

State of New York
County of Fulton
Town of Caroga

Minutes of a Site Plan Review meeting held by the Town of Caroga Planning Board on November 7, 2024 at 7 pm at town hall. Attendance by roll call:

Chairman Alan Kozakiewicz - Here
Lynn Delesky - Here
Rodrick Gilmour - Here
Karen Dutcher – Here
John Ivancic – Here
Thomas Wojciechowski – Here
George Hamilton – Absent

Alternate Member Anita Long was in attendance. The applicant Greta Fraiser was in attendance as was Darrin M. Romeyn P.E. and Anthony Fancher and one other person.

At 7 pm the Chairman asked the Alternate Planning Board Member to join the board for the evening. PBA Long asked if it was for the application. The chairman was unsure if we will see Mr. Hamilton back. The chairman stated “an alternate was not to be seated unless there was a conflict of interest with a board member.”

Chairman Kozakiewicz made a motion to waive the reading of the minutes of the last meeting. The motion was seconded by Planning Board Member (PBM) Ivancic. All board members were in favor of the motion. Kozakiewicz, Delesky, Gilmour, Dutcher, Wojciechowski, Ivancic, Long.

Terms abbreviated throughout these minutes: Planning Board “PLB”
Planning Board Member “PBM”
Planning Board Alternate “PBA” Long
Site Plan Review “SPR”
Zoning Board of Appeals “ZBA”
Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan “SWPPP”
Special Use Permit “SUP”
NYS Department of Health “DOH”
Jurisdictional Inquiry Form “JIF”

The application before the board is from Greta Frasier to develop a campground down near Royal Mountain. The chairman’s goal this evening was to go through the checklist and make sure it is complete. Then the board can decide if they want to waive or require some additional items. The chairman asked if the board wanted to ask questions first? One of the issues the chairman had with doing the application this way was is that we tend to take these meetings and start delving into deliberations without any members of the public here to hear the deliberations. What happens at the December meeting, the board has already had a thorough discussion tonight, and say what do you think and the members of the public wonder why there’s no discussion. The chairman wanted

to keep this brief. He wanted to focus on whether the application has everything the board needs. If the board didn't agree that is fine too, he stated.

PMB Delesky thought if things needed to be added.... the chairman replied Yes that is part of it. He did not want to consider the substance of the application. He wanted to ask enough questions so the board has enough information to judge whether the application is complete. He did not want to get into what the board normally does during a public hearing.

PMB Gilmour thought the applicant is going to say what they need to say and then the people who come to the open meeting will ask questions.

PMA Long stated questions about the standard of review of what the use is, are part of this process. That has implications on how it gets reviewed. The chairman noted the first step is to determine whether we have the information we need in order to make that review. That is the main purpose of this meeting. The chairman thought the 29-item check list could be reviewed in 15 minutes. That should spur some thinking. Any questions that come up would be discussed during that review.

PBM Gilmour wanted to hear what the applicants wanted to do. The chairman stated that is usually at a public hearing. Normally, the chairman stated, we do the application review and the public hearing on the same day.

Darrin Romeyn introduced himself as the owner of DMI Civil Engineering and stated he is a professional licensed engineer in New York State. He has been hired by Greta Frasier to help her develop this campsite. She has approximately 80 acres of beautiful majestic land. It has been in the family for over 20 years. She wants to take advantage of it. He understands there is a waiting list for those who want to rent campsites. He explained a few things about the plans.

When you look at the site plan there is a R3 and R10 Zone. They are both for residential use the R3 primary purpose is to serve approximately 20 acres associated with their residential home. The R10 if the campsite use is kept within it, is a permitted use if allowed by the Planning Board. That is the intent by pushing everything back and having an access road that travels quite a way back into the woods. It gives users of the campsite a nice secluded scenic area.

In designing this there is a two-way roadway to get back to the sites. The roadway will give users access to the Royal View Pub, Pavilion and Campground. The owner wants to install a building that is approximately 67 feet by 40 feet for a pub style set up in there to accommodate all the campground users and the public as well. There would be a pub type kitchen in the facility and have a wine and beer license. The road access has two loop roads that access 27 campsites. Parking spaces were provided based on square footage according to the town code. There is one space required for every 50 square feet for pub use and also the bar. That is 50 spaces. They provided 58 he believed.

