

**TOWN OF MAYFIELD PLANNING BOARD
JULY 17, 2019
6:00 P.M.
TOWN OF MAYFIELD TOWN HALL**

MEETING NOTES

PRESENT:

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

**SEAN M. GERAGHTY, SENIOR PLANNER
DAMON CURLEY, CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFICER**

OTHERS PRESENT:

**RICHARD ARGOTSINGER
LIZ ARGOTSINGER
EMILIE FLANAGAN, BORREGO SOLAR
GREG GIBBONS, BORREGO SOLAR
EUGENE JOUBERT
DARRIN ROMEYN, P.E.
WALLY HART
PAUL JOHNSON
KEVIN BORNT
DOMINICK SANTA MARIA
SANDY TOWN
NANCY PARKER**

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 June 19, 2019 meeting.

MADE BY: Adam Lanphere

SECONDED: Richard Miles

VOTE: 5 in favor, 0 opposed

III. PV ENGINEERS, P.C. (BORREGO SOLAR) – RECONVENE PUBLIC HEARING ON SPECIAL PERMIT FOR SOLAR FARM ALONG NYS ROUTE 29:

A. Background:

PV Engineers (Borrego Solar) is proposing a Solar Farm Project along the south side of NYS Route 29 on property owned by Karen and Eugene Joubert (Tax Map Parcel No. 151.-6-9). The parcel is approximately 138+/- acres in size and extends on both sides of the road. The applicants would like to develop a 6.5 megawatt AC system on the property. The project will be divided into two (2) components. System A will be 2.5 megawatts, while System B will be 4.0 megawatts.

(NOTE: The most recent proposal for a Solar Farm project by Borrego Solar on Karen and Eugene Joubert's property involved the development of a 4.0 megawatt AC Solar System on the parcel. Since that time, the proposal has been revised to expand the project to a 6.5 megawatt AC project. The solar arrays have been moved further away from NYS Route 29 and the entire Landscaping Plan for the project has been redesigned. The application now involves the subdivision of the Joubert's property into four (4) separate parcels. Lot #1 on the south side of NYS Route 29 will be approximately 4.73 acres in size and will be created around an existing home. Lot #2 will be 47.37 acres in size and will be created around System A on the property. Lot #3 will be 48.078 acres in size and will be created around System B on the property. The remaining 36.14 acres on the north side of NYS Route 29 will become Lot #4.

B. June 19, 2019 Meeting:

During its June 19, 2019 meeting, the Town of Mayfield Planning Board continued its review of PV Engineers' Special Permit for a Solar Farm along NYS Route 29. The Planning Board opened a public hearing and listened to comments from the public. Given the fact that the Planning Board was still waiting for additional information from the applicants, the Board decided to leave the public hearing open and reconvene it this evening. The Planning Board asked that the following information be provided prior to this evening's meeting:

1. The timeframe for the Landscaping Bond (\$194,460) must be identified. The Planning Board asked that the Landscaping Bond be for the same 25-year period as the Decommissioning Bond.

STATUS: In its correspondence back to the Planning Board, the applicants' engineers have indicated that Borrego Solar has agreed that the term of the Landscaping Bond will run concurrently with the Decommissioning Bond.

DISCUSSION: Planning Board members had no further comments regarding the Landscaping Bond.

2. Any wetland permit requirements from the NYSDEC or the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers must be submitted to the Town of Mayfield Planning Board.

STATUS: Copies of both the Article 24 Freshwater Wetlands Permit to NYSDEC and the Section 404 Clean Water Act Permit to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers have been provided.

DISCUSSION: Greg Gibbons, P.E., Borrego Solar, stated that he has received a confirmation back from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers that the permit for the project has been issued. He stated that he also received correspondence back from NYSDEC that questioned why the Solar Farm was pushed towards the rear of the property and into wetland areas? Mr. Gibbons stated that he is in the process of responding to NYSDEC and answering their question.

