

**TOWN OF NORTHAMPTON PLANNING BOARD
NOVEMBER 14, 2018
7:00 P.M.
TOWN HALL**

MEETING NOTES

PRESENT:

**ROBERT SMITH, CHAIRMAN
STEVEN NAPLE, MEMBER
JAMES CONKLING, MEMBER
JACK GROFF, MEMBER
ROBERT ANDERSON, MEMBER**

**JAMES GROFF, TOWN SUPERVISOR
MATT GINTER, CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFICER
KEN CRAMER, TOWN HIGHWAY SUPERINTENDENT
OWNEN JENSEN, CHIEF, NORTHVILLE FIRE DEPARTMENT
SCOTT D. HENZE, FULTON COUNTY PLANNING DIRECTOR
ALAN LORD, PROJECT MANAGER, NEW YORK LAND AND LAKES
BOB LESPERENCE, MANAGING PARTNER, NEW YORK LAND AND LAKES**

I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER:

The meeting was called to order at 7:04 p.m.

II. APPROVE MINUTES OF LAST REGULAR MEETING:

MOTION: To approve the minutes to the October 9, 2018 meeting.

MADE BY: Member Anderson

SECONDED: Member Groff

VOTE: 5 in favor, 0 opposed

III. WOODWARD LAKE SUBDIVISION:

A. Background:

- The Subdivider of this application is NY Land & Lakes, Development LLC.
- The Record Owner of the properties proposed to be subdivided is Woodward Lake Properties, LLC.
- The Representative Agent of the project is Alan Lord Surveying Services.
- The Record Owners own 1,197+/- acres along Collins-Gifford Valley Road a.k.a "Winnies Pond". Of the 1,197+/- acres, 1,146+/- acres are located within the Town of Northampton as follows:

17.-1-23: 820.5ac

31.-1-2: 275.4ac

31.2-1-25: 36.2ac

31.-2-1: 14.1ac

Total: 1,146.2+/- ac

- The Representative Agent is proposing to subdivide the property into 37 lots ranging in size from 5 to 200 acres. All lots are located within the Town of Northampton's Resource Conservation Zoning District that requires a minimum of 45 acres per principal building. Based upon this density, 25 principal building lots are allowed. (*The Zoning Board of Appeals issued an area variance to the minimum lot size within the Resource Conservation Zoning District to allow for the subdivision to include 37 lots*).
- All principal building lots are located within the Adirondack Park Agencies (APA) Rural Use Land Use Classification. The APA's Rural Use area requires 8.5 acres per principal building. Of the total acreage, 460+/- acres are located within this classification. Based upon this density, the APA should allow 54 principal buildings.
- There is approximately 607+/- acres located within the APA Resource Management area. The APA's Resource Management area requires 42.7 acres per principal building. Based upon this density, the APA should allow 68 principal buildings.
- The Representative Agent has been coordinating the subdivision with the APA.

DISCUSSION: Chairman Smith thanked those present for attending tonight's Planning Board meeting. Chairman Smith quickly reviewed the background information within the Agenda for those present, in particular, those present who are not representing the Planning Board.

B. Documentation Submitted/Other:

The applicant submitted the following other materials:

1. Completed Town of Northampton Subdivision application.
2. Sketch Map of Woodward Lake Subdivision dated April 12, 2018 drawn by Alan Lord, P.L.S.
3. Sketch Map of Woodward Lake Subdivision with orthoimagery dated April 12, 2018 drawn by Alan Lord, P.L.S.
4. Sketch Map of Woodward Lake Subdivision with USGS topography dated April 12, 2018 drawn by Alan Lord, P.L.S.
5. Sketch Plan Application Packet for Resource Analysis.
6. An "About Us" Document (NY Land and Lakes Development, LLC).
7. Other

DISCUSSION:

C. 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 SEQ. R.
- To determine if subdivision is major or minor.

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 view sheds. 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.

c. Sketch Plan

- 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:
 1. 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 roads, commercial areas, schools, etc. Such a sketch may be superimposed upon a United States Geological Survey Map of the area.