They provided a septic system to accommodate that building and parking. Then as you go back there are one-way roads that access some very nice sites that are the minimum size of 50 feet by 50 feet. People can easily pull through their site, pull around past their site and then back in. On

the site there is enough room for a vehicle that is towing a boat or RV in this case. There is room next to that for two other vehicles. Three vehicles and an RV. There is a site for a tent pad a fire pit and a picnic table. According to the regulations Mr. Romeyn used he noted the New York State code of rules and regulation Section 7 – 3 regarding campgrounds. That was his bible he went through to make sure everything is accommodating. He stated the DOT would be overseeing this if it is approved by the Planning Board. He tried to minimize the impact. They were shooting for 25 campsites so it would be economically feasible to spend all this money for the development and get their money back within a decent period of time. Then in the future who knows what will happen. They were not certain right now.

Mr. Romeyn stated for the campsites he needed to provide accessible water within 250 feet of each site. One water spigot cannot serve more than 10 campsites. He was able to offset the distance he needed. On the plans are the locations of where the water spigots are and which site they will accommodate. With the septic system... the septic system would have to be very vast, a huge septic system in order to provide bathhouses and campgrounds and right now it doesn't seem feasible to do that. When you are borrowing money and with no money coming in. What he did was DOT allows he corrected himself by saying New York State allows for what they call a scavenger system. We wanted to put up porta-johns, Nice porta-johns that would accommodate a male and a female. For every 25 campsites you need one toilet per sex. Keep in mind we have 27. The kicker is they need to be within 500 feet of each site. Things are spread out so far, they had to include 3 or 4 of these porta-johns. When the DOT approves the uses of these porta-johns using a scavenger system you have to come up with a maintenance schedule and plan indicating that you are hiring someone that there's a regular schedule to document things. The clearing limits will be tight to the sites so they are secluded with woods all around them.

Mr. Romeyn reviewed the map of the sites. There is a two-way road going straight back and there are two loop roads. One loop goes off to the right as you travel in. It has a little cul-de-sac at the end. There are a few sites there. There is a loop road that gets close to the property line on the one side and loops back around and hugs the R10 line it doesn't go beyond that. He again noted he was able to get in 27 sites. He noted you need a dumping station for 100 campsites so they also provided a dumping station for sewage. They made it for RVs so on their way out there is a loop it is accessible on the driver's side and it is basically just a septic holding tank with a spray pad. There are details in the plans for that as well. They hope this will be a good thing for the area, there is a big need for it. All of the campsites are filled up around here all the time. There is ample room for it.

PBM Gilmour noted the parking for the pub is not on the R10 it is on the R3. He asked if that was allowable.

Mr. Fancher stated it is part of the new zoning when the two zoning districts within a single owned property – the rules are contiguous if it is in the same density. The whole area is in the low intensity density he stated.

PBA Long reviewed the APA act she saw wording that said if it is between two areas it needs to meet all of the requirements of both. PBM Gilmour asked if it did.

Chairman Kozakiewicz stated our zoning ordinance supersedes that. We have an approved plan. Part of the application (included was a letter from the APA) and they didn't have any issues. It basically said they didn't have any issues with this go take it up with the Town Planning Board.

PBA Long stated she had a letter that said this was an agency approved local land use plan so we need to comply with all the rules. Just the parking lot is being erected in the R3, and the dumping station.

Mr. Romeyn stated that could be relocated. It was placed there for the ease of those leaving.

The chairman stated our ordinance was written to be deliberately vague. When we rewrote it almost 10 years ago now the APA was very clear they would not approve any widescale rezoning of parcels but we don't really care what uses the town allows on those parcels. That is why you find that for the larger residential lots commercial development is allowed with Site Plan Review just like it would be in a commercial parcel. Mr. Fancher contends not if the rules are contiguous. He stated that is on page 30 of the ordinance.

