received, the Applicant may apply for a building permit and proceed with Phase 1 of the project; however, no new sites may be occupied until the municipal sewer system has been installed and approved for service. Subsequent phases and/or land disturbance outside the limits of Phase 1 may not proceed until the municipal sewer system has been installed and approved for service.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Enfield reminded the Planning Board that this project is contingent on municipal sewer. He indicated that if this did not occur, the project would need to return to the Planning Board for an amendment.

15. All permits and approvals issued (or to be issued) for the Project by other agencies, including, as applicable, APA, NYSDEC, NYSDOT, NYSDOH, and the Town of Mayfield Code Enforcement Department, shall be fully complied with.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Harrington asked that the Army Corps of Engineers be added.

Planning Board members agreed with this.

16. The escrow account that was previously established shall be maintained and funded to permit technical assistance and inspections that the CEO may need during the construction phases and to provide any other technical or legal assistance required by the Town through the end of the construction phases and issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.

DISCUSSION: The Planning Board was alright with these conditions.

17. These conditions shall run with the land, and subsequent owners, operators, and tenants are bound thereby.

DISCUSSION: The Planning Board felt that this made sense to include as a condition.

18. Upon receipt of required approvals, final plans shall be submitted in the final form and ready for the Planning Board's approval and signature.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Enfield stated that the chairman would do this once the project has officially passed its conditions.

Planning Board members agreed with this.

D. Checklist:

1. To the extent possible, the 911 address of the new section should be NY-30.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Enfield indicated that he would speak with the Fulton County Sheriff's Department again to obtain confirmation of the addresses.

*POST MEETING NOTE: Mr. Enfield spoke with Keith Shults of the Fulton County 911 Division. He agreed this made sense, and the applicant should follow up with him on this process.*

2. Fulton County Board of Supervisors to remove Tax Map Parcel 88.-4-20 from the Fulton County Agricultural District.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Enfield stated that the Board of Supervisors has not addressed this issue this year, but plans to do so soon.

E. Planning Board Action:

DISCUSSION: Mr. Harrington stated that he would review the latest set of plans again to identify any other issues he may find.

MOTION: To table review on the Sunset Bay project until the October 15, 2025, meeting.

MADE BY: Jerry Moore  
SECONDED: Grant Rauch  
VOTE: Unanimous

**IV. JACOB GAITO – SITE PLAN REVIEW FOR A STORAGE FACILITY(S) AT 111 WOODS HOLLOW ROAD (136.-9-1):**

A. Background:

Jacob Gaito is looking to construct a Storage Facility at 111 Woods Hollow (136.-9-1), which is approximately 4.60+/- acres in size. The applicant is looking to build five storage facilities: one 30'x255', one 30'x260', one 40'x265', one 20'x235', and one 20'x110'. Additionally, there will be five parking spots.

The project is situated within the Mixed Use 2 Zoning District, and a Storage Facility is a permitted use under Site Plan Review. A Storage Facility is defined as “a piece of land, structure, or group of structures, designed and/or constructed for short- or long-term storage of individual or business property for a fee. A storage facility does not include a warehouse/distribution center, truck terminal, or other transfer facility for goods, wares, or merchandise.”

The applicant indicated that the storage facilities will be green and brown to align with the Town of Mayfield's comprehensive desire for buildings to be more Adirondack-themed in nature.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Gaito provided an overview of the project. He stated that he had purchased the property from one of the adjacent property owners, who had no issue with the project.

Mr. Gaito explained that the parking spots were for boat storage, not vehicles.

Chairman Kessler indicated that there is no parking indicated on the Site Plan . He stated that, according to the zoning code, parking will be necessary, and that he should look into seeing how he could fit some on the property. He stated that if required, he could go to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Mr. Moore questioned the ownership of the property where the project was taking place.