2. A density calculation as outlined in Subsection F.3.
Density Calculation.
3. 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.
4. General subdivision information necessary to explain and/or supplement the vicinity map and sketch plan.

➤ **During the May 5, 2018 meeting, the Planning Board and applicants met to discuss the proposed subdivision application. During this meeting, the Planning Board:**

- 1. Reviewed the application materials with the applicant.**
- 2. Reviewed the Resource Analysis provided.**
- 3. Discussed seeking relief to the minimum lot size through an area variance.**
- 4. Determined that the application was a major subdivision.**
- 5. Discussed the process with the NYS Adirondack Park Agency.**
- 6. Did not start SEQR.**
- 7. The Applicant has not submitted an official subdivision application at this time.**

D. New Information:

1. Status of the APA Review:

DISCUSSION: Chairman Smith asked the representatives from Land and Lakes to provide a presentation to those present that would update Planning Board members as to the status of the project, as well as provide background for those who are seeing this proposed project for the first time. Chairman Smith asked that the status of the APA review also be included. Alan Lord referenced that they have been working on and have provided the application for the APA which is quite extensive and based upon the four (4) site visits that the APA representatives have conducted at the project site. Mr. Lord indicated that APA representatives canoed around the entire lake taking water depths and conducting a weed and vegetation survey. Mr. Lord stated that APA representatives also walked every proposed building site to verify its location. Mr. Lord indicated that the APA will be requiring that a biological study be performed for the site and that he has already received, from the APA, approval as to the procedure in which he will have the biological study conducted. Mr. Lord indicated that the APA would like for the biological study to be a 4-season study. However, Mr. Lord indicated that he is hoping that since the biologist

that he has been working with on the project site has already been on the site for a year that the APA would allow for the biological study to be complete as of this spring.

Mr. Lord referenced an area to the east of Woodward Lake on the APA subdivision application, Conceptual Site Plan and Test Pit Location Map that is hatched identifying wetlands that this particular area will be identified as a common area under the Homeowner's Association. Mr. Lord indicated that the APA is also requesting that additional soil tests be conducted on four (4) of the proposed building sites. Mr. Lord stated that all 37 lots have asked the deep hole test pits.

Mr. Lord stated that the APA representatives have identified that Woodward Lake in its entirety is considered a Class 1 Wetland due to the vegetation present. Mr. Lord indicated that the Class 1 Wetland is the highest level of wetland classification. Mr. Lord stated that, with that being said, the building envelopes have been adjusted to double the setback requirement to the Lake and all building envelopes are at least 200' from the shoreline.

Mr. Lord indicated that he has been in discussion with National Grid in regards to extending power down the Collins Gifford Valley Road. Mr. Lord indicated that the power would be aboveground utilizing poles, would commence from the south an existing electric service location and run north along Collins Gifford Valley Road.

Mr. Lord identified that he was able to find the existing cemetery that was discussed and counted 23 stones. Mr. Lord stated that this cemetery has been identified on the subdivision plat. Bob Lesperence stated that they will be providing a permanent easement across the properties from the Collins Gifford Valley Road to the cemetery that will be accessible by the public use as per State Law. Member Groff questioned how the easement would be structured? Bob Lesperence stated that the easement for ingress and egress will be defined on the subdivision map. The defined path will be provided from the Collins Gifford Valley Road. Member Naple questioned if there would need to be maintenance performed at the cemetery from time to time. Member Groff stated that he was unsure as to whether there would need to be maintenance performed. However, he has had discussions with a Mr. Porter who has relatives buried in the existing cemetery who has also visited the cemetery site. Member Groff identified that he would anticipate that relatives of those who are buried at the cemetery would perform general maintenance. A discussion ensued in regards to a public accessway that would access the scenic overlook behind properties. Member Groff stated that the most ideal path would lead up the existing gate road to the site. Mr. Lord stated that it would be convenient if someone were to propose an alternate path to access the site that they could review.