PBM Gilmour asked if the system was just a holding tank, it was. For the building it is different. Mr. Romeyn stated "for the building it would probably be 1500 gallon or 2000." Mr. Fancher stated it would basically get pumped out every time the Porta – Johns got pumped out. It was stated there are no showers on the property. Mr. Romeyn stated they don't need to be provided.

PBM Dutcher stated in our definitions, we may need an interpretation from zoning, there is recreational vehicle park and campground, and a commercial use. In the RV Park in our ordinance, it states you need showers and restrooms containing a toilet, sink and shower. You need electrical outlets at each site, and sewer hookup. She printed up copies for each board member.

The applicant and Mr. Fancher stated they are not doing an RV Park.

PBM Dutcher stated if you read it, you are doing both.

The chairman did not see how RV Park applies here. The definition is read, "A parcel of land under single ownership which is designed and improved for the placement of two or more recreational vehicle/travel trailers, thereon to be used for temporary living quarters and for the occupancy of not more than 120 consecutive days." This implies a permanent placement of the trailer. The chairman reads the definition of campground. "Any area designed for transient occupancy by camping in tents, camp trailers, travel trailers, motor homes or similar facilities designed for temporary shelter." It is one or the other it is not both.

PBM Ivancic can clarify. He was part of Pine Lake Park they were a campground when they went to a seasonal park, they then became an RV Park. Campground is transient. This is how the license reads.

The chairman stated you are implying because motor homes and travel trailers is in both definitions then both definitions must apply. They don't. The issue is, is this a Recreational Vehicle Park, a Campground, or somehow both.

PBA Long thought it could possibly be both.

The chairman asked how many trailers and motor homes are going to be permanently parked at the site. Zero was the response from the applicant. The chairman stated so it can't be an RV Park.

PBA Long stated the RV Park says it cannot be used for more than 120 days. PBM Ivancic argued that is a seasonal park. They come in and rent monthly or for the season. Mr. Fancher stated this is a nightly, like a state campsite. PBM Gilmour interjected weekly.

PBM Dutcher again read the definition - any portable vehicle including a popup, a camper, a motorhome, a travel trailer self-propelled or designed to be transported on its own wheels. She interprets them as the same thing. She can take her travel trailer to an RV Park or campsite. PBM Ivancic stated in looking throughout the US RV Parks are generally seasonal parks, you rent for the season you don't park your trailer overnight.

PBM Dutcher argued it was not stated that way in our ordinance. PBA Long agreed we have to follow the ordinance.

A discussion ensued. The chairman stated you are trying to stretch the definition of a Recreational Vehicle Park to something that is not what the applicant is here for.

PBM Dutcher stated the campground needs a SPR, but the recreational vehicle park needs a SUP. To which the chairman replied correct. He again noted they applied for a campground. He did not see anything in their application contrary to the definition of campground.

PBA Long stated the letters of support the applicant included in their application describe it as a Recreational Vehicle Park. Our ordinance clearly states there upon temporary use of not more than 120 consecutive days. The chairman noted this applies to residential homes too. It was noted it can be occupied for 28 days. PBA Long stated putting a single RV on your property is not a park. That is for multiple vehicles, that is what they are describing.

PBA Long thought this should have been part of the preliminary discussion. She sees a commercial use for the banquet hall, the chairman replied, "Yup" RV Park and Campground, the chairman replied, "Yup" the chairman stated campground and commercial use are allowed by SPR. He was corrected it was not allowed in R3 or R10. PBA Long continued and since it is in a low intensity use this is defined as a class B regional project. The jurisdictional inquiry form (JIF) would have stated that, The JIF did not see the whole commercial use that is part of this proposal. We just need to clarify with the APA.

Chairman Kozakiewicz will call Robyn Burgess of the APA tomorrow. He stated they looked to see if it was a regional project and whether it's in the Town of Caroga. PBM Ivancic reads from the APA letter. "The construction of the campground described in the submission and depicted on the untitled map does not require APA approval. PBA Long stated if they did not see the plans.... The applicant was asked if the plans were submitted to the APA. Mr. Fancher replied, "No." it was basically the cover letter that describes the whole project was part of what was submitted

along with the JIF plan. At that time, they did not have the plans. The chairman stated the third paragraph stated the Pub style Bar and Grill offering Breakfast, Lunch, Dinner.

