

**TOWN OF NORTHAMPTON PLANNING BOARD
JANUARY 17, 2014
7:00 P.M.
TOWN HALL**

MEETING NOTES

PRESENT:

**ROBERT SMITH, CHAIRMAN
STEVEN NAPLE
JAMES CONKLING**

**MATT GINTER, CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFICER
SCOTT D. HENZE, PLANNER/GIS FULTON COUNTY PLANNING DEPT.**

OTHER:

**DARRYL ROOSA, TOWN COUNCILMAN
KEVIN FERGUSON, APPLICANT
TIM BOGDAN, APPLICANT**

I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER:

The meeting was called to order at 6:58 p.m.

II. APPROVE MINUTES OF LAST REGULAR MEETING:

MOTION: To approve the minutes to the December 11, 2013 meeting with spelling correction.

DISCUSSION: Steve Naple indicated that the December 11, 2013 minutes misspelled his name. Steve Naple asked Scott Henze to make the correction within the minutes.

MADE BY: Steve Naple
SECONDED: Jim Conkling
VOTE: 3 in favor, 3 opposed

III. ADIRONDACK ESCAPE, LLC MAJOR SUBDIVISION:

A. Background: * See GIS location map provided by applicant.

Adirondack Escape, LLC Tim Bogdan and Kevin Ferguson own a 18.75 acre parcel at 1606 County Highway 110 having SBL#: 76.3-3-9.1.

Tax Parcel 76.3-3-9.1 contains one (1) three (3) unit building providing Tourist Accommodations/Multiple Family Dwelling units. The Tourist Accommodations/Multiple Family Dwelling units are connected to a private well and septic system.

There is an existing private gravel drive from County Highway 110 to the Tourist Accommodation/Multiple Family Dwelling building.

There is an existing storage shed on the property.

The entire property is located within the Town of Northampton's Rural Residential 2 Zoning District.

DISCUSSION:

Matt Ginter, Code Enforcement Officer provided Planning Board members with a copy of a Resource Analysis Assessment Data and Documents form that can be used for future Major Subdivision applications.

Scott Henze stated that he has provided a quick background of the subdivision as indicated within the Agenda.

Steve Naple stated that he has several issues with the subdivision layout and the materials that have been provided to date. Steve Naple questioned the number of lots that are proposed to be subdivided and referenced that the Adirondack Park Agency documentation indicated five (5) lots, whereas the plans provided by the applicant through Environmental Design Partnership, LLP indicate six (6) lots. Steve Naple also indicated that the plat is not stamped by a licensed professional engineer. Steve Naple indicated that the plat indicates a 40' wide private gravel drive, where the Town of Northampton Subdivision Regulations require a 50' right-of-way. Steve Naple indicated that this being a major subdivision having more than three (3) houses on a private road will require the Town of Northampton Highway Superintendent to approve the private road, as well as the creation of a Homeowner's Association

that the Town Attorney must also approve and that the Town Board needed to approve any private road created.

There was a lengthy discussion regarding all of Member Naple's questions and comments by the Planning Board.

Chairman Smith indicated that these will be addressed within future sections of the Agenda.

B. Subdivision Proposal:

The applicants are seeking to subdivide the 18.75 acre property into six (6) lots as follows:

Lot #1 - 2.49 acres that will contain the existing three (3) unit Tourist Accommodation/Multiple Family Dwelling building and septic system. The applicants are proposing to construct a 24 foot x 60 foot detached one (1) story three (3) bay garage for the Tourist Accommodation/Multiple Family Dwelling. The applicants wish to continue to own/operate as a rental the Tourist Accommodation/Multiple Family Dwelling on Lot #1

Lot #2 - 1.22 acres that will be developed with a single family dwelling with corresponding well and septic system. The dwelling is proposed to be 2,000 s.f., not exceed two (2) stories in height and be approximately 32 feet above the lowest existing grade.

Lot #3 - 1.01 acres that will be developed with a single family dwelling with corresponding well and septic system. The dwelling is proposed to be 2,000 s.f., not exceed two (2) stories in height and be approximately 32 feet above the lowest existing grade.

Lot #4 - 1.02 acres that will be developed with a single family dwelling with corresponding well and septic system. The dwelling is proposed to be 2,000 s.f., not exceed two (2) stories in height and be approximately 32 feet above the lowest existing grade.