Mr. Lesperence stated that the APA's 45-day comment period had expired and that there were eight (8) written comments submitted, three (3) of which were from private individuals and five (5) from environmental groups.

Chairman Smith requested that the Planning Board be provided with all of the written comments from the 45-day comment period for the Planning Board's records. Mr. Lord stated that he would provide those via e-mail.

Scott Henze asked Mr. Lord and Mr. Lesperence whether or not they would entertain conservation easements on the large areas of open space that will remain as part of the private lots? Mr. Henze identified that the Town of Northampton Zoning Code references conservation easements on portions of lands that will be considered as undevelopable etc. Mr. Henze stated that he believes that this topic should be discussed now prior to the official application being made for the subdivision. Scott Henze asked Mr. Lord and Mr. Lesperence to provide examples of conservation easements that they have used for other subdivision projects in the past. Mr. Lesperence stated that the concerns with conservation easements are that you need to identify a third party who will be responsible for said easement. Mr. Lesperence asked whether or not the Planning Board could identify a third party at this time? The consensus of the Planning Board was that they could not identify a third party at this time, however, could be identified in the future. There was continued discussion in regards to conservation easements. Mr. Lesperence stated that, within the Woodworth Lake Subdivision, there were individual resource management plans provided for each of the parcels. Mr. Lesperence stated that this seemed to be a positive route to take given the fact that each of the property owners was able to then apply for a 488 Plan since the resource management plan was already provided, which provided them with a reduced overall property tax. Mr. Lesperence stated that the APA found this route to be acceptable. Member Naple questioned whether or not the resource management plan was incorporated directly into the property's deed. Mr. Lesperence stated that the resource management plans would be incorporated within the covenants of the Homeowner's Association and the Homeowner's Association and property owners would be the ones who policed the resource management plans.

Matt Ginter asked whether or not the common area would include boat docks or are there particular parcels that would be able to install docks at the shoreline? Mr. Lord stated that the APA located an area where a dock could be installed right at the location of the existing dam. Mr. Lord identified that they would like to include a boat launch some place in the common area so that the property owners who do not have direct lake access could launch a row boat or canoe etc. However, he does not feel as though the location that the APA identified on the dam would be a great location to do so. Mr. Lord stated that the APA went around in a canoe and GPSed areas of the shoreline where it lacked vegetation that they identified that docks may be able to be located.

2. NY Land and Lakes Questions:

- During a recent conversation between Alan Lord and Scott Henze, several questions surfaced in regards to the major subdivision proposal. It was determined that the subdivision had progressed to the point where a subsequent meeting was in order to discuss and resolve at a minimum, the following issues:

a. Proposed New Road

- The subdivision proposal includes a 3,000 +/- ' dead end road that would include a single lane loop with trees remaining in the center (center will not be clear).
 - The road would include two (2) 9' drive lanes plus 2' shoulders that would total 22' wide.
 - The road would be constructed of 12" of run of bank gravel topped with 4' of 2" crusher run.
- **Based upon this information, the following questions need clarification:**

1. Are these road specifications acceptable/comparable to the Town Road specifications/requirements?

DISCUSSION: Matt Ginter passed around the fire apparatus access roads specification issued by the international fire code. Matt Ginter stated that, in regards to Table D-103.4, requirements for data and fire apparatus access roads, and given the length of the proposed private road being 3,000', the table identifies that length of road over 750' requires special approval. However, a length of road between 501' to 750' would require a minimum road width of 26'. Matt Ginter stated that the existing proposal is to include two (2) 9' driveways plus 2' of shoulders that would total 22' wide and that seems to be too narrow. There was a discussion in regards to the international fire code in comparison to the existing road standards within the Town of Northampton Zoning Ordinance. The overall consensus of those present was that the 22' wide road should be widened to meet at a minimum the 26' requirement of the international code. Matt Ginter stated that it is also proposed that a turnaround be constructed that would include a 200' radius, as well as a single 9' drive lane and 2' of shoulders on either side. Matt

Ginter stated that the 9' drive lane seems awfully tight. Mr. Jensen stated that the existing fire trucks at the Northville Fire Department are 9' wide and that would be an extremely tight turn. Mr. Jensen recommended that the 9' drive lane be widened considerably. Mr. Cramer identified that plowing a 9' wide roadway would be extremely difficult to do with a wing plow and also recommended that that width be increased. Matt Ginter asked Mr. Jensen whether or not the 200' radius turn would be adequate for the fire trucks? It was agreed that Mr. Jensen would identify what the minimum requirement is for the trucks to turn around. The overall consensus of the Planning Board was that the turnaround area would be better served with a treed center rather than a standard cul-de-sac style turnaround.

2. If these road specifications are acceptable to the Town, would the Town be interested in assuming the ownership of the road in the future?

DISCUSSION: Chairman Smith asked whether or not requests will be made to the Town Board to assume the ownership and maintenance of the proposed private road? Mr. Lord stated that this is one of the reasons that a meeting was called in order to discuss this issue. Mr. Lord identified that, a few weeks ago, he and Scott Henze had a discussion in regards to the status of the project. Mr. Lord stated that, during that discussion, Mr. Henze had questioned what the proposed type of garbage pickup will be as well as plowing and road maintenance. Mr. Lord stated that it was then determined that, given the status of the project, that a meeting should be called to have some of these questions hashed out. The Planning Board stated that they are here to see what specifications they would need to use to construct the private road in case that the Town may, at some point, assume ownership of it. Mr. Cramer asked how many lots would be serviced by this private road? Mr. Lord stated that there could potentially be 16 residences. Mr. Cramer stated that, in regards to the garbage collection, that means that there could potentially be 16+ garbage pails at the end of each respective driveway along the private road or there may be 16 pails in an enclosure at the end of the private road along the High Rock Road. Mr. Cramer stated that, currently, the Town does pick up garbage along some areas of private road in the Town and there are some private road areas that the Town does not collect garbage from. Mr. Cramer stated that it would be beneficial if the Town were to either collect from all private

roads or collect from none whatsoever. Supervisor Groff stated that he would prefer that the road be kept a private road, however, be built to the Town's specifications for some time in the future that there are lots developed along that stretch of private road that the Town may at that point assume the ownership of said private road. There was a discussion that ensued in regards to whether or not that private road would be required to be paved if the Town were to assume ownership in the future. Supervisor Groff stated that, if the Town were to assume the ownership and maintenance of the private road, that the road should be paved at that time. Scott Henze stated that, unfortunately, the APA may not agree that the road be paved. Matt Ginter identified that this would be due to an increase of impervious surfaces etc. Mr. Lord and Mr. Lesperence both agreed that the APA would be concerned if the road was paved. Mr. Cramer stated that if say, in 20 years, the road is proposed to be turned over to the Town and the Town accepts ownership, Mr. Cramer indicated that it would be in the best interest of the Town to make sure that the Town road is up to the most recent Town road specifications given the fact that those specifications may change in time.

Chairman Smith asked the applicants whether or not their clientele would want the road to be a private road or would they rather prefer the road being a Town road? Mr. Lesperence and Mr. Lord indicated that it would depend on the person, as each would most likely have their own opinion.

3. If the road remains a private road, what will the Town require in regards to garbage collection? Will the Town collect residential garbage along the private road?

DISCUSSION:

4. What is the Town's fee for garbage collection?

DISCUSSION: Mr. Lord asked Supervisor Groff what the Town's fee for garbage collection is? Supervisor Groff stated that he does not know the exact fee at this time. However, it is not a high cost and it is factored within the property tax.

5. The subdivider is proposing to service the building sites via overhead electric that will be extended along Collins-Gifford Valley Road. How far off of the Collins-Gifford Valley Road will the Town require that the electric poles be placed?

DISCUSSION: Mr. Lord asked Mr. Cramer in regards to the Collins-Gifford Valley Road right-of-way that is currently 49.5' whether or not he wished that the right-of-way be increased. Mr. Lord stated that he would provide additional feet of right-of-way to the Town if they so desired. Mr. Cramer stated that he would like for the right-of-way to be at 60' wide for maintenance purposes. It was noted that each side of the road right-of-way would be increased proportionally. Mr. Lord and Mr. Lesperence stated that the entire 60' of road right-of-way would be cleared of trees providing for a low maintenance and issues for the Town. Mr. Cramer identified that this would be ideal.

Mr. Lord asked Mr. Cramer how far off the existing improved road would he recommend that the power poles be placed? Mr. Cramer stated that, at a minimum, the same distance as the existing poles to the south of the Collins-Gifford Valley Road.

6. The APA has questioned whether or not the Town is requiring other infrastructure improvements as part of the project?

DISCUSSION: Scott Henze stated that the APA is questioning whether or not the Town is requiring other infrastructure improvements as part of the project. Mr. Henze stated that this may be a good time to discuss fire protection. Mr. Jensen stated that it would be ideal if there could be a few dry hydrants be installed for fire protection. Mr. Lord stated that they would be willing to provide an easement to the Fire Department/Town as well as a donation to the Fire Department in order for said department to install the dry hydrants. Mr. Lord stated that their insurance company has recommended that they not install dry hydrants for insurance purposes in case they should fail. It was agreed that Mr. Jensen would coordinate with Mr. Lord to identify proposed locations for the installation of dry hydrants as part of the project.

7. The APA identified that the culvert under the Collins-Gifford Valley Road between two (2) bodies of water is plugged. Will the Town take care of this?

DISCUSSION: Mr. Lord stated that the APA is concerned about the plugged culvert under the Collins-Gifford Valley Road. Mr. Cramer stated that, from time to time, they have provided maintenance at this culvert site. However, he is somewhat hesitant to do so now given the fact that the APA has identified Woodworth Lake to be wetlands etc. Mr. Lord stated that the APA is most concerned about the flooding of the road if the culvert continues to be plugged.

8. Other items?

DISCUSSION: Mr. Cramer asked whether or not there are any historical features on the site to include old cellars etc. etc. Mr. Lord stated that he has sent correspondence to the NYS Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation (NYSOPRHP) in regards to a Phase 1 Archeological Study on the project site. Mr. Lord identified that the NYSOPRHP responded stating that the site was clear and that there were no concerns.

Scott Henze asked Mr. Lord and Mr. Lesperence where the project was in regards to a timeline? Mr. Lord stated that he is targeting that the final engineering will be completed in March of 2019 and that they can make a preliminary application to the Town shortly thereafter. Matt Ginter discussed the application and lot fees that would be required as part of the project.

Member Naple asked whether or not New York Lands and Lakes would also be doing the residential construction? Mr. Lord stated that New York Lands and Lakes are site developers and will not be performing any of the residential construction and that it will be up to individual property owners to hire their own private contractor.

Matt Ginter questioned whether or not the APA would be requiring particular architectural design and colors of the residences? Mr. Lord stated that the APA would be identifying general color palettes.

- 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.
 - The Fulton County Planning Department has reviewed the request. It is recommended that the Planning Board takes no action at this time.

DISCUSSION:

MOTION:

MADE BY:

SECONDED:

VOTE:

End Sketch Plan Procedures

Start of Major Subdivision Preliminary Plat Procedures

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 F, 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.

