

**TOWN OF MAYFIELD PLANNING BOARD
JULY 15, 2020
6:00 P.M.
TOWN OF MAYFIELD TOWN HALL**

MEETING NOTES

PRESENT:

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

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

(NOTE: Planning Board Members Aaron Howland and Jerry Moore participated in the meeting remotely through a Zoom Conference.)

OTHERS PRESENT:

**JACK PUTMAN
ROGER PUTMAN
TYLER PUTMAN
MICHAEL IULIUCCI**

I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER:

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

II. APPROVE MINUTES OF LAST REGULAR MEETING:

DISCUSSION: Planning Board Chairman John Kessler indicated that Board members did not receive copies of the June 17, 2020 minutes.

Mr. Geraghty stated that he thought the minutes were e-mailed to the Town Code Enforcement Office. However, he indicated that he would check and have the minutes available for next month's meeting.

III. ROGER PUTMAN – PUBLIC HEARING ON SITE PLAN AMENDMENT FOR EQUIPMENT SALES BUSINESS:

A. Background:

Roger Putman owns a piece of property along both the north and south sides of NYS Route 29 in the Town of Mayfield between Progress Road and the Johnstown Town line (Tax Map Parcel No. 150.-3-57). The property is approximately 69 acres in size and is zoned under a C-1 Commercial classification. In 2013, Mr. Putman received a Site Plan approval for an equipment sales business that involved running the operation out of an existing office on the property and creating two (2) display areas for the equipment sales. One of the areas was approximately 900 sq. ft. in size and was situated along NYS Route 29, while the other display area was approximately 600 sq. ft. in size and was located behind the flower garden on Mr. Putman's property.

In July of 2017, Mr. Putman sought a Site Plan amendment for the equipment sales business that involved removing a portion of an existing barn along NYS Route 29 and constructing a 36' x 42' storage addition attached to the office space he was using for the business.

Mr. Putman has now constructed a 40' x 48' (1,920 sq. ft.) addition on the front side of the shop that is located behind his residence. As part of this project, a drainage swale will be or has been constructed along the west side of the addition that will drain into a 15' x 20' retaining pond in front of the new structure. Drainage calculations have been provided by the applicant's engineer as part of this proposed amendment.

B. June 17, 2020 Meeting:

During its June 17, 2020 meeting, the Town of Mayfield Planning Board continued its review of Roger Putman's Site Plan Amendment for his equipment sales business along NYS Route 29 in the Town of Mayfield. At that time, the Planning Board did not ask for any new information and decided to schedule a public hearing on the Site Plan application for this evening's meeting.

STATUS: Since last month's meeting, Mr. Putman has now decided to make an additional amendment to his approved Site Plan by constructing a 24' x 36' (864 sq. ft.) addition on the backside of the office building that will be used as a showroom or display area.

PLANNING BOARD DISCUSSION: County Planning Consultant Sean Geraghty suggested that the Planning Board combine Mr. Putman's amendments into one (1) proposal rather than starting over with a separate amendment.

Planning Board members immediately agreed that this was the best way to review Mr. Putman's proposal.

C. Public Hearing:

1. The public hearing was opened at 6:03 p.m.
2. Speakers:

There was no one to speak during the public hearing.

3. The public hearing was closed at 6:04 p.m.

D. Planning Board Action:

In accordance with Article 9, Section 906 of the Town of Mayfield Zoning Regulations, the Planning Board, within sixty-two (62) days following the public hearing, shall approve, approve with modifications or disapprove the application for Site Plan approval. Consequently, does the Planning Board wish to make its final decision on Roger Putman's Site Plan Amendment at this time?

MOTION: To approve Roger Putman's Site Plan Amendments for his equipment sales business along NYS Route 29.

MADE BY: John Kessler
SECONDED: Fred Castiglione
VOTE: 5 in favor, 0 opposed

IV. MICHAEL AND SARITA IULIUCCI – SUBDIVISION ALONG PERIQUE ROAD:

A. Background:

Michael and Sarita Iuliucci own a 9.6+/- acre property along the east side of Perique Road in the Town of Mayfield (Tax Map Parcel No. 121.-2-2.2). The applicants would like to create a lot around the existing home and, at the same time, create a new building lot that will have access off of Lakeshore Drive.