Lot #5A - 7.51 acres that will contain the existing garage and be deed restricted to remain as open space recreational use property. Lot #5A also contains the existing well supplying the Tourist Accommodation/Multiple Family Dwelling building and the entire existing and proposed private gravel drive.

Lot #5B - 5.5 acres that will be deed restricted to remain as open space recreational use property. There is an existing easement granted to the State of New York located on the NE corner of proposed lot 5B.

DISCUSSION: Scott Henze stated that within the Agenda he has broken out each lot and how it is to be developed based upon the Adirondack Park Agency materials provided. Scott Henze asked the applicants whether or not the background information for each lot as indicated within the Agenda was accurate.

Member Naple questioned the existing easement granted to the people of the State of New York area located in the northeast corner of the property within Lot #5B.

The Kevin Ferguson stated that he does not know exactly what that pertains to and has always been a part of the property.

Member Naple questioned whether or not the description of this easement area is located within the deeds.

Scott Henze indicated that he has all of the deed information that was provided by the applicants and has reviewed them. However, did not see where a description of the New York State easement is located within them but will review the deeds again to see if he can find the reference.

Member Naple questioned the required front yard width of Lot #1 and Lot #5B. Member Naple indicated that the minimum lot width required within the Rural Residential 2 is 100'.

Planning Board members had a discussion regarding the minimum lot width versus required drive frontage. Matt Ginter, Code Enforcement Officer, indicated that, through discussions with Scott Henze as well as assistance from Riverstreet Planning and Development, who assisted the Town drafting the Ordinance, it was confirmed that the minimum lot width is equal to the required drive frontage, so therefore 100' is accurate.

Planning Board members discussed the required drive frontage as per the Subdivision Regulations and a consensus was made that the proposed subdivision as illustrated to date complies with the required drive frontage. However, the proposed private gravel road labeled "Partridge Run" will need to comply with the required 50' right-of-way.

C. Documentation Submitted/Other:

The applicants received an APA Project Permit 2011-140 approval dated August 27, 2012.

- Note: The proposed lot acreages specified within the APA Project Permit do not match the Subdivision Plan dated June 24, 2011 by Environmental Design Partnership, LLC. (APA permit indicates 18.75 acres, application indicates 17.9 acres).

The applicants received a Non-Commercial Access Permit #14753-S, Tract #390 from the HRBRRD dated May 3, 2012.

The applicants submitted a Short Environmental Assessment Form.

The applicants submitted the following plans prepared by Environmental Design Partnership, LLC dated June 24, 2011 at a scale of 1"=60':

1. Subdivision Plan
2. Site Layout and Grading Plan
3. Drive Profile and Site Details
4. Site Details
5. Dock Details (Various Scales)

The applicants submitted the following other materials:

1. Certified Deeds to the Property
2. An Aerial location map at a scale of 1"=400' to include NWI wetlands.
3. An Aerial NRCS Soils Map.
4. Title Insurance Documentation.

DISCUSSION: Scott Henze indicated that other documentation that has been provided by the applicant is noted within the Agenda.

Steve Naple questioned the discrepancies between the APA Project Permit 2011-140 and the Environmental Design Partnership, LLC Subdivision plans provided and stated that he believes that the applicants should re-submit their application to the APA.

D. Subdivision Approval Procedure

1. Pre-Application Procedure
 - a. Pre-Application Meeting (Required for Major Subdivision)

- For applicant and Board to discuss a subdivision concept.
- Discuss SEQR

Based upon the information provided by the applicant to date, does the Planning Board feel that the Pre-Application meeting is complete?

DISCUSSION: Scott Henze indicated that this is really where the review by the Planning Board comes into play within the Agenda. Scott Henze asked the Planning Board whether or not based upon the information provided by the applicant to date if the Planning Board feels that tonight's meeting could be considered the pre-application meeting. Scott Henze stated that major subdivisions require a pre-application meeting.

The consensus of the Planning Board was that the meeting could be considered as the pre-application meeting so therefore that requirement is complete.