A. Site Plan Review:

The following comments have been made in accordance with the Town's Site Plan Review of the Mayfield Zoning Ordinance:

1. The title of the drawing, including the name and address of the applicant and the person responsible for preparing said plan.  
STATUS: Provided
2. Both existing and final contours shall be shown. Unless otherwise permitted by the Planning Board, the plan shall be drawn to a scale of 1 inch equals 50 feet, with two-foot contours indicating the topography of the parcel within 100 feet of the area under review.  
STATUS: Provided, the contours are 1 inch equals 60' and are done at 1-foot contours.
3. North arrow, scale, and date.  
SSTATUS: Provided.
4. The boundaries of the property are plotted to scale—current zoning classification of property, including exact zoning boundary if in more than 1 district.  
STATUS: Provided.
5. Existing watercourses and wetlands.  
STATUS: Provided.
6. A grading and drainage plan, type of construction, proposed use, and exterior dimensions of all buildings.  
STATUS: Provided.
7. The location, design, type of construction, proposed use, and exterior dimensions of all buildings.  
STATUS: Provided.
8. The location and widths of driveways on the site and access to existing roads and highways. Location to the nearest intersection of public roads to be provided. Location, design, and type of construction of all parking and/or truck loading areas, including access and egress.  
STATUS: Provided.
9. The location and dimensions for pedestrian access.  
STATUS: N/A
10. The location for outdoor storage, if any.  
STATUS: Provided.

11. The location, design, and construction materials of all existing or proposed site improvements, including buildings, drains, culverts, retaining walls, and fences.  
STATUS: N/A
12. The location and size of water and sewer lines and appurtenances. Any means of water supply or sewage disposal should be described, including location, design, and construction materials, and shall comply with all requirements of the New York State Department of Health and New York State Department of Environmental Conservation.  
STATUS: N/A
13. The location of fire and other emergency zones, including the location of fire hydrants.  
STATUS: N/A
14. The location, design, and construction materials of all energy distribution facilities, including electrical, gas, and alternative energy.  
STATUS: N/A
15. The location, size, design, and type of construction of all proposed signs.  
STATUS: Provided.  
DISCUSSION: Chairman Kessler asked if there would be any lighting on the sign.  
  
Mr. Gaito stated there may be.  
  
Chairman Kessler stated that the type of lighting should be provided to the Planning Board.
16. The location and proposed development of all buffer areas, including existing vegetative cover.  
STATUS: Provided. A wetland buffer is provided.
17. The location and design of outdoor lighting facilities.  
STATUS: Provided.  
DISCUSSION: Mr. Enfield asked that the legend reflect the light locations.  
  
Mr. Enfield requested that the application revisit his lighting plan, as it appears there are currently too many lights provided, which may cause light pollution.
18. The location and amount of building area proposed for retail sales or similar commercial activity.  
STATUS: ?  
DISCUSSION: Mr. Gaito stated 0%.
19. The general landscaping plan and planting schedule.  
STATUS: Not Provided. Does the Planning Board wish to include any screening along Woods Hollow Road?  
  
DISCUSSION: The Planning Board had a back-and-forth conversation with the applicant. They asked that plants fence be places along Woods Hollow Road. Subsequently, they indicated that while the neighbor next door has no concerns, given all the trees coming down, there should be some attempt for screening.
20. An estimated project construction schedule.  
STATUS: Mr. Gaito stated it would take several weeks to implement Phase I.
21. State Environmental Quality Review information and completed forms as may be required.

STATUS: Provided.

22. The location, width, and purpose of all existing and proposed easements, setbacks, reservations, and areas dedicated to public use within the adjoining property.

STATUS:?

DISCUSSION: Mr. Gaito stated there were none.

23. A description of all existing deed restrictions or covenants applying to the property.

STATUS: N/A

24. A location map, to be prominently provided on the first sheet of plans.

STATUS: Provided.

25. A signature line, to be provided for the Chairman of the Planning Board.

STATUS: N/A

26. Any other elements integral to the proposed development as deemed necessary by the Planning Board, including identification of any state or county permits required for the project's execution and the existence of any covenants governing the land.

A. Staffing

DISCUSSION: Mr. Gaito stated that there will be no on-site staff. He did indicate that Douglas Soucy, the neighbor, would serve as an as-needed employee.

B. Hours of Operation

DISCUSSION: Mr. Gaito stated that the storage facility would be open 24 hours a day.

C. Office?

DISCUSSION: Mr. Gaito mentioned there will be no office for the storage facility.

D. NYSDEC Freshwater Wetland Jurisdictional Determination Form.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Enfield mentioned that a Determination letter will be necessary for this project, given the ground disturbance. He indicated that if the project needs to be reconfigured, it can come back for a Site Plan Amendment.