Mr. Geraghty reminded him that the Planning Board will need to have a copy of the responses that are received from both of those wetland permitting agencies.

3. The interconnect review from National Grid for the additional 2.5 megawatt system must be provided for the Planning Board.

STATUS: In its correspondence back to the Planning Board, the applicants' engineer has indicated that the National Grid documentation will be provided during this evening's meeting.

DISCUSSION: Emilie Flanagan, Borrego Solar, showed Board members and e-mail from National Grid indicating that the additional 2.5 megawatt system has been approved by the company. She explained that National Grid is finalizing the full Coordinated Electric System Interconnect Review (CESIR).

Mr. Geraghty stated that the Planning Board will need a copy of that document as soon as it is completed.

4. The plantings shown along Nine Mile Tree Road should be removed and repositioned along the eastern property line of the project site in an arrangement that maximizes buffering of the project.

STATUS: A grouping of approximately 98 trees and shrubs have been repositioned along the eastern property line.

DISCUSSION: Planning Board Member Jerry Moore stated that he would like to see a visual showing the trees in relation to where the poles will be located near the intersection of the access driveway and NYS Route 29.

Greg Gibbons showed Board members a revised visual analysis depicting what the landscaping will look like in approximately 7 to 8 years.

The Planning Board had no further comments regarding this issue.

5. As was recommended by the Fulton County Planning Board, the Blue Spruce species should be removed from the mix of trees that was included on the Landscaping Plan and White Pine, Nigra Arborvitae, White Cedar and Native Red Maple should be added to the mix of species. The Planning Board has also asked that the White Pine not be located any closer than 100' to a road surface.

STATUS: Those species have been added to the Planting Schedule and there are no White Pine shown within 100' of NYS Route 29.

DISCUSSION: The Planning Board had no comments regarding the revised planting schedule.

6. Fulton County Administrator Jon Stead should be contacted regarding the PILOT Agreement for the project.

STATUS: In its correspondence back to the Planning Board, the applicants' engineer indicates that the Town of Mayfield, Fulton County and the Broadalbin School District were all contacted to discuss a PILOT and all jurisdictions have expressed their intent to enter into the PILOT. On behalf of the Planning Board, a letter was also sent to County Administrator John Stead on May 20, 2019 providing him with information and contacts for the project.

DISCUSSION: Planning Board Member Jerry Moore asked if the PILOT Agreement needs to be negotiated prior to Planning Board action?

Mr. Geraghty explained that, typically, the PILOT Agreements are recognized during the Planning Board review and then the applicant is responsible for negotiating with the local taxing jurisdictions following an approval of the project.

Ms. Flanagan explained that, under NYS Law, her company was responsible for notifying the County of its intent to develop a Solar Farm. She explained that once that letter is sent to the County, the County has 60 days to respond to her firm verifying whether it intends to request a PILOT Agreement. She confirmed that the County, the Town and the School District have officially confirmed that a PILOT Agreement will be necessary.

She indicated that once the project is approved, the negotiations for that PILOT will commence.

C. State Environmental Quality Review:

During its June 19, 2019 meeting, the Town of Mayfield Planning Board declared itself the Lead Agency and authorized the filing of a negative declaration under SEQR for this proposed action. Consequently, unless new additional information has been provided or significant project changes have been made, no further SEQR action is necessary.

D. Public Hearing:

1. The public hearing was reconvened at 6:10 P.M.
2. Speakers:

Sandy Town

Ms. Town indicated that she had some questions concerning the project.

County Senior Planner Sean Geraghty explained that the public hearing is not a question and answer session but rather an opportunity for the public to offer comments on the application itself. He indicated that if she had specific comments about the application itself, the Board would be more than happy to hear from her.

Ms. Town stated “never mind” and expressed her discontent with the situation.