Scott Henze informed the applicants that this is an unusual procedure given the fact that the applicants have already provided a substantial amount of information and have performed allot of work on the subdivision already. Scott Henze stated that the Planning Board has to catch up within the Subdivision Regulations to review what has already been provided and compare that with the Subdivision Regulations. Scott Henze stated that, typically, an applicant would meet with the Planning Board in what is referred to as the pre-application meeting in order to discuss the subdivision concept, SEQR as well as all requirements regarding subdivisions prior to the applicant doing any work.

b. Resource Analysis (Required for Major Subdivision)

- The required information to be included within the Resource Analysis is as follows:
 1. The proposed subdivision name or identifying title, and the words "Town of Northampton, Fulton County, New York."
 2. The name of the property owner(s) and the authorized applicant, if different from the property owner(s).
 3. Aerial map at a scale of 1" = 400' or larger, showing the location of the proposed subdivision parcel with respect to all streets and property within 1,000 feet of the applicant's parcel and superimposed with 10' contours, NYSDEC wetlands, NWI wetlands, floodplains, streams, water bodies, NYSDEC Natural Heritage Program data, and public trails.

4. A list including general location of features known to exist on the parcel including but not limited to historic buildings, stone walls, rock outcrops, significant trees and stands of trees, potential wildlife habitats and viewsheds. This list is a preliminary step in identifying existing features and is subject to modification and interpretation of the reviewing bodies.
5. Provide an 8½ x 11 soils map indicating if Prime and/or Statewide important soils, as defined by the Soil Survey of Fulton County New York, exist on the property.
6. General subdivision information necessary to explain and/or supplement the Aerial Map.

Based upon the information provided by the applicant to date, does the Planning Board feel that the Resource Analysis is complete?

DISCUSSION: Scott Henze stated that the Agenda outlines the requirements of the Resource Analysis for major subdivisions. Scott Henze suggested that the Planning Board review each of them as outlined in order to determine whether or not there is sufficient information to determine whether or not the Resource Analysis is complete.

The Planning Board reviewed all items 1-6 within the Agenda regarding the Resource Analysis and there was a consensus by the Planning Board that all information required by the Resource Analysis has been met with the addition of the applicant identifying 15" diameter trees or greater to be removed within the project area.

c. Sketch Plan Submission

- For applicant and Board to review and discuss the proposal and reach an agreement on requirements of Article VIII and to classify the subdivision as either Minor or Major.
- The required information to be included on a Sketch Plan is as follows:

7. A vicinity map sketched at a scale of 2,000 feet to the inch, showing the relationship of the proposed subdivision to existing community facilities that serve it, such as drives, commercial areas, schools, etc.

Such a sketch may be superimposed upon a United States Geological Survey Map of the area.

8. A density calculation as outlined in Subsection F.3. Density Calculation.
9. Sketch plan on a topographic survey of the proposed area to be subdivided showing, in simple sketch form, the proposed layout of streets, lots and other features.
10. General subdivision information necessary to explain and/or supplement the vicinity map and sketch plan.

Based upon the information provided by the applicant to date, does the Planning Board feel that the Sketch Plan is complete?

- If the Planning Board deems the Sketch Plan is complete, the Board must classify the subdivision as either a Major or Minor Subdivision.
- SEQR - The Planning Board must initiate SEQR upon completion of the sketch plan phase of the Pre-Application process, and when a Preliminary Plat application is determined to be complete. SEQR shall be completed prior to approval of the Preliminary Plat.

DISCUSSION: Scott Henze stated that the Agenda outlines the requirements for the Sketch Plan submission. Scott Henze stated that although the current subdivision plan as provided by Environmental Design Partnership, LLP is further advanced than what the Planning Board would see in a typical Sketch Plan, the Planning Board should regard the applicant's submittal as a Sketch Plan at this time.

The Planning Board reviewed all items outlined within the Agenda regarding the requirements of a Sketch Plan submission. The consensus of the Planning Board was that all Sketch Plan submission requirements have been met except the density calculation as outlined in subsection F3. Planning Board members indicated that this density calculation should be added to the preliminary plat in the future.

Scott Henze stated that the Sketch Plan is really the basis for the Board to determine whether or not the subdivision would be considered a minor or major subdivision. Scott Henze stated since the Planning Board has accepted the Sketch Plan as presented with one (1) addition being the addition of the density calculation, does the Planning Board feel that this is a minor or major subdivision?

The consensus of the Planning Board was that the subdivision is considered a major subdivision.

Scott Henze stated that the State Environmental Quality Review process should be initiated at the completion of the Sketch Plan phase of the pre-application process and must be completed prior to the Planning Board approving the preliminary plat. Scott Henze recommended that the Planning Board wait on the SEQR action until the modifications to the Sketch Plan as have been identified are completed.