B. General Municipal Law 239-m:

In accordance with NYS General Municipal Law Section 239-m, the Planning Board shall refer projects to the Fulton County Planning Board to assess any regional impacts that are within 500' of a municipal boundary, county or state existing or proposed road, a county or state existing or proposed park or recreation area, a county or a state-owned property (existing or proposed, on which a public building or institution is located), or a farm operation located within an agricultural district. Project referrals include Site Plans, Special Use Permits, Zoning Amendments, Comprehensive Plans, or other authorizations that the Board may issue under zoning provisions.

Does the Planning Board feel as though this project is ready to go to the Fulton County Planning Board?

MOTION: To forward the project to the Fulton County Planning Board for their October 2025 meeting.

MADE BY: Grant Rauch  
SECONDED: Jerry Moore

VOTE: Unanimous

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 an 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?
2. Does the Planning Board feel that any additional information should be provided as part of the SEQR process?
3. Type I or an Unlisted Action: Section 617.6 (b)(3) of 6 NYCRR states that when an agency proposes to directly undertake, fund, or approve a Type I or Unlisted Action undergoing a Coordinated Review with other Involved Agencies, it must, as soon as possible, transmit Part I of the Environmental Assessment Form, completed by the Project Sponsor, or a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), along with a copy of any received application, to all Involved Agencies. It must also 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.  
Type II Action: A Type II Action is categorically excluded from SEQR. These actions have been determined not to have a significant adverse impact on the environment. Once an action is determined to be a Type II, no further environmental review is required. Section 617.5(c) provides the following actions that are not subject to a Type II Action.
4. It is recommended that the project be classified as Unlisted Action and that a Coordinated Review be done with the following agencies: Broadalbin-Kenyon Volunteer Fire Department, NYS Department of Environmental Conservation.

MOTION: To classify the project as an Unlisted Action and to do a Coordinated review and allow agencies until October 15, 2025, to offer comments.

MADE BY: Jerry Moore

SECONDED: Grant Rauch

VOTE: Unanimous

D. Planning Board Action:

Article X of the Town of Mayfield Zoning Law indicates that within 62 days from the time the Planning Board determines that a project is complete, it shall hold a public hearing on the application. Said hearing shall be advertised in a newspaper of general circulation in the Town at least ten (10) days before such hearing. Does the Planning Board wish to schedule a Public Hearing at this time?

DISCUSSION:

Chairman Kessler stated that he did not feel the project was complete and that more information was needed. He asked to table the project.

MOTION: To table Jacob Gaito's Site Plan Review.

MADE BY: John Kessler

SECONDED: Jerry Moore  
VOTE: Unanimous

**V. LOUIS STUTZKE – SITE PLAN FOR AN EXPANSION OF A RETAIL OR SERVICE ESTABLISHMENT (FOOD & FUEL) AT 3006 & 3008 NY-30 (120.-1-10 & 120.-1-11):**

**A. Background:**

Louis Stutzke currently owns 3008 NY-30 (Take Map Parcel Number 120.-1-11), which is approximately .54 acres. Mr. Stutzke also owns the business Food and Fuel, located at 3006 NY-30 (Tax Map Parcel 120.-1-10) on property owned by Muhammad Sharif, which is 0.64 acres in size. Mr. Stutzke intends to expand the Food and Fuel operation onto 3006 NY-30.

The applicant will construct a 6,340 sq ft building that includes a new wastewater treatment area, a new concrete pad and propane tanks, new air pumps, a new enclosed dumpster, and 32 parking spaces. The applicant is also considering adding four more gas pumps to the property.

The project is located within the Mixed Use 1, and a Retail or Service Establishment is an allowed use under Site Plan Review. A Retail or Service Establishment can be defined as “a use or structure, not otherwise described in this Law, that provides goods and/or services directly to consumers where said goods and/or services are available for immediate purchase and removal.”

In 1998, the NYS Department of Environmental Conservation approved a reclamation remediation system on the property at 3006 NY-30, which led to a shed being built partly within the NYSDOT ROW.

**DISCUSSION:**

Mr. Dell and Mr. Studke provided the Planning Board with an overall concept of the proposed Food and Fuel project, which will include the adjacent parcel.