3. The public hearing was closed at 6:11 P.M

E. Planning Board Action:

Article XI, Section 1102 of the Town of Mayfield Zoning Law indicates that the Planning Board must issue its final decision on an application within sixty (60) days of the completion of the public hearing on the Special Use Permit.

DISCUSSION: Planning Board Chairman John Kessler indicated that he would like to actually view all of the documents that have been requested by the Planning Board.

Mr. Geraghty confirmed that the final correspondence from NYSDEC has not yet been received and the final CESIR has not been offered by National Grid.

Planning Board Member Adam Lanphere stated that the applicants have been very good about getting information to the Board and he felt comfortable that the requested information would be delivered.

Planning Board Member Aaron Howland stated that he didn't see a reason to wait any longer to issue a decision on the application. He indicated that he didn't feel the information that has been requested will substantially alter the application.

There were several minutes of discussion concerning the issuance of a final decision.

MOTION: To table final action on Borrego Solar's Special Permit for a Solar Farm along NYS Route 29 pending receipt of the final correspondence from NYSDEC, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and National Grid.

MADE BY: John Kessler

SECONDED: Richard Miles

VOTE: 4 in favor, 1 opposed (Howland), 0 abstained

IV. CRANBERRY COVE MARINA, INC. – PUBLIC HEARING ON SITE PLAN FOR MARINA ADDITION:

A. Background:

Cranberry Cove Marina is proposing an addition to its existing marina building at 1840 State Highway 30 in the Town of Mayfield (Tax Map Parcel No. 73.-1-39). The proposed project calls for the construction of a 45' x 20' addition that will tie into the existing 1-story ranch structure. The addition will take place on the rear portion of the building and will be taller than the existing structure. According to the narrative that was provided as part of the Site Plan submittal, the proposed addition will be used for dry boat storage. The narrative also explains that a letter of approval from the Adirondack Park Agency (APA) is forthcoming.

B. June 19, 2019 Meeting:

During its June 19, 2019 meeting, the Town of Mayfield Planning Board began reviewing Cranberry Cove Marina's Site Plan for a boat storage addition on its existing marina building along NYS Route 30. At that time, the Planning Board asked that a Building Elevation Drawing of the proposed addition be provided on the final Site Plan drawing.

STATUS: Provided.

DISCUSSION: The Planning Board had no further comments or questions on the application.

C. County Planning Board Review:

During its July 16, 2019 meeting, the Fulton County Planning Board reviewed the Cranberry Cove Marina's Site Plan application in accordance with Section 239-m of the General Municipal Law. At that time, the County Planning Board felt that the proposed project would have no regional implications and decided to offer no recommendation to the Town of Mayfield Planning Board regarding this application.

D. Public Hearing:

1. The public hearing was opened at 6:17 P.M.

2. Speakers:

There was no one to speak regarding Cranberry Cove Marina's application.

3. The public hearing was closed at 6:18 P.M

E. Planning Board Action:

In accordance with Article IX, 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 Cranberry Cove Marina's Site Plan application for a marina addition along NYS Route 30 at this time?

MOTION: To approve the Cranberry Cove Marina's Site Plan for a boat storage addition.

MADE BY: Aaron Howland

SECONDED: Jerry Moore

VOTE: 5 in favor, 0 opposed

V. LEXINGTON CENTER - SITE PLAN FOR DAYCARE ALONG NYS ROUTE 30:

A. Background:

Lexington Center is proposing to convert about 1,560 sq. ft. of office space that is attached to its maintenance building along NYS Route 30 into a daycare facility (Tax Map Parcel No. 119.-9-6). The only exterior work to take place on the property will be the installation of some additional sidewalk.

DISCUSSION: Wally Hart explained to Board members that there is an existing daycare operation occupying approximately 5,000 sq. ft. of space in the main building on the property. He indicated that NYS has approached the daycare operator and asked if they could consider offering a program for younger kids. He explained that in an effort to accommodate a program for younger children, Lexington Center has offered up the former office space that is attached to the maintenance building on the property. He explained that the new space will specifically cater to younger children.