Member Naple questioned whether or not the Planning Board should send to the Adirondack Park Agency the amended Sketch Plan prior to the start of the SEQR process due to the fact that there is a discrepancy regarding the number of lots and overall acreage between the APA Permit and what is identified on Environmental Design Partnership, LLP plans.

Scott Henze stated that the Adirondack Park Agency would be coordinated within SEQR and the Adirondack Park Agency would provide correspondence back to the Planning Board indicating their jurisdiction over the project in the future, if any.

MOTION: The Planning Board determines the proposed Adirondack Escape, LLC subdivision to be a major subdivision under Article VIII.

MADE BY: Jim Conkling
SECONDED: Steve Naple
VOTE: 3 in favor, 0 opposed

E. Major Subdivision - Preliminary Plat

1. Application Procedure

Prior to filing an application for the approval of a plat, the applicant shall file an application for the approval of a preliminary plat. The application shall:

- a. Be made on forms available at the office of the Code Enforcement Officer.
- b. Include all land that the applicant proposes to subdivide.

- c. Be accompanied by an original and 7 copies of the preliminary plat and supplementary material described in Subsection G(7), Preliminary Plat of these regulations.
- d. Comply in all respects with the requirements specified in Subsection G, General Requirements and Design Standards of these regulations and with the provisions of Section 276 and Section 277 of New York State Town Law.
- e. Be submitted to the Clerk of the Planning Board.
- f. Be accompanied by fees as specified by the Town Fee schedule.

Based upon the information provided by the applicant to date, it is recommended that the Planning Board discuss with the applicant, via step by step, all of the requirements outlined above in order for the Planning Board and applicant to have a clear understanding of what will be required on the Preliminary Plat.

1. SUBSECTION G7 - PRELIMINARY PLAT REQUIREMENTS:

DISCUSSION: Scott Henze stated that now that the Planning Board has determined that the subdivision is a major subdivision, included within agenda is the preliminary plat and application procedure for major subdivisions.

Member Naple questioned whether or not the Code Enforcement Officer has the preliminary plat application forms as indicated within the Agenda as item (a).

Matt Ginter, Code Enforcement Officer, stated that he has not prepared the forms as indicated within the Agenda. However, will do so in the future.

The Planning Board discussed the format for the pre-application procedure forms and stated that the format that he utilized regarding the required data and documents and Resource Analysis should be utilized.

Scott Henze stated that since there are no forms available at this time, that he recommends that the Planning Board review, step by step, each requirement under Subsection G7.

The Planning Board reviewed each requirement under Subsection G7 Preliminary Plat and the following determinations were made:

(a) Data Required by Subsection G2: General Requirements:

The Planning Board determined that the preliminary plat application will need to comply with these requirements to include the seal of a New York State licensed engineer and land surveyor responsible for the plat.

(b) The Name of the Property Owners and the Authorized Applicant if Different from the Property Owners:

The Planning Board determined that the information provided to date is acceptable.

(c) Tax Number of all Parcels to be Subdivided:

The Planning Board determined that the information provided to date is acceptable.

(d) Location, Bearings and Distances of Trace Boundary including Georeferencing Information or Latitude and Longitude Coordinates of the Plat as Available:

The Planning Board requested that the applicant provide georeferencing information on the preliminary plat.

(e) A Vicinity Map Sketched at a Scale of 2,000 to the Inch Showing the Relationship of the Proposed Subdivision to Existing Community Facilities that Serve it, Such as Drives, Commercial Areas, Schools, Etc. Such a Sketch may be Superimposed upon a United States Geological Survey Map of the Area:

The Planning Board determined that the information provided to date is acceptable.

(f) Topography at a Contour Interval of Not More than 10' Unless Waived by the Planning Board and Referred to a Datum Satisfactory to the Board:

The Planning Board determined that the information provided to date is acceptable.

(g) The Names of Property Owners Within 200' of the Property Boundary, Including those Adjoining and Those Across Drives Fronting the Proposed Development. If the Proposed Development Property is Within

an Agricultural District Containing a Farm Operation or Within 500' of a Farm Operation Located in an Agricultural District, the Applicant shall complete an Agricultural Data Statement, in Accordance with NYS Agricultural District Law, Which shall Contain the Name and Address of the Applicant, a Description of the Proposed Project and its Location, and the Name and Address of All Property Owners Within 500' of the Property Boundary:

The Planning Board determined that the applicant shall comply with this regulation to identify the names of the property owners within 200' of the property boundary, including those adjoining and those across the drives fronting the proposed development. The Planning Board determined that the property is not located within an Agricultural District, so none of the Agricultural Regulations shall need to be addressed.