Mr. Stutke indicated there was a spill in 1984, which contaminated the soil. He mentioned that in 1998, the NYS Department of Environmental Conservation approved a reclamation remediation system for the property, which included the construction of a shed, a portion of which is in the NYSDOT ROW.

**B. Site Plan Review:**

The following comments have been made in accordance with the Town’s Site Plan Review of the Mayfield Zoning Ordinance:

1. The title of the drawing, including the name and address of the applicant and the person responsible for preparing said plan.  
STATUS: Provided
2. Both existing and final contours shall be shown. Unless otherwise permitted by the Planning Board, the plan shall be drawn to a scale of 1 inch equals 50 feet, with two-foot contours indicating the topography of the parcel within 100 feet of the area under review.  
STATUS: Provided
3. North arrow, scale, and date.  
STATUS: Provided
4. The boundaries of the property are plotted to scale—current zoning classification of property, including exact zoning boundary if in more than 1 district.  
STATUS: Provided

5. Existing watercourses and wetlands.  
STATUS: N/A
6. A grading and drainage plan, type of construction, proposed use, and exterior dimensions of all buildings.  
STATUS: Provided
7. The location, design, type of construction, proposed use, and exterior dimensions of all buildings.  
STATUS: Not Provided. Does the Planning Board wish to see the exterior dimensions?  
DISCUSSION:  
Chairman Kessler stated that he would like to see elevations of the building and that the color and aesthetic be Adirondack in style, which is cited in the Town's Comprehensive Plan.
8. The location and widths of driveways on the site and access to existing roads and highways. Location to the nearest intersection of public roads to be provided. Location, design, and type of construction of all parking and/or truck loading areas, including access and egress.  
STATUS: Provided. NYSDOT may comment on a change.
9. The location and dimensions for pedestrian access.  
STATUS: N/A
10. The location for outdoor storage, if any.  
STATUS: Provided
11. The location, design, and construction materials of all existing or proposed site improvements, including buildings, drains, culverts, retaining walls, and fences.  
STATUS: N/A
12. The location and size of water and sewer lines and appurtenances. Any means of water supply or sewage disposal should be described, including location, design, and construction materials, and shall comply with all requirements of the New York State Department of Health and New York State Department of Environmental Conservation.  
STATUS: N/A
13. The location of fire and other emergency zones, including the location of fire hydrants.  
STATUS: N/A
14. The location, design, and construction materials of all energy distribution facilities, including electrical, gas, and alternative energy.  
STATUS: Provided.
15. The location, size, design, and type of construction of all proposed signs.  
STATUS: ? Will the applicant be making any changes to the signage?  
DISCUSSION: Mr. Studke mentioned that a sign will be placed on the building. The sign in the NYSDOT ROW will be staying.
16. The location and proposed development of all buffer areas, including existing vegetative cover.  
STATUS: N/A
17. The location and design of outdoor lighting facilities.  
STATUS: ?

DISCUSSION: The Planning Board indicated that lighting will need to be shown on the site plan, indicating where the lighting on the property will be located, such as the building and gas pumps.

18. The location and amount of building area proposed for retail sales or similar commercial activity.  
STATUS: 80% of the Food and Fuel building.
19. The general landscaping plan and planting schedule.  
STATUS: The Planning Board felt this did not apply to this project.
20. An estimated project construction schedule.  
STATUS: 60 days to start construction on the project.
21. State Environmental Quality Review information and completed forms as may be required.  
STATUS: Provided.
22. The location, width, and purpose of all existing and proposed easements, setbacks, reservations, and areas dedicated to public use within the adjoining property.  
STATUS: N/A
23. A description of all existing deed restrictions or covenants applying to the property.  
STATUS: N/A
24. A location map, to be prominently provided on the first sheet of plans.  
STATUS: Provided
25. A signature line, to be provided for the Chairman of the Planning Board.  
STATUS: N/A
26. Any other elements integral to the proposed development as deemed necessary by the Planning Board, including identification of any state or county permits required for the project's execution and the existence of any covenants governing the land.
  - A. Merging of both properties  
DISCUSSION: Mr. Enfield pointed out that both addresses are owned by two separate individuals. He stated that while Mr. Studke rents Food and Fuel, he doesn't own the land. He stated that ownership of the parcel would benefit the project.
  - B. Staffing:  
DISCUSSION: Mr. Studke stated there are 24 employees for Food and Fuel.
  - C. Hours of Operation:  
DISCUSSION: Mr. Studke stated that the store is open 5:00 am – 10:00 pm Monday – Saturday, and 7:00 am – 10:00 pm on Sundays.
  - D. NYSDEC Freshwater Wetland Jurisdictional Determination Form.  
DISCUSSION: Mr. Enfield stated that this document will be necessary for the Planning Board. He indicated that if the agency has issues with the project, it may need to come back for a Site Plan amendment.
  - E. Snow Removal Plan:  
DISCUSSION: Mr. Enfield stated that a Snow Plan should be provided on the Site Plan.