B. County Planning Department and Town Code Enforcement Office Review:

The Fulton County Planning Department and the Town of Mayfield Code Enforcement Office have reviewed the Site Plan application in accordance with the Town's Site Plan Regulations and would like to offer the following comments:

1. A short narrative should be provided outlining the details regarding the size of the daycare operation, the hours of operation, number of staff, etc.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Geraghty explained that, in an effort to provide some clarity in the Planning Board's records for this application, a brief narrative, outlining what was just explained by Mr. Hart, should be provided as part of the final submittal.

Mr. Moore asked if the playground facility will need to be expanded as part of the proposal?

Mr. Hart indicated that New York State has not yet stated that a larger or separate playground facility will be necessary. He indicated that Lexington Center and the daycare operators are hoping that the two (2) operations will be able to share the playground area.

C. State Environmental Quality Review:

Section 617.1 of 6 NYCRR states that, the basic purpose of SEQR is to incorporate the consideration of environmental factors into the existing planning, review and decision making processes of State, regional and local government agencies at the earliest possible time. To accomplish this goal, SEQR requires that all agencies determine whether the actions they directly undertake, fund or approve may have a significant effect on the environment, and if it is determined that the actions may have a significant effect, prepare or request an environmental impact statement. Under these terms, the review of a Site Plan application is subject to SEQR. Therefore, the following issues must be addressed:

1. Does the Planning Board feel that the Short Environmental Assessment Form, provided by the applicant, has been completed adequately?

DISCUSSION: The Planning Board felt that the Short Environmental Assessment Form had been completed adequately.

2. Does the Planning Board feel that any additional information should be provided as part of the SEQR process?

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

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

MOTION: To authorize the filing of a negative declaration under SEQR for this proposed action since:

1. The applicants are proposing to reuse an existing facility.
2. There will be very limited traffic impacts resulting from the proposed action.
3. There will be very limited exterior changes made on the property.

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

D. Planning Board Action:

In accordance with Article IX, Section 906 of the Town of Mayfield Zoning Regulations, the Planning Board shall fix a time within sixty-two (62) days from the day the Planning Board determines an application for Site Plan review to be complete for a public hearing on the application for Site Plan approval. Consequently, does the Planning Board feel it has enough information to schedule a public hearing on the Lexington Center's Site Plan for a daycare operation along NYS Route 30 at this time?

MOTION: To schedule a public hearing on the Lexington Center's Site Plan for a daycare operation along NYS Route 30 for 6:00 p.m., Wednesday, August 14, 2019.

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

VI. SCOTIA SAND AND GRAVEL – SUBDIVISION ALONG NORTH SECOND AVENUE:

A. Background:

Scotia Sand and Gravel owns a piece of property approximately 50+/- acres in size along the west side of North Second Avenue in the Town of Mayfield (Tax Map Parcel No. 137.-4-11.11). The company would like to create a 1.376 acre building lot from the original tract of land.

B. Code Enforcement Office/County Planning Department Review:

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

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

STATUS: Provided.

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

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

DISCUSSION: The Planning Board did not feel that topographic 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: 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: Percolation or pit test results for the new building lot must be provided.

DISCUSSION: Town Code Enforcement Officer Damon Curley pointed out that the applicant's surveyor has already discussed with him the need to provide percolation and pit test results for the property.

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

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

DISCUSSION: The Planning Board held a brief discussion concerning the possibility of easements existing on the applicant's property. However, in the absence of anyone representing the applicants, the question remained unanswered.

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

STATUS: Provided.

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

STATUS: Not provided.

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

STATUS: Provided.

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

STATUS: Provided.

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

STATUS: Provided.

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

STATUS: Not provided.

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: Mr. Kessler pointed out that, on Question 4 of the Short Environmental Assessment Form, the box for “aquatic” should have been checked.