(h) Location, Name and Dimensions of Existing Streets, Easements, Deed Restrictions, Zoning District Boundaries, Property Lines, Buildings, Parks and Public Properties:

The Planning Board determined that the existing right-of-way has been scaled at 40'. However, it is not indicated directly on the plans. The Planning Board determined that the right-of-way, as per Schedule B of the Ordinance, requires a 50' right-of-way and should be identified on the plans.

(i) Location of Existing Sewers, Water Mains, Culverts and Storm Drains, if any, Including Pipe Sizes, Grades and Direction of Flow:

The Planning Board determined that the water mains or lines, including diameter of pipe, should be illustrated on the preliminary plat that is located from the existing well on Lot #1 that services the existing Townhouse property.

(j) Location of Pertinent Natural and Other Features, such as Water Courses, Wetlands, Flood Plains, Rock Outcrops, Stone Walls, Agricultural District Lands, Contiguous Forest, and Single Trees 15" or More in Diameter (DBH) as Measured 4' Above the Base of the Trunk:

The Planning Board indicated that single trees 15" or more in diameter as measured 4' above the base of the trunk should be identified within the project area.

(k) Location, Width and Approximate Grade of all Proposed Streets with Approximate Elevations Shown at the Beginning and End of Each Street, at Street Intersections and all Points where There is a Decided Change in the Slope or Direction:

The Planning Board determined that the information provided to date is acceptable.

(l) Proposed Provision of Sanitary Waste Disposal, Water Supply, Fire Protection, Stormwater Drainage, Street Trees, Street Light Fixtures, Street Signs and Sidewalks:

The Planning Board determined that the information provided to date is acceptable.

(m) Lot Lines of all Proposed or Existing Lots, and Suggested Building Envelopes:

The Planning Board determined that the information provided to date is acceptable.

(n) Conceptual Future Plans for the Parcel, if any:

The Planning Board determined that the information provided to date is acceptable.

(o) Location and Approximate Dimensions of all Property Proposed to be Reserved for Park or Public Uses:

The Planning Board determined that the information provided to date is acceptable.

(p) A Copy of the Adirondack Park Agency Response to Either a Jurisdiction Inquiry Form or Permit Application:

The Planning Board determined that the information provided to date is acceptable, however may change in the future.

(q) Information on all Other County and State Permits Required for a Subdivision Plat Approval:

The Planning Board determined that there are no other County or State permits required for the subdivision plat approval that would not be brought about within the SEQOR process.

(r) A Written Statement of Any Requests or Specific Waivers of Requirements by the Planning Board:

The Planning Board determined that if the applicant wished to seek the Planning Board's ability to waive the requirement for the creation of a

Homeowner's Association for the development of the private drive, then the applicant should do so under Section F(p)(8).

(s) Other Data Which Must be Available for Consideration of the Subdivision at this Stage:

The Planning Board determined that the applicant will need to provide sufficient information regarding the creation of a Homeowner's Association.

2. SUBSECTION F - GENERAL REQUIREMENTS AND DESIGN STANDARDS:

DISCUSSION: The Planning Board reviewed all general requirements and design standards as outlined within the Subdivision Regulations under Subsection F and determined that the applicant has met all requirements accepting the following:

- F4(e) - The plat shall provide each lot with satisfactory access to an existing public street or to a subdivision street that will be ceded to public use at the time of final plat approval. Private streets may be permitted only by resolution of the Town Board.

The Planning Board determined that the Town Board would need to, by resolution, permit the creation of the Partridge Run private drive prior to the final plat approval.

- F5(l) - Permanent dead end streets (cul-de-sac) where a street does not extend to the boundary of the subdivision and it's not needed for access to adjoining property, it shall be separated by such boundary by a distance of no less than 100'.

The Planning Board determined that the Preliminary Plat should include a measurement from the cul-de-sac right-of-way to the adjacent property line (southernmost property line).

- F5(p)(2) - Private Drives

(2) Written approval from the Town Superintendent of Highways and the Town's engineer (not applicable) shall be secured before approval of any private drives.