The clerk hands the Chairman a correspondence from the APA Robyn Burgess dated June 21, 2024.

The board reviews the use table and the definitions in the Town of Caroga Zoning Ordinance.

The chairman stated the commercial use in R10 is going to require a variance. Mr. Fancher asked isn't a campground a commercial use? Anything that a commercial use that doesn't have another definition you go by the more restrictive one. Campground has its own line in the use table. Commercial use covers everything that doesn't have... that is commercial in nature and doesn't have its own line.

PBA Long asked if we established based on Robyn Burgess's email that specifically says it's a class B project. Chairman Kozakiewicz reviews the email again and agrees it is under the town's class B review. PBA Long stated these are typically done in partnership and consultation with the APA. The chairman stated we've never done that. The chairman stated he did not know the criteria for a class B project is. He reads, it has to be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, has to meet the zoning ordinance, would not create a public hazard from traffic, traffic congestion or parking of automobiles. Would not have an undo adverse impact upon the natural scenic, esthetic, ecological wildlife, etc. the same things to be considered when reviewing the SEQR. The chairman did not know why we need the APA sitting and holding our hands to go over that.

PBM Dutcher mentioned the trees that have been logged. The chairman stated it is irrelevant. And stated he is allowed to harvest timber on her land!! That is a benefit of owning property and owning trees. The fact that they were going to eventually make it a campground doesn't take that right away. Two other PBM's agreed. PBM Ivancic stated you have the right to have ideas. PBM Dutcher stated she tries to go by the ordinance.

The topic of the definition was again brought up. The chairman stated it is up to us to interpret it. "there are only two people here who think it is both a campground and an RV Park. The chairman offered that the applicant can ask for an interpretation from the ZBA. PBA Long noted they have to go there anyway and thought the PLB should take a comprehensive approach. This is a big project. PBA Long thought there were conflicts of interests. She stated Anthony Fancher's (Town of Caroga Code Officer) name is on the plans. The chairman noted he was already told he is not going to be signing off on this. It will be done by a CEO from another town. This was the first time PBA Long and PBM Delesky had heard that. PBA Long noted the example that the APA reviewed a similar project in Mayfield, it was basically an approval with conditions. It was also a Class B project. It has to be clear. Again, the chairman stated he will call the APA on this. He guarantees she will say we have a plan – implement it.

The check list was then reviewed:

1. A Site Plan prepared and stamped by a NYS licensed engineer, architect or land surveyor that includes: title, the name and address of applicant, and property owner and person responsible for

preparation of the Site Plan. Response: **Chairman Kozakiewicz stated he believed we have that. No one disagreed.**

2. North arrow, scale bar and date. **Response: that was on the plat.**

3. Boundaries of the property plotted to scale of one inch to 50 feet and all property boundary dimensions and setbacks in feet (if the property is located in more than one zoning district, the boundaries of the districts shall also be shown). **Response: PBM Ivancic stated it is. PBA Long stated some of the requirements require the boundary of wetlands. The chairman stated the APA said the wetlands are way far away. The applicant's engineer stated the wetlands are 50 feet away. PBA Long wanted them on the plan. A stream is on the plan. Mr. Fancher stated on the property but not near the project. PBM Delesky stated they should be on the map. She asked why the SEQR 13a says yes to wetlands. Mr. Fancher stated due to the size of the project the scale couldn't fit everything. The chairman reads from the APA letter states that the proposal won't impact any wetlands. The setback is 200ft from the wetlands.**

4. Existing contours (unless otherwise indicated by the Planning Board, two-foot contours shall be required showing the topography for all disturbed areas of the parcel and land within 100 feet of such areas). **Response: no contours were seen on the plot plan. Mr. Fancher stated the elevations are only two feet from point A to point B. PBM Delesky did not know that unless it is stated. Chris Foss did the survey. No contours were taken. The chairman stated it is a valid point it will need to be shown.**