2. Does the Planning Board feel that any additional information should be provided as part of the SEQR process?

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

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

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

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

MADE BY: Aaron Howland
SECONDED: Adam Lanphere
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 the Scotia Sand & Gravel subdivision application for 6:00 p.m., Wednesday, August 14, 2019.

MADE BY: Adam Lanphere

SECONDED: Jerry Moore

VOTE: 5 in favor, 0 opposed

VII. PAUL JOHNSON – SITE PLAN FOR SELF-STORAGE UNITS ALONG RICEVILLE ROAD:

A. Background:

Paul Johnson owns a piece of property along Riceville Road in the Town of Mayfield (Tax Map Parcel No. 119.8-1-15). There is currently a commercial building on Mr. Johnson's property which is approximately 34,872 sq. ft. in size. Mr. Johnson will be obtaining additional property from the adjacent property owners, Richard and Barbara Gifford, and would subsequently like to install four (4) self-storage units on the property with the following dimensions:

- 10' x 100'
- 20' x 100'
- 40' x 70'
- 40' x 60'

C. Code Enforcement Office/County Planning Department Review:

The Fulton County Planning Department and the Town of Mayfield Code Enforcement Office have reviewed the Site Plan application in accordance with the Town's Site Plan Regulations and would like to offer the following comments:

1. The amount of property to be obtained from Richard and Barbara Gifford must be identified on the Site Plan drawing so that the total parcel acreage can be identified.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Geraghty asked Mr. Johnson if the acreage shown on the preliminary drawing represents the amount of land he will have after his property transaction with Richard and Barbara Gifford?

Mr. Johnson confirmed that, once the property transaction is complete, he will have 34,872 sq. ft.

Mr. Geraghty pointed out that the Giffords will be left with 44,465 sq. ft. of property, which will still conform to the 1-acre minimum lot size for the District.

2. More detailed elevation drawings of the storage units must be provided.

DISCUSSION: The Planning Board indicated that building elevation drawings for the new commercial storage buildings will need to be provided.

3. The topography of the site has not been identified.

DISCUSSION: The Planning Board asked that topographic features for the property be shown.

4. A Grading and Drainage Plan for the site will need to be prepared.

DISCUSSION: Planning Board Member Aaron Howland stated that he felt the Grading and Drainage Plan will be extremely important for this particular project. He talked about some of the problems the applicant may encounter in terms of trying to retain stormwater on the property.

5. The width of the access driveway along Riceville Road needs to be identified.

DISCUSSION: The Planning Board felt that the width of the access driveway should be identified.

Mr. Kessler stated that he would also like to see internal traffic circulation patterns on the property shown. He expressed some concern that there will simply not be enough room on the property for vehicles to maneuver in and out of the spaces between buildings.

There were several minutes of discussion between Mr. Johnson and Board members concerning this issue.

6. The location of the existing well and septic system servicing the property should be identified.

DISCUSSION: The Planning Board asked that the well and septic system be identified on the revised drawing.

7. The location, size and design of the sign advertising the business must be identified.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Johnson pointed out that he intends to place his signage for the storage business on the back side of his commercial building.

Mr. Geraghty indicated that the location and design of that sign will need to be shown on the revised drawing.

8. The location and design of any new lighting on the property must be identified.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Geraghty noted that the applicant has indicated that he will be using solar-powered lights. He stated that the location and design of those lights will need to be shown on the revised drawing.

9. If any additional landscaping is going to be provided as a buffer for the project, it should be shown along with a planting schedule.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Kessler indicated that he felt the applicant should provide enough landscaping to totally screen the project from view along NYS Route 30.

Mr. Howland disagreed but stated he would like to see some landscaping provided for the project.

Planning Board Member Richard Miles indicated that he was also more inclined to want to see the entire project screened from NYS Route 30.

Jerry Moore pointed out that extensive screening along the NYS Route 30 side of the project will severely limit access around the buildings.