C. General Municipal Law 239-m:

In accordance with NYS General Municipal Law Section 239-m, the Planning Board shall refer projects to the Fulton County Planning Board to assess any regional impacts that are within 500' of a municipal boundary, county or state existing or proposed road, a county or state existing or proposed park or recreation area, a county or a state-owned property (existing or proposed, on which a public building or institution is located), or a farm operation located within an agricultural district. Project referrals include Site Plans, Special Use Permits, Zoning Amendments, Comprehensive Plans, or other authorizations that the Board may issue under zoning provisions.

Does the Planning Board feel as though this project is ready to go to the Fulton County Planning Board?

MOTION: To forward the project to the Fulton County Planning Board.

MADE BY: Rich Miles

SECONDED: Grany Miles

VOTE: Unanimous

D. 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 an 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?
2. Does the Planning Board feel that any additional information should be provided as part of the SEQR process?
3. Type I or an Unlisted Action: Section 617.6 (b)(3) of 6 NYCRR states that when an agency proposes to directly undertake, fund, or approve a Type I or Unlisted Action undergoing a Coordinated Review with other Involved Agencies, it must, as soon as possible, transmit Part I of the Environmental Assessment Form, completed by the Project Sponsor, or a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), along with a copy of any received application, to all Involved Agencies. It must also 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.

Type II Action: A Type II Action is categorically excluded from SEQR. These actions have been determined not to have a significant adverse impact on the environment. Once an action is determined to be a Type II, no further environmental review is required. Section 617.5(c) provides the following actions that are not subject to a Type II Action.

4. It is recommended that the project be classified as an Unlisted Action and that a Coordinated Review be conducted with the NYS Department of Health, the NYS Department of Transportation, the Mayfield Town Zoning Board of Appeals, the NYS Department of Environmental Conservation, and the Mayfield Fire Department. Does the Planning Board wish to include any additional agencies?

DISCUSSION: Planning Board members felt no additional agencies should be included.

MOTION: To classify the project as an Unlisted Action and to do a Coordinated review and allow agencies until October 15, 2025, to offer comments.

MADE BY: Grant Rauch  
SECONDED: John Kessler  
VOTE: Unanimous

E. Planning Board Action:

Article X of the Town of Mayfield Zoning Law indicates that within 62 days from the time the Planning Board determines that a preliminary plat for a proposed subdivision is complete, it shall hold a public hearing on the application. Said hearing shall be advertised in a newspaper of general circulation in the Town at least ten (10) days before such hearing. Does the Planning Board wish to schedule a Public Hearing at this time?

DISCUSSION:

The Planning Board felt that, aside from some missing items, the applicant was complete and ready to hold a Public Hearing.

MOTION: To schedule a Public Hearing on Louis Studke’s Site Plan for a Commercial Business along NY-30.

MADE BY: Rich Miles  
SECONDED: Grant Rauch  
VOTE: Unanimous

**VI. OTHER BUSINESS:**

A. Fulton County Planning Department:

Mr. Enfield mentioned that a Planning and Zoning training will be held at Mohawk Valley Community College on November 10, 2025. He indicated that topics include Affordable Housing, Short-Term Rentals, and Pro-Housing.

**VII. CLOSE OF THE MEETING:**

MOTION: To close the meeting at 8:16 pm

MADE BY: Grant Rauch  
SECONDED: John Kessler  
VOTE: Unanimous