B. Code Enforcement Office/County Planning Department Review:

Section 501 of the Town of Mayfield Subdivision Regulations outlines the information an applicant is required to submit to the Planning Board for a proposed subdivision. Upon review of the proposed preliminary plat by the

Town Code Enforcement Office and the Fulton County Planning Department, the following issues have been raised:

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

STATUS: Provided.

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

STATUS: Provided.

DISCUSSION: The Planning Board felt that no additional physical features needed to be shown on the subdivision 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: No accurate tax map information has been identified on the plat.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Geraghty indicated that the Adirondack Park Agency (APA) application, that was submitted as part of the subdivision application, has an incorrect Tax Map Parcel Number identified. He suggested that the correct Tax Map Parcel should be clearly shown on the final plat and be noted on the APA application.

5. All available utilities on all existing streets.

STATUS: Provided.

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

STATUS: Provided.

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

STATUS: The agreement transferring the easement over DOT's road to Rugg Road for Parcel Nos. 121.13-1-1, 2, 3 and 4 is identified in a notation on the plat.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Geraghty described the easements that are noted on the subdivision plat that provide access to four (4) small parcels along the lakefront.

The Planning Board had no comments or questions regarding the easements.

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 Health Department notation has not been noted.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Geraghty indicated that he would forward the language to the applicants regarding the Health Department's specifications.

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

STATUS: Provided.

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

STATUS: Provided.

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

STATUS: Provided.

13. It is the policy of this state and this community to conserve protect and encourage the development and improvements of agricultural land for the production of food and other products and also for its natural and ecological value. This disclosure notice is to inform prospective residents that farming activities occur within the Town.

Such activities may include but not be limited to activities that cause noise, dust and odors.

STATUS: The statement concerning agricultural land has not been included on the plat.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Geraghty indicated that he would forward the language concerning agricultural land uses to the applicant.

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: Planning Board Member Jerry Moore stated that Question 13A on the Short Environmental Assessment Form should be checked “yes” since the adjacent lands are owned by the Hudson River Black River Regulating District. Mr. Moore also stated that he felt Question 14 should include a checkmark by “shoreline”.

Mr. Geraghty agreed and indicated that he would have the applicant amend the form prior to the public hearing.

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 proposed action since:

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

MADE BY: John Kessler
SECONDED: Richard Miles
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 Michael and Sarita Iuliucci's subdivision application for 6:00 p.m., Wednesday, August 12, 2020.

MADE BY: Richard Miles
SECONDED: Fred Castiglione
VOTE: 5 in favor, 0 opposed

V. **REVIEW OF TOWN COMPREHENSIVE PLAN:**

A. Background:

On February 19, 2020, the Mayfield Planning Board, Town Code Enforcement Officer Damon Curley and County Planning Consultant Sean Geraghty had a meeting to discuss a potential update to the Town of Mayfield Comprehensive Plan. The meeting resulted from a request by Town Supervisor Rick Argotsinger to have the Planning Board take a look at the existing Comprehensive Plan, which was adopted in July of 2013 and

recommend to the Town Board any changes that should be made at this time. As a result of the meeting, it was decided that the Planning Board would take a little time at each of its meetings to discuss possible changes to the document.

B. Review of Executive Summary:

PLANNING BOARD DISCUSSION: Mr. Geraghty indicated that he reviewed the first section of the Comprehensive Plan and pointed out that the first place where additional language is going to have to be put in the document will be on page 2 under the Introduction. Mr. Geraghty pointed out that the Introduction to the document simply gives a brief history of how the Comprehensive Plan was put together. Mr. Geraghty pointed out that since the Planning Board has been asked to provide an update to the document, another paragraph will have to be added to the Introduction talking about the work that the Planning Board performed as part of the update.

Mr. Geraghty asked Board members if anyone felt that the Vision Statement in the Comprehensive Plan needed to be amended?

After a brief discussion, there was a general consensus among Board members that the Vision Statement for the community is still very valid and is not in need of an update at this time.

Mr. Geraghty asked Board members if they still felt the description and locations for the Resource Hub areas in the Town of Mayfield were still a good idea?

Board members were very much in favor of continuing to pursue development of the resource hub areas.