Mr. Howland agreed and talked briefly about the difficulties the applicant is going to have with plowing snow during the winter months and having to store the snow anywhere on the property.

Mr. Johnson stated that he has a loader and will be able to remove snow from the property.

Mr. Howland also pointed out that the limited amount of space is going to effect the amount of landscaping that can be provided.

10. Any easements or covenants on the property should be identified.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Johnson indicated that there are no easements or covenants to go along with the property.

The Planning Board recognized that additional information will be needed on the application before any further action is taken. The Planning Board also recognized and expressed to the applicant that the project may need to be reduced in size in order to address all of the Board's concerns.

MOTION: To table any further action on Paul Johnson's Site Plan application for commercial self-storage units along Riceville Road until additional information on the project can be provided.

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

**VIII. KEVIN BORNT AND DOMINICK AND MELISSA SANTA MARIA -
PROPERTY TRANSACTION ALONG BLANCHARD ROAD:**

A. Background:

Kevin Bornt and Dominick and Melissa Santa Maria own pieces of property along Blanchard Road in the Town of Mayfield (Tax Map Parcel Nos. 135.-4-2 and 135.-4-8). There is a parcel situated between their properties that is owned by Kathy Lehr (Tax Map Parcel No. 135.-4-10). The applicants' property transaction involves splitting Kathy Lehr's property in half and combining the two (2) halves of property with their parcels.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Bornt and Mr. Santa Maria explained to the Planning Board that they have purchased the parcel that is situated between their properties and was formerly owned by Kathy Lehr and intend to split the property in half to give them additional land for their own residences.

Mr. Kessler asked if there were any wells or septic systems on the former Lehr property?

Both Mr. Bornt and Mr. Santa Maria indicated that the property is vacant and has never been improved.

MOTION: Recognizing that Kevin Bornt's and Dominick and Melissa Santa Maria's property transaction along Blanchard Road is not subject to the Town of Mayfield's Subdivision Regulations and can be approved as a lot line amendment.

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

**IX. GREAT SACANDAGA BREWING COMPANY – FINAL DECISION ON SITE
PLAN FOR NANOBREWERY AND TASTING ROOM ALONG NYS ROUTE 30:**

A. Background:

The Great Sacandaga Brewing Company (GSBC) owns a piece of property along the east side of NYS Route 30 just north of the intersection with NYS Route 29 (Tax Map Parcel No. 152.-3-6.5). The property is approximately 18.75 acres in size and extends back to the Kenneyetto Creek. There is an existing 2,043 sq. ft. building on the property. Approximately 774 sq. ft. of that space will be used as a brewing room, while the remaining space will be used as the tasting room.

(NOTE: Planning Board Chairman John Kessler indicated that he would be abstaining from participating in the review of this application of the potential for a perceived business conflict.)

B. June 19, 2019 Meeting:

During its June 19, 2019 meeting, the Town of Mayfield Planning Board held a public hearing on the Great Sacandaga Brewing Company's Site Plan application. Following the public hearing, the Planning Board asked that some additional information be provided prior to issuing its final decision:

1. Details regarding the plans for addressing onsite sewage disposal for both the brewing operation and the tap room need to be finalized.

STATUS: Mark DeJong, P.E., the applicant's engineer, has been working with Town Code Enforcement Officer Damon Curley and discussing the onsite sewage issues with the NYSDEC. Essentially, the applicants are proposing to use a filtration system with an equalization tank/settling tank and a "Biogill Tower Plus System". The investment in this filtration system will be made within the next two (2) years when production is ramped up at the tap room. Meanwhile, the proposal is to use the existing 1,000 gallon concrete septic tank as a holding tank.

DISCUSSION: Board members expressed some frustration that there was no one in attendance representing the applicants.

Mr. Geraghty and Mr. Curley attempted to explain how the applicant's engineer, Mark DeJong, P.E., is attempting to address the ongoing septic concern on the property.

Several Board members expressed concern that the use of the 1,000-gallon concrete septic tank as a holding tank, will require frequent pumping out, and may become a financial burden.

