

TOWN OF KENDALL
TOWN BOARD WORK SESSION
Saturday, November 17, 2012, 10:00 AM

Supervisor Gaesser opened the meeting at 10:08 a.m.

ROLL CALL

Councilman Pritchard	present
Councilman Joseph	present
Councilman Schuth	present
Councilwoman Szozda	present
Supervisor Gaesser	present

Also present, Attorney Dan Spitzer, Attorney Chuck Malcomb, Planning Chair Paul Gray, CEO Paul Hennekey, Engineer for the Town Mike Schaffron , Marathon Engineer Matt Tomlinson, Dave and Jon Wegman, Deputy Chief of Morton Fire District Gary Zinsmeister, Assistant Chief of Morton Fire Company Ken Keirn, Jonathan Gillman, Mr. and Mrs. Sweeney, Clerk Amy Richardson

SUPERVISOR'S REMARKS

Supervisor Gaesser said the purpose of this meeting is to continue and complete the extensive site plan review, and to complete the LWRP consistency review.

COTTAGES AT TROUTBURG REVIEW

1. Water

The Engineer for the Town, Mike Schaffron, of LaBella Associates, reviewed his water supply and distribution analysis. Based on the results of the hydraulic supply system analyses, the conclusion is that the proposed system will be properly sized to provide adequate fire flow.

The Morton Fire Company – location of hydrant, fire flow

Mr. Zinsmeister has reviewed the proposed plans and is satisfied with the exception of one additional hydrant being necessary. Fire flow for water is acceptable. Road widths are adequate. Mr. Tomlinson of Marathon Engineering said The Wegman Group will comply with the request for the relocation or addition of a hydrant.

Councilman Joseph spoke about ISO guidelines and the several components which are considered in taking into account a total fire protection package and any effect on the district. He is confident with the plans as submitted.

Councilwoman Szozda asked Mr. Zinsmeister if the current number of volunteers could handle needed protection services. Mr. Zinsmeister said, "Absolutely".

A discussion about the pending consolidation, available pumper trucks, a letter from MCWA stating that the development will have no significant effect on water pressure, and protocol for flow testing resulted in agreement that the plans address any concerns.

Water unit assessment and the potential to reduce the debt burden on the current users were discussed.

2. Site Plan Overview

Lockbox/Emergency services access

Emergency responders from several agencies would require access to the project.

Mr. Zinsmeister suggested that a Knox Box key system be used. These systems have been used successfully in other gated communities for EMS needs.

Parcel Delivery

The South entrance would be the only parcel acceptance spot. There will be signage, and a notification system will be in place. Semi-truck deliveries are not expected except at move-in time. Mail delivery will be to gang box only.

Structure Size

In the Planning Board referral it is recommended that the minimum size be set at 300 square feet. The County Board had no issue with that recommendation. Future marketability of small structures was discussed, and market research indicates it is expected to be solid. NYS Residential Codes address minimum allowable room size. Councilmen Pritchard, Schuth, and Joseph and Supervisor Gaesser expressed satisfaction with the recommendation. Councilwoman Szozda questioned the size as being too small and the proximity of the cottages within the clusters being too close. Chairman Gray said the proximity is consistent with the custom of surrounding areas.

Other

Roads – Mr. Tomlinson stated there will be very few paved roads. Paving at a future date would not have an adverse effect on drainage. Paved roads are not preferred from an environmental standpoint. The roads have a single responsible owner which will be an advantage over most private roads, on which several owners have to agree on decisions for the roads. Councilwoman Szozda asked about roads passing through designated wetlands. Mr. Tomlinson said the DEC and Army Corps of Engineers have been solicited for review and evaluations by geotechnical engineers. Attorney Spitzer asked how much wetland is affected. Mr. Tomlinson said 1.5 acres. The road plan has been designed to minimize disturbance. The mitigation formula is 1.5 to 1 (on site), prior to the disturbance. That will be monitored by the DEC for five years. Attorney Spitzer said the Army Corps requires permanent mitigation plans, which is generally done through easements. If given to the Town, the Town would have no responsibility other than to ensure no development occurs in these conservation mitigation areas.

Street Signs – will be subdued, but will have reflective lettering.

House numbers for emergency services – Mr. Tomlinson said plans for a numbering system will be submitted.

Parking – there will be overflow guest parking provided, and parking in open space will be permissible.

3. Local Law 2 to create a WPDD

Supervisor Gaesser asked if the Board members have any questions about this law.

Attorney Spitzer outlined the maps, the overlay district, and the regulations of the district as re-zoned.

One resolution will cover the actions of SEQR, another can cover the consistency review, site plan review, and passage of the law.

Supervisor Gaesser recapped:

- Relocate or add hydrant on plan
- Establish an annual flow test procedure
- Water debt legal questions answered
- Emergency access procