Approved: May 15, 2018

Present: Town Planning Board Chair David Blake, and board members Jonathan Ferrari, Katelin Olson, Rebecca Schneider, and John Wertis; Town Planner Darby Kiley; Town Attorney Mariette Geldenhuys, and Town Board Liaison Rich Goldman

Public in Attendance: Karen Hollands, Max and Anna Paskin, Kim and Bryon Moore, Krys Cail, Tom Myers, Peter Glanville, Reba McCutchen, and Michael Boggs

Call to Order: 7:00 p.m.

Agenda Review; Minutes Review (03/20/18, 04/03/2018)

Mr. Wertis MADE the MOTION to accept the March 20, 2018 meeting minutes, and Mr. Blake SECONDED the MOTION. The motion carried unanimously, 4-0.

Ms. Schneider MADE the MOTION to accept the amended April 3, 2018 meeting minutes, and Mr. Blake SECONDED the MOTION. The motion unanimously carried, 4-0.

Mr. Ferrari arrived at 7:03 p.m.

Privilege of the Floor: No one addressed the Board at this time.

Sketch/Site Plan Approval: Consideration of Sketch/Site Plan Approval for a Single-Family Residence on a flag lot located at 3229 Halseyville Rd, Tax Parcel Number 35.-1-5.24, A1-Agricultural District; Anna and Max Paskin, owners.

Mr. Wertis MADE the MOTION to open the sketch plan, and Ms. Schneider SECONDED the MOTION. The motion unanimously carried, 5-0.

Mr. Paskin gave a brief explanation of the project.

Ms. Olson MADE the MOTION to close the sketch plan and open the site plan, and Ms. Schneider SECONDED the MOTION. The motion unanimously carried.

After a review the application materials, the Board reached a general consensus that a public hearing on the matter was not necessary.

Resolution for Site Plan Approval
Mr. Blake MADE the MOTION to waive the public hearing and approve the site plan resolution, and Ms. Schneider SECONDED the MOTION as follows:

WHEREAS:

1. This is consideration of Site Plan Approval for a Single-Family Residence on a flag lot located at 3229 Halseyville Rd, Tax Parcel Number 35.-1-5.24, A1-Agricultural District; Anna and Max Paskin, owners; and

2. On April 17, 2018, the Planning Board has reviewed and accepted as adequate, application materials including the application, narrative, survey map dated 12/11/17, and other application materials; and

3. The construction of a Single-Family Residence is a Type II action which does not require the preparation of a determination of significance;

THEREFORE IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED,

1. That the Planning Board of the Town of Ulysses hereby waives certain requirements for Site Plan Approval, including a public hearing, having determined from the materials presented that such waiver will result in neither a significant alteration of the purpose of site plan control nor the policies enunciated or implied by the Town; and

2. That the Planning Board of the Town of Ulysses hereby grants Site Plan Approval for the proposed Single-Family Residence on a flag lot, as shown on the application materials.

The vote was as follows:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Blake</td>
<td>AYE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Ferrari</td>
<td>AYE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Olson</td>
<td>AYE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Schneider</td>
<td>AYE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Wertis</td>
<td>AYE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Result:** Resolution passes

**Development District 8 – Moore’s Marine; referral from and recommendation to Town Board**

The Town Board recently submitted several comments outlining issues they wanted the Planning Board to address, Mr. Blake said. Additionally, the applicant and neighbors have discussed various aspects of the project that may fall outside of the Planning Board’s discussions thus far. He asked Ms. Geldenhuys if the Planning Board is to address those topics. In response, she
advised the Board to address only those issues outlined by the Town Board, and that ultimately, the Town Board will decide on matters relating to the Development District.

Ms. Moore provided a review of developments related to buffering and a stockade fence. The Moores discussed fencing with the McCutchen household, and the McCutchens would approve a vegetative fence at their own discretion. The Moores reached out to Cayuga Landscaping this morning and will meet with the McCutchen household again to decide on what exactly to plant. As to illuminated signs, Mr. Blake suggested any illuminated signs be turned off by 9 p.m.

Mr. Wertis asked about buffering for the northern adjacent property, the Cail residence. Mr. Moore said there are two buffers there already – an existing row of tall trees and an additional three rows of pear trees, which, though not tall, provide some screening. The Cail residence is about 1,000 feet away; you don’t see the boats at land level, he said. Ms. Cail said the boats are visible from the second floor of her house. There is really only a four-month window during the winter months when boats are visible through the trees. Plus, there are no trees that would grow tall enough to screen views from Ms. Cail’s second floor, Mr. Moore said. The Moore’s lawyer has advised the couple to focus on screening for adjacent properties, like the McCutcheon residence, Ms. Moore said, suggesting the Cail residence is outside the Moore’s scope for visual buffering.