5. Existing watercourses and wetlands. **Response: The chairman thought it was there. PBA Long stated no. Mr. Fancher stated the area being disturbed is nowhere near the wetlands. The board examines the plan. PBA Long stated these plans need to comply with requirements for Storm Water Prevention Plans. That would be the place to show the wetlands and contours.**

6. Grading and drainage plan, showing existing and proposed final contours. **Response: The chairman wanted to put that off, and noted the SWPPP should cover that.**

7. Location, design, types of construction, proposed use and exterior dimensions of all buildings. Identify finished floor elevation. **Response: A couple PBM's thought it was there. The height was not specified on the main building. Mr. Romeyn stated it was well under that. The chairman asked for it to be put on the drawing.**

8. Location and widths of existing and proposed driveways for the site and access to existing roads and highways. Location to nearest intersection of public roads. **Response: That is there.**

9. Location, design and type of construction of all parking and truck loading areas, showing access and egress. **Response: PBA Long had a question on the size of the building. Is it 40 x 62 that's 2600 for one floor but it is two floors. She asked what the sq footage was. Mr. Fancher stated it is only one floor. PBA Long stated there is a game room in the finished area on the ground level. The top floor is storage. Mr. Fancher stated it is not a basement, it's open. PBA Long stated so, there's no walls. Mr. Fancher stated correct. It is an open foundation. The chairman did not want to get into debating the merits of the specifics.**

10. Provision for pedestrian access, if applicable. **Response: No.**
11. Location of outdoor storage, if any. **Response: N/A.**
12. Location, design and construction materials of all existing or proposed site improvements including water and sewer lines, roads, drains, culverts, retaining walls and fences. **Response: PBA Long stated there is no septic system for the dumping station. A holding tank may not comply with the NYS Department of Health. The chairman replied that will be up to them. The chairman noted the PE signs this stuff under penalty of perjury. His license is on the line that this design is fit for the purpose. PBA Long noted on the project in Mayfield there was an independent reviewer. There was an engineer advocating for the applicant and an engineer presenting facts of an independent reviewer. The chairman stated if we had a reason to question it, they would have to hire an engineer. We are getting into the merits of it before deciding if we have enough information to approve or deny. He wanted to postpone that discussion.**
13. A plan, prepared by a licensed professional engineer, identifying the onsite water and wastewater disposal systems and that includes a certification that the plan complies with NYSDEC and NYSDOH required setbacks for existing water sources and onsite wastewater disposal systems and that the onsite wastewater disposal system is designed to properly collect and treat all wastewater to be generated on the site in accordance with all application State and local sanitary laws and codes. **Response: PBA Long thought this was important. PBM Ivancic stated it was in there.**
14. Location of fire and other emergency zones, including the location of fire hydrants. **response: The chairman stated do not laugh. N/A**
15. Location, design and construction materials of all energy distribution facilities, including electrical, gas and alternative energy. **Response: PBM Ivancic stated we don't have that. N/A**
16. Location, size and design and type of construction of all proposed signs. **Response: PBM Delesky stated it was not there. The chairman asked if there were going to be signs? Yes, was the applicant's response. Mr. Fancher replied 4 x 8. The chairman stated the design was needed.**
17. Location and proposed development of all buffer areas, including existing vegetative cover. **Response: The chairman stated he saw squiggly lines on there like trees. Did he misread that, "No."**
18. Location, design, type and uses of exterior lighting and signs including illumination levels and patterns. **Response: This is big, as we are in the Adirondacks the chairman stated. Mr. Fancher stated we have in there that everything is LED incandescent lighting. The chairman stated it should be part of the spec. and the engineer should be able to do it. If you have the spec. of the light fixture and the angle at which the light goes out. He should be able calculate what the lumens are. "we only care about it at the property line." If there is an obstruction of trees we don't care about that particular area." It is going to be any place it is visible to the public. The applicant noted everything is surrounded by trees. PBA Long stated it depends on the determination on whether this is an RV Park that requires a SUP as there are different**

requirements for lighting and electricity of each site. The chairman stated we are not going to get into whether it is an RV Park again. That is postponed for another time. PBM Delesky stated on the map we need to know where the lights are going to be. The chairman agreed. Mr. Romeyn stated it is 1000 feet off the road and the lights shine down on the ground. Mr. Fancher stated the lighting on the building is on there. PBA Long stated SPR requires lighting in the parking area it is not there. The chairman noted normally the spec. sheets are requested and then show on the plat where they would be located.