IV. REVIEW AMENDED DRAFT BYLAWS:

A. Background:

During the December 11, 2013 meeting, the Planning Board endorsed and made revisions to a draft set of Bylaws.

See handout of revised Bylaws.

DISCUSSION: Scott Henze stated that, based upon the December 11, 2013 meeting discussion regarding the draft Bylaws, he has made several changes to the draft bylaws. Scott Henze stated that he had sent the revised draft Bylaws, via e-mail, to all Planning Board members and received e-mail correspondence back with additional changes. Scott Henze stated that he revised the draft Bylaws to include all changes made by Planning Board members. Scott Henze stated that the only other piece of information that needs to be included within the draft Bylaws is under Article IV, 4.2, indicating the regular meeting time.

The consensus of the Planning Board was to continue the regular meeting time at 7:00 p.m.

The Planning Board authorized Scott Henze to send a letter to the Town Board to include the amended Bylaws seeking their consideration for adoption.

MOTION: To approve the revised Bylaws dated 1/17/14 to include a regular meeting time of 7:00 p.m. and authorize Scott Henze to send written correspondence to the Town Board requesting consideration to the adoption of the proposed Bylaws.

MADE BY: Steve Naple
SECONDED: Jim Conkling
VOTE: 3 in favor, 0 opposed

V. FULTON COUNTY VISION SURVEY:

A. Background:

Fulton and Montgomery Counties have launched a Regional Branding Project designed to discover, define and design a cohesive economic

development marketing message for the Region which can be used in business, visitor and resident recruitment.

To bring outside objectivity and professionals into this intensive project, Fulton/Montgomery Counties have retained Nashville-based North Star Destination Strategies. North Star has developed community brands for more than 170 communities in 40 states nationwide.

This Project needs organizations, businesses, community leaders and the public to provide input for North Star to use in the development of this brand/logo. North Star seeks to obtain this input by having elected, community and business leaders complete a Vision Survey. You have been selected to complete a Vision Survey and provide your input into this Regional Branding Project.

To complete the survey, please go online to this link: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/FultonVision>. Fill out the survey and submit it online by Friday, January 31, 2014.

DISCUSSION: Scott Henze stated that the Fulton and Montgomery Counties are undertaking a Regional Branding Project and part of the Regional Branding Project includes a Vision Survey as indicated within the Agenda. Scott Henze asked each Planning Board member if they would please fill out the Vision Survey. Scott Henze stated that each Planning Board member would also be receiving an email or written correspondence from the Planning Department regarding the Vision Survey.

VI. CODE ENFORCEMENT REPORT:

DISCUSSION: Matt Ginter indicated that he has information going to the Town Board regarding the discussion of merging the Town and Village Planning Board's into one.

Matt Ginter indicated that he has provided all Planning Board members with a copy of another subdivision application with the property owner of Linda Bojarski along Seven Hills Drive prepared by Ferguson and Foss Land Surveyors. Matt Ginter indicated that upon his preliminary review of the proposed subdivision, there seems to be a minimum lot width issue. Matt Ginter indicated that the proposal is for 38' of drive frontage, whereby he interprets the code to require 75'. Matt Ginter indicated that he and Scott Henze have discussed the minimum lot width and required drive frontage and have determined that the minimum lot width is equal to the required minimum drive frontage. Matt Ginter indicated that the Ordinance includes a definition of flag lots. However, flag lots do not have regulations regarding "regulating" them within the ordinance. Matt Ginter indicated that Scott Henze has

contacted River Street Planning and Development, the authors of the Ordinance, to discuss this situation. Matt Ginter indicated that River Street Planning and Development stated that some communities wish to have regulations of flag lots. However, the Town of Northampton's Ordinance does not regulate flag lots but the definition of a flag lot was left within the ordinance as a future placeholder. Matt Ginter stated that he just wanted to make sure that the Planning Board understood the issue regarding this particular subdivision.

VII. OTHER BUSINESS:

FYI - The Fulton County Planning Board will be holding a SEQR Training course to be conducted by NYSDOS staff at FMCC on February 26, 2014 @ 7:00p.m. (3 Credit Hours).

DISCUSSION: Scott Henze reviewed the Other Business as outlined within the Agenda.

VIII. CLOSE OF THE MEETING:

MOTION: To close the meeting at 9:16 p.m.

MADE BY: Steve Naple

SECONDED: Jim Conkling

VOTE: 3 in favor, 0 opposed