Mr. Curley stated that Mr. DeJong has designed an alarm system for the holding tank. He indicated that he is willing to monitor the tank on behalf of the Town. He stated that he understood how much time and effort may be required to allow the applicants to proceed initially with the holding tank proposal.

There was then several minutes of discussion regarding the idea of setting a time limit for the applicant to have the “Biogill Tower Plus System” in place.

There was then a discussion concerning the amount of work that still needs to be done to the building structure itself. Board members asked if the applicants are currently working within the building?

Mr. Curley stated that he is allowing the applicants to work within the building to secure the structure and to allow them to make some progress on the project. He pointed out that Darrin Romeyn, P.E. has prepared the plans for securing the structure.

2. The final drawing should show the exact location of the NYSDEC minor commercial driveway cut for the property including specifications on how the driveway will be defined on the property (i.e.; curbing).

STATUS: There is a 35’ entrance driveway and a 30’ exit driveway shown on the drawings. Internal traffic circulation patterns are also depicted.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Geraghty stated that the applicant’s engineer, Mark DeJong, has forwarded plans to NYSDOT regarding the driveway entrance and exit. Mr. Geraghty stated that, to his knowledge, Mr. DeJong has not received a verification from NYSDOT that the existing driveway layout will be acceptable.

3. If signage is to be placed on the 1,500 gallon water tank or if the Sacandaga Brewing Company logo will be printed on the tank, it should be noted on the final drawing.

STATUS: An elevation drawing showing the 1,500 gallon storage tank, along with the arborvitae that will be placed in front of the tank, has been provided on the detail sheets.

DISCUSSION: The Planning Board had no questions regarding the water tank.

4. The exact number of American Arborvitae to be planted around the concrete slab where the water tank and propane tank will be located should be identified along with the height of those plantings.

STATUS: The Detail Sheet shows eight (8) 4’ tall American Arborvitae that will be planted in front of the water storage tank.

DISCUSSION: The Planning Board had no comments regarding the planting schedule.

5. Stormwater calculations for the site must be provided.

STATUS: A stormwater report for the site has been provided.

DISCUSSION: Planning Board members indicated that they had not received a copy of the stormwater report.

Mr. Geraghty stated that either he or Town Code Enforcement Officer Damon Curley would forward an electronic copy of the report to them.

C. State Environmental Quality Review:

During its June 19, 2019 meeting, the Town of Mayfield Planning Board declared itself the Lead Agency for the purpose of issuing a determination of significance under SEQR. At that time, the Planning Board felt that additional information needed to be provided on the design of the onsite septic system before a determination of significance is issued.

D. Planning Board Action:

In accordance with Article IX, 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 the Great Sacandaga Brewing Company's Site Plan application for a nanobrewery and tasting room along NYS Route 30 at this time?

DISCUSSION: Planning Board members felt that there were still too many unanswered questions to proceed any further with the application.

MOTION: To table any action on the Great Sacandaga Brewing Company's Site Plan for a nanobrewery and tasting room along NYS Route 30 until additional information is provided.

MADE BY: Jerry Moore

SECONDED: Adam Lanphere

VOTE: 4 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained (Kessler)

X. H & L INSURANCE, INC.:

Mr. Geraghty pointed out that Michael O'Brien, who owns H & L Insurance, Inc. would like to construct a 300 sq. ft. addition on the west side of his building along NYS Route 30. Mr. Geraghty reminded members that, back in March of 2013, Mr. O'Brien received approval for a 1,200 sq. ft. addition on the building that was never constructed.

After a brief discussion, Board members felt that it was not necessary to bring Mr. O'Brien's application back to the Board.

XI. CLOSE OF THE MEETING:

MOTION: To close the meeting at 7:13 p.m.

MADE BY: Aaron Howland

SECONDED: John Kessler

VOTE: 5 in favor, 0 opposed