Planning Board Member Jerry Moore stated that he felt single-family home development should be added to the list of potential uses in the Resource Hub that are outlined in the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Moore stated that he didn't feel single-family homes should be ruled out and he pointed to the fact that there has been a residential subdivision talked about for the last few years on the edge of the Vail Mills Resource Hub.

The consensus among Board members was to add single-family residences to the list of uses that are encouraged in the Resource Hubs.

Mr. Geraghty noted that one of the reasons that the Planning Board has been asked to look at the Comprehensive Plan is the fact that the local short-term rental industry has expanded a great deal over the last few years. Mr. Geraghty pointed to the tourism section under Recreational Resources as the first location where the document talks about the lack of adequate tourist accommodations and encourages the development of both

a hotel and a recreational vehicle park. Mr. Geraghty suggested that this is the first place where the Town will have to decide how it wants to address the proliferation of short-term rentals in the community. Mr. Geraghty reminded Board members that this is a somewhat controversial issue and that they are probably not going to come up with language that everyone in the community will agree upon. Mr. Geraghty indicated that Board members should think about this over the course of the next month. He suggested that the language to be added to the tourism section concerning short-term rentals such as airbnb and VRBO will probably include an acceptance of these types of uses as long as certain parameters are put in place.

Planning Board Member Ralph Desiderio distributed a handout to Board members outlining some research he did on the management of short-term rentals.

Mr. Geraghty thanked Mr. Desiderio for the time he spent doing the research and suggested that Board members take a copy of the document and review it so that it can be discussed during next month's Board meeting.

Mr. Geraghty stated that he found it somewhat puzzling that the Executive Summary does not include any language concerning the FJ & G Rail Trail. He pointed to the focus on the Upper Hudson Woodlands ATP purchase of the Finch Pruyn Company Lands in the northern part of the Town. He speculated that this was a very visible issue during the preparation of the Comprehensive Plan and, consequently, became the focus of potential trail development in the community. He asked if anyone was aware of any trail development on the former Finch Pruyn lands?

Former Town Councilman Jack Putman, who was in attendance, indicated that there has been some limited trail development on the property but the lands are closed off during the winter months.

Mr. Geraghty speculated that because the Nature Conservancy facilitated that land purchase, there may be some limitations on the usage of the property.

Mr. Geraghty pointed out that, in terms of infrastructure development, the Town has made some progress, especially in the Vail Mills Resource Hub area.

Planning Board Member Rich Miles asked if the Planning Board intended to suggest that items be removed from the Comprehensive Plan that have already been addressed?

Mr. Geraghty stated that he felt the Planning Board would be better off leaving those items in the document to show that the community has been making some progress.

Mr. Miles agreed and pointed to the fact that the document is on the Town's website. He stated that he felt it showed that the community is making progress and that the community is progressing forward.

Mr. Geraghty pointed to the fact that, under the "Top Priorities" in the Executive Summary, the school system is the focus of the action items under Community Facilities. Mr. Geraghty stated that all of the Town's Community Facilities are mentioned later in the document and he found it difficult to believe that the only action item outlined in the Executive Summary under Community Facilities involves the school system. Mr. Geraghty reminded Board members that the Town itself has very little control over how the school system is operated.

Mr. Geraghty suggested that, during next month's meeting, the Board continue its review of the Comprehensive Plan by reviewing Chapters 2, 3 and 4 of the document.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS:

A. Code Enforcement Update:

Town Code Enforcement Officer Damon Curley indicated that the Sacandaga Brewery is looking to get its Certificate of Occupancy next week. He stated that the Brewery has its liquor license and is waiting for the third-party electrical inspection to be completed.

Mr. Curley indicated to Board members that he received a complaint regarding John Papa's Recreational Vehicle Park along the Lake. He stated that a neighbor is complaining that decks and storage sheds are being installed on the Recreational Vehicle lots and that the RV's were not removed during the winter months.

The Planning Board held a brief discussion concerning Mr. Papa's project.

Mr. Geraghty stated that he would look back in the minutes and letters to see if there was a stipulation that Mr. Papa has to remove the RV's during the winter months.

VII. CLOSE OF THE MEETING:

MOTION: To close the meeting at 6:42 p.m.

MADE BY: Fred Castiglione

SECONDED: Richard Miles

VOTE: 5 in favor, 0 opposed