19. The type, location and hours of activities likely to generate noise or ground vibrations of a magnitude as to be a public concern. Response: The chairman asked if there would live entertainment there. The applicant indicated positively. If so, the chairman asked for this to be put in the executive summary along with the hours of operation. PBA Long thought the executive summary should be in line with the plan.

20. Location and design of outdoor lighting facilities. Response: chairman – this was already kind of covered with illumination levels.

21. Identification of the location and amount of building area proposed for retail sales or similar commercial activity. Response: The chairman stated he thought that was done.

22. General landscaping plan and planting schedule. Response: The chairman stated that is assuming you are going to add planting instead of removing. The applicant stated they would not be doing plantings.

23. An estimated project construction schedule. Response: The chairman wanted to see a construction schedule. He wanted a timeline that gives the start and what will be done here, and this will be done here, etc. and when the project will be finished. The applicant thought this was hard to say based on being here and waiting on the department of health. The applicant stated all of this has to go to the DOH before.... The chairman stated it can begin at day zero and measure off of that. We want to know if it will be 6 months of mud being tracked out on to route 10, we would want to know about that. Mr. Fancher stated there won't be any mud tracked out. PBM Delesky asked what would be built first? The campground first and then six months later the pavilion? Mr. Romeyn responded phasing in the construction schedule. PBM Dutcher asked where the pavilion was located.

24. Identification of any federal, state or county permits required for the project's execution. Response: The chairman thought he saw that. He listed the Department of Health, Department of Transportation, these need permits. and DEC Stormwater was noted.

25. Record of application for and approval status of all necessary permits from federal, state and county officials. Response: the chairman stated generally what we do there... your approval take DOH their inspection won't be until you build the building. So, we can't ask for a DOH permit before you get a permit to build the building. The occupancy will be dependent upon getting all the required permits. The chairman continued "If we grant approval, it will be contingent on you can't open as a business until you get all the permits you are supposed to have."

The clerk offered a document listing the required preliminary paperwork that needs to be filed per DOH. The Chairman did not want to police the DOH. He wants to know that first of all the applicant will have to submit the permits before they get a certificate of occupancy. He did not want to second guess DOH's work. All we want to know is if they pass. PBA Long did not want to wait for a Certificate of Occupancy. PBA Long wanted to know if the waste water was adequate. DOH is also required for the Bar and Restaurant. PBM Gilmour stated that is way past we are done with it by that time. PBA Long stated certain inspections are done by DOH. The Chairman stated he is relying on the PE to tell him what they do. Mr. Romeyn stated they inspect 30 days prior to doing all this work and then they come out and inspect it. PBA Long supports small business but thought it would helpful if she knew if a 1500-gal tank or two of them are adequate or if they need a 5000-gal tank. The chairman stated the state will sign off on the design. DOH will take care of that it is their domain.

26. Description of the proposed use or uses, including hours of operation, number of employees, expected volume of business and type and volume of traffic expected to be generated. **RESPONSE: The chairman stated normally we ask that this is part of the narrative. The applicant stated the information was in her business plan. It is part of the information needed for her business loan. She will get that information for the board.**

#27 was skipped for now. 27. Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for all land development activities (excluding agricultural activities) on the site that results in land disturbance of 1 acre or more. A SWPPP shall comply with NYSDEC requirements for stormwater discharges from construction activities. It shall be at the discretion of the Planning Board as to whether a SWPPP shall be required for disturbances of less than one (1) acre and which are not otherwise subject to such regulations.