Mr. Wertis said he has driven down the driveway at the Cail property, and boats are clearly visible. The Moores could plant a year-round buffer at the site of the existing pear trees.

At Mr. Blake’s suggestion, the Planning Board walked through each provision within the updated Development District document. Several changes were made, including the following:

1. Language was clarified in Section 3 (District specifications), sub b to read “No boat repair sounds shall emanate from the property before 8 a.m. and after 8 p.m. Monday through Saturday and on holidays.”
2. On the subject of buffering, Board members discussed the pros and cons of stockade fencing and vegetative buffers. Ms. Schneider thought though a stockade fence may be less attractive, it would be more secure. Mr. Ferrari expressed the positives associated with vegetative buffers: they can grow taller than a fence, depending on type of plant; they can be planted anywhere on the property where boats are a visual impact to neighbors, and they provide environmental benefits to the air and soil quality. Ultimately, a vegetative buffer was favored, and draft language in regard to stockade fencing was removed from Section 3 (District specifications), sub G, while language pertaining to a vegetative buffer was retained.
3. No illuminated signs would be permitted at the site.
4. The word “only” was added to 3F. “Used boat sales shall be permitted only on the south side of the building, as shown on approved site plan on…”

The discussion turned to boat owners accessing the boatyard outside of open hours and the potential for noise. Ms. Geldenhuyys advised the Board to consider land use concerns and cautioned against getting into too much detail about business operations.
Mr. Blake MADE the MOTION to approve the revised Development District language, and Ms. Schneider SECONDED the MOTION. The vote was as follows:

Mr. Blake  AYE  
Mr. Ferrari  AYE  
Ms. Olson  AYE  
Ms. Schneider  AYE  
Mr. Wertis  AYE

**Result:** Development District language passes

Mr. Blake MADE the MOTION to schedule a public hearing for May 1, and Mr. Ferrari SECONDED the MOTION. The motion was approved, 4-0, with Mr. Wertis abstaining.

The Moores left the meeting at 7:58 p.m.

**Draft zoning discussion**

Ms. Schneider provided a recap of the previous meeting of the Zoning Upstate Steering Committee, saying much of the meeting was devoted to design standards, but buffers, CAFOs and animal waste storage are areas that still need to be addressed. Elsewhere, funding for the zoning rewrites seems to be driving the process, and questions have been asked about whether or not an entire zoning rewrite must be completed in order to receive NYSERDA grant funding.

Randall + West have suggested the use of additional overlays atop the single Ag/Rural zone to address sensitive Town areas, but Ms. Schneider questions the effect overlays have. She said the Town’s steep slopes overlay is little more than a phrase within the law, and most people do not have a clue about it. There is also the logistical problem of scheduling among all the stakeholder committees: by the time committees meet to discuss an item from the previous ZUSC meeting, ZUSC has moved onto other zoning considerations. She is trying to keep the Planning Board ahead of the game. She recently sent the Board information completed by her graduate school students, who have begun a review of the zoning rewrite, recently honing in on permitted uses and microbreweries.

Addressing emails sent among stakeholders, Ms. Olson said it seems odd to do a zoning rewrite before updating the Comprehensive Plan. Updating the Plan engages the public more than holding ZUSC meetings. There should be a way to get the community involved instead of holding an input meeting right before the holidays. Outreach with the community is a problem, she added. Ms. Schneider suggested mailers to homeowners.

A general discussion ensued over specifics of the grant and fundamental differences among participating stakeholder groups. Mr. Wertis circulated a document outlining the issue of the 80/20 conservation-development proposal, particularly for those who own between four and 10 acres of land. If you own less than 10 acres of land, you cannot subdivide it for residential development, he said. Meeting schedules were discussed, with Board members brainstorming about issues to discuss at future meetings.
Town Board Liaison Report

Mr. Goldman applauded the Planning Board’s efforts and acknowledged the importance of the Board’s voice in the ongoing zoning process. The Town Board will be taking up the zoning draft soon, a review that could dominate the Board’s agendas for the next three to four months.

For next meeting

Ms. Kiley said a single-family residence has been proposed on a small lot in the Conservation District. The project will come before the BZA as well, and comments to the BZA would be helpful.

Ms. Olson MADE the MOTION to adjourn the meeting, and Mr. Blake SECONDED the MOTION. The motion was unanimously accepted.

Meeting adjourned at 8:52 p.m.