DISCUSSION:

2. Required Data and Documents - Preliminary Plat

- *The Planning Board should review the Preliminary Plat requirements (page 110) with the applicant at this time. The Planning Board should indicate what requirements will be required (Comply), what requirements will be waived (Waive) or what requirements have been met (Accepted).*

(a) Data required by Subsection G.2. General Requirements:

- A NYS Licensed Land Surveyor shall be required for all subdivision plats. (Comply) (Waive)(Accepted)
 - A NYS Licensed Engineer shall be required for all Major subdivision plats. (Comply) (Waive) (Accepted)
 - Sketch plans and plats shall be clearly and legibly drawn at an adequate scale to show detail from 1"=50' to 1"=200' for parcels under 100 acres; and 1"=200' for parcels of 100 acres or more. (Comply) (Waive) (Accepted)
- (b) The name of the property owner(s) and the authorized applicant, if different from the property owner(s). (Comply) (Waive) (Accepted)
- (c) Tax number of all parcels to be subdivided. (Comply) (Waive) (Accepted)
- (d) Location, bearings and distances of trace boundary including georeferencing information or latitude and longitude coordinates of the plat as available. (Comply) (Waive) (Accepted)

- (e) 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 roads, commercial areas, schools, etc. Such a sketch may be superimposed upon a United States Geological Survey Map of the area. (Comply) (Waive) (Accepted)
- (f) Topography at a contour interval of not more than 10 feet, unless waived by the Planning Board and referred to a datum satisfactory to the Board. (Comply) (Waive) (Accepted)
- (g) The names of property owners within 200 feet of the property boundary, including those adjoining and those across roads fronting the proposed development. If the proposed development property is within an agricultural district containing a farm operation or within 500 feet of a farm operation located in an agricultural district, the applicant shall complete an Agricultural Data statement, in accordance with NYS Agriculture 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 feet of the property boundary. (Comply) (Waive) (Accepted)
- (h) Location, name and dimensions of existing streets, easements, deed restrictions, zoning district boundaries, property lines, buildings, parks and public properties. (Comply) (Waive) (Accepted)
- (i) Location of existing sewers, water mains, culverts and storm drains, if any, including pipe sizes, grades and direction of flow. (Comply) (Waive) (Accepted)
- (j) Location of pertinent natural and other features such as watercourses, wetlands, floodplains, rock outcrops, stone walls, agricultural district lands, contiguous forest, and single trees 15" or more in diameter (dbh) as measured 4 feet above the base of the trunk. (Comply) (Waive) (Accepted)
- (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 at all points where there is a decided change in the slope or direction. (Comply) (Waive) (Accepted)

- (l) Proposed provision of sanitary waste disposal, water supply, fire protection, stormwater drainage, street trees, streetlight fixtures, street signs and sidewalks. (Comply) (Waive) (Accepted)
- (m) Lot lines of all proposed or existing lots, and suggested building envelopes. (Comply) (Waive) (Accepted)
- (n) Conceptual future plans for the parcel, if any. (Comply) (Waive) (Accepted)
- (o) Location and approximate dimensions of all property proposed to be reserved for park or public uses. (Comply) (Waive) (Accepted)
- (p) A copy of the Adirondack Park Agency response to either a Jurisdiction Inquiry Form or permit application (as applicable). (Comply) (Waive) (Accepted)
- (q) Information on all other County and State permits required for subdivision plat approval. (Comply) (Waive) (Accepted)
- (r) A written statement of any requests for specific waivers of requirements by the Planning Board. (Comply) (Waive) (Accepted)
- (s) Other data which must be available for consideration of the subdivision at this stage.
 - Soils Perc Test on each Lot in location of proposed building site.

DISCUSSION:

3. Required Data and Documents - Final Plat

- *The Planning Board should review the Final Plat requirements (page 112) with the applicant at this time. The Planning Board should indicate what requirements will be required (Comply), what requirements will be waived (Waive) or what requirements have been met (Accepted).*

The plat submitted to the Board shall show or be accompanied by the following information:

- (a) Data required by Subsection G.2., General Requirements and Subsection G.7., Preliminary Plat, subsections (b) through (s).
- (b) Location, width and name of each proposed street and typical cross sections showing street pavement and, where required, curbs, gutters and sidewalks. (Comply) (Waive) (Accepted)
- (c) Lengths and deflection angles of all straight lines and radii: length, central angles, chords and tangent distances of all curves for each street proposed. (Comply) (Waive) (Accepted)
- (d) Profiles showing existing and proposed elevations along the center line of all proposed streets and the elevations of existing streets for a distance of 100 feet either side of their intersection with a proposed street. (Comply) (Waive) (Accepted)
- (e) Present elevations of all proposed streets shown every 100 feet at 5 points on a line at right angles to the center line of the street, said elevation points being indicated at the center line of the street, each property line and points 30 feet inside each property line (only when required by the Board because of the existence of steep slopes). (Comply) (Waive) (Accepted)
- (f) Setback lines. (Comply) (Waive) (Accepted)
- (g) Location, size and invert elevations of existing and proposed stormwater drains and sanitary sewers; the exact location of utilities and fire hydrants. (Comply) (Waive) (Accepted)
- (h) Location of any existing wells onsite and other proposed lot wells and individual water supply system details such as pumps, storage, treatment, controls, etc. (Comply) (Waive) (Accepted)
- (i) Location of street trees, street lighting standards and street signs. (Comply) (Waive) (Accepted)
- (j) Areas of all lots in hundredths of an acre; lots numbers as directed by the Town Assessor; and location, material and size of all permanent monuments. (Comply) (Waive) (Accepted)

- (k) Accurate location of all property to be offered for dedication for public use, with the purpose indicated thereon, and of all property to be reserved by deed covenant for the common use of the property owners of the subdivision. (Comply) (Waive) (Accepted)
- (l) Sufficient data, acceptable to the Highway Superintendent, to readily determine the location, bearing and length of all street, lot and boundary lines and to reproduce such lines upon the ground. (Comply) (Waive) (Accepted)
- (m) Necessary agreements in connection with required easements or releases. (Comply) (Waive) (Accepted)
- (n) Formal offers of cession to the Town of all streets and public parks. (Comply) (Waive) (Accepted)

DISCUSSION:

General Requirements and Design Standards for Subdivisions:

The Planning Board should review the General Subdivision Requirements and Design Standards (page 97) with the applicant at this time. The Planning Board should indicate what requirements will be applicable to the application and what will not. For those that will be applicable, the Planning Board should indicate what will be required.

- (4) Minimum Lot Standards
- (5) Streets (to include Private Roads)
- (6) Blocks
- (7) Driveways
- (8) Preservation of Open Space
- (9) Reservations and Dedications

DISCUSSION:

IV. CODE ENFORCEMENT REPORT:

DISCUSSION: Matt Ginter stated that he has had a few conversations with the owner of the Golf Course in reference to a proposed building lot area. Mr. Ginter stated that there were discussions in regards to amendments to the Golf Course District to include within the definitions of Golf Course that seasonal or some form of other rental structure be allowed in keeping with the Golf Course. Mr. Ginter stated that the Planning Board should seriously move these amendments forward as the owner of the Golf Course needs to get started with something in the spring. Mr. Ginter stated that the existing block building that was used for equipment at the Golf Course site has now been provided with onsite well and septic system. This was done due to the fact that the Town could not provide municipal services to that site.

Chairman Smith proposed that the Planning Board call for a special meeting to discuss the amendments and bring the amendments back to light in order to forward said amendments to the Town Board for consideration.

Matt Ginter stated that there was a pending application coming forward to the Planning Board. However, it will most likely go to the ZBA as it will need a variance.

Member Groff stated that he recently read an article where the City of Boston is being sued by Airbnb. Planning Board members discussed the previous discussions of the Planning Board in regards to regulating Airbnb's. Matt Ginter stated that the Planning Board members were provided with the Town of Mayfield's regulation that was developed to regulate said types of uses.

V. OTHER BUSINESS:

VI. CLOSE OF THE MEETING:

MOTION: To close the meeting at 8:45 p.m.

MADE BY: Member Conkling

SECONDED: Member Groff

VOTE: 5 in favor, 0 opposed