28. Other elements or information integral to the proposed development as considered necessary by the Planning Board. **Response: PBA Long stated there was a question whether planning would help manage waste water. It was noted that previous PBM Franko helped with that on the application from Dollar General. PBM Gilmour noted that was a commercial building right by the road. This is a campground set way back in the woods. He didn't think it should apply. PBZ Long thought it was to the discretion of the whole board. The chairman stated they would come back to that one.**

29. Completed Part I Environmental Assessment Form (EAF). **Response: The chairman stated we have this.**

27. Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for all land development activities (excluding agricultural activities) on the site that results in land disturbance of 1 acre or more. A SWPPP shall comply with NYSDEC requirements for stormwater discharges from construction activities. It shall be at the discretion of the Planning Board as to whether a SWPPP shall be required for disturbances of less than one (1) acre and which are not otherwise subject to such regulations. **Response: The chairman asked if this was something Mr. Romeyn normally did was he familiar with it? He does not do it that often. PBA Long stated this is a class B project and Mayfield had one. Mr. Romyne has done SWPPP in the past but he doesn't typically do them. The chairman**

stated this town seems to like them. Mr. Romeyn explained the site is 1000 feet off the road. It was noted this is in the Adirondack Park.

PBM Delesky asked if there was going to be a pavilion – she did not see it on the plan. Mr. Fancher replied no. The pavilion will be under the Pub building. The whole underneath of the building.

PMA Long asked if there was going to be a use variance to be a complete application. Chairman Kozakiewicz stated it is for the restaurant part of it. He did not want to get into who was going to go first. In the past the Planning Board was asked to take it up and then if it was passed.... But there is a lot of work in a Site Plan Review. So, if the variance wasn't granted then the SPR wouldn't have to be done. He stated this was contingent on getting a variance. The PLB will do it without waiting for the ZBA and the ZBA without waiting for a SPR. The chairman informed the applicant that they would have to talk to the ZBA about an application. Mr. Fancher asked if that was upon their recommendation. The chairman explained it is not a recommendation. He stated the commercial use – restaurant for example, campground is a separately listed category. Campground is allowed in an R10 by SPR. A commercial use is not allowed in R10 so you will have to get a variance.

PBM Delesky asked about the split with the project being in R3 and R10 what the actual requirements are. Mr. Fancher had stated if the density was the same ... this is listed on page 30 of the ordinance. She could not find that.

PBA Long stated the campground is allowed in R10 but not in R3. She asked if it carried over. The chairman did not know the answer to that. He suggested changing the plan so that it doesn't impact the R3 parcel at all. Or if it's just a road going over there include it in the variance. Mr. Fancher stated he can show the board information on contiguous use. He will email the PLB the information.

PBM Dutcher asked about the health department requiring toilets lavatories, and utility sinks. She reads from the State Sanitary Code on Campgrounds Subpart 7 – 3. Mr. Fancher stated this was covered with the Port- a- johns. PBA Long stated a shower is required.

PBM Gilmour asked for a campground or RV Park? Campground was the reply.

The chairman stated at some point you will have to provide proof that the Health Department requirements are met and certified. We just need to know that the pursuant regulations are being applied. That is the health department's job. If they say it's ok, we should be ok. It sounds like you may have a problem. The chairman recommended looking into that sooner rather than later.

Mr. Romeyn looked at Section 7-3 .16. He stated if showers are provided, it didn't say showers need to be provided. The toilet part was what PBM Dutcher was refereeing to 7-3.15, page 15. He stated the hand wash facilities will be in the Port-a- johns. PBM Dutcher then noted what the town ordinance requires. PBA Long thought this was an important question. She stated it would improve the quality of facility. The chairman did not want to get into projecting our values onto people who are not going to be our clientele. We need to know is the law being met. That is all. It is their capitol if people don't come because they don't like port-a-potties it is on them.

PBM Delesky asked if the roads were adequate for emergency vehicles. The engineer replied yes. They will be gravel roads not paved. "The minimum lane widths have been exceeded." It was asked if a curb cut was needed. Mr. Fancher replied it is already in there. PBM Delesky stated she saw that document it was for a culvert. That is a curb cut. The document doesn't say anything about the traffic on it. She noted now there are trucks pulling campers/travel trailers coming out onto route 10. She wanted to make sure someone was thinking about that.

Chairman Kozakiewicz clarified with the board that the application was not complete yet. When did the applicant want to come back? In December or sooner? Mr. Romeyn stated the SWPPP was of concern. It is thousands of computations for numerous storm events, Pre and post conditions. That alone takes a long, long time. The chairman wanted to accommodate their schedule. Everything except the SWPPP can be accomplished by the next meeting. Everything requested. The board was asked if they wanted to consider the application complete without the SWPPP. We have to have it before a vote. PBM Gilmour suggested waiting. January will be the next meeting on this application. That will be the public hearing. The board will have copies of the updated materials well in advance of the 10 days prior to the January meeting. If any board members have a problem, then the public hearing will be cancelled, and another meeting like this one will be held.

Chairman Kozakiewicz stated PBM Dutcher was correct it is the kind of thing you tend to see in built up areas where there is a lot of hardscapes. But there is hardscape where there wasn't any before. It changes the run off picture significantly.

Chairman wrote down three things, PBM Delesky has more items the board needs to have a completed application. The board needs:

- 1) For the developed area contours.
- 2) A drainage plan the SWPPP
- 3) The sign drawing and dimensions.
- 4) Height of building
- 5) Lighting locations and spec sheets
- 6) Hours of operation
- 7) Estimated project schedule
- 8) Identify the permits needed
- 9) Volume of traffic expected

PBA Long asked to have the information in a PDF. The Chairman did not agree or disagree. The law says the materials have to be available for public review. He was on the side of put everything out there and let the public take a look at it. The hard copies are stamped so everyone knows by looking at it that this is the application.

PBA Long has already heard from multiple residents that are neighbors and are concerned about this, let's follow the law so that the project will not have an adverse impact. They have a right to review the project. It is at town hall. The policy is currently not to put this on the website. Not that the Chairman agreed.

Chairman Kozakiewicz made a motion to table the Laundromat application. The motion was seconded by PBM Ivancic. All board members were in favor of the motion. Kozakiewicz, Delesky, Gilmour, Dutcher, Wojciechowski, Ivancic, Long.

Anita Long asked the Chairman if he wanted an update on the Comprehensive Plan Committee. She sent a note to the Chairman on this, but not the entire board. She wanted to make everyone aware that the Town of Caroga is doing a Comprehensive Planning process to update the 2011 plan. She gave a who, what, where, so the board members know who is involved, what's the process and where to go for more information to be involved.

A committee was formed from letters of interest submitted. The town got 7 letters and appointed Chris Foss – who has a lot of experience as the chairman. Rachael Simons who has been involved in the community – Vice Chairman, Doug Purcell former ZBA Chairman, Jeremy Manning – Bike Trail and former council member, Dave Cumming who has been involved with the golf course, Jim Hale is a business man, and Anita Long serving as Secretary.

They are very interested in having input from others. The Town Board has approved the committee working with Fulton County Planning. Public input will be from meetings and surveys, and small group interviews. The Planning Board also has an important role in this.

The process began with going through and updating the profile of the 2011 plan. They are updating the demographic information via the county planning department. They are working on a survey and Ms. Long provided a summary document to the board. She anticipates a survey coming out in January. The official website is Caroga.town. The PDF of the minutes will be posted there. Another website specifically for the comprehensive plan will be created and linked to the town site. Information was also posted on another unofficial site.

Chairman Kozakiewicz explained for the new members on the board (everyone except himself and PBM Delesky) that this involves them because the Comprehensive Plan is a vision statement. It is the vision of the Town. Activities have to be allowed per the ordinance. So, when the town adopts a Comprehensive Plan usually that requires the Planning Board to update the zoning ordinance in order to be able to implement the vision that is outline in the plan. It was also noted that this helps improve opportunities for grants.

At 8:35 pm PBM Delesky made a motion to adjourn the motion was seconded by Chairman Kozakiewicz. All board members were in favor of the motion. Kozakiewicz, Delesky, Gilmour, Dutcher, Wojciechowski, Ivancic, Long.

Respectfully Submitted by

Linda Gilbert
Acting Board Clerk to the
Caroga Planning Board