

Meeting of Planning board, 4/26/16

Immediately following a training session on sec. 85-37 of Town Code the meeting was called to order.

All Members were present

There was no public comment

69 Galligan Rd application for 2 lot improvement. Mr Chase was present for the applicant, and Board received a report from Engineer Gottlieb recommending consideration for approval. The proper survey, and all documentation of mailings were presented. The public hearing was declared open, and there were no comments either written or verbal. The hearing was closed by motion from Karen and second by Susan, all were in favor. The 289 review was received from the County declaring it a local determination, it was moved by Karen, 2nd by Bob, all in favor. SEQRA part 2 was discussed, answering in the negative each question it presents, and a motion for a negative declaration was made by Susan, 2nd Karen, all in favor.

Motion by Susan, 2nd by Karen to approve application and site plan for 69 Galligan rd. All in favor. Resolution will be finalized, served on Mr Chase and filed by next week.

At the request of the town board, the Planning Board discussed a proposed local law adding alternates to the composition of the Planning Board. Following discussion, the board unanimously voted to support the adoption of the proposed Local Law insofar as it provides for the appointment of alternates to the Planning Board, and that they have the same training requirements and compensation as full members of the Planning Board and that they act in the capacity of a full member whenever a regular member is recused due to a conflict of interest. There was also agreement that a mechanism should be established by which the Alternate to be seated is selected – and that it must be a transparent mechanism and not a matter us discretion. There was also discussion of what would be the appropriate number of alternates – whether it should be 2, as the proposed law set forth – or 3, as certain articles which the Board had reviewed suggested for a board of this size. There was not agreement amongst the members of the Planning Board on this issue. There was, however, agreement that the alternates should be required to attend all meetings, but only have the power to vote in the event they are required in order to fill a vacancy of a regular member. Finally, it was agreed that the initial terms of the alternates be staggered - in the same manner that the initial terms of the reconstituted Planning Board's were. It was agreed that Richard would prepare a report to the Town Board setting forth the results of the Planning Board's discussions concerning the proposed Local Law to provide for Alternates to the Planning Board – and that he would circulate it amongst the members of the Planning Board in advance of submitting it to the Town Board

Discussion was held on a proposed Kennel law, and why it is not permitted in residential, as opposed to commercial zone. There was discussion that proposed law very lax, and needs to be tightened up, and more clear definitions provided. A form statute from another jurisdiction was discussed as an example of how such a law could be drafted with greater specificity. The board unanimously voted to report to the town board that the proposed amendment of the zoning code to add Kennels as a permitted use was not consistent with the aims and principles embodied in Chapter 85 of the Town Zoning Law. Karen agreed to prepare the report required under zoning Code section 85-37(A) (1) and circulate it among the Planning Board members before its submission to the Town Board.

Discussion was held on Comprehensive plan. David sees a different direction than was outlined in 2006 document. “ Neighboring towns growing, and we need to address this to increase the towns taxes” . : The Comprehensive plan should encourage growth”. The town should do a mailing to see what all the residents want. Susan feels the plan needs to be “ freshened up”.

Board comments on items not on the agenda.

Susan requests more notice of workshops, at least 1 week before

Discussion was held about time an application should have before it should be declared dead. 6 months was discussed, if no activity, the plan board may revoke application under sec. 276 of subdivision review in NYS Town Law,

Motion By Karen , 2nd By Bob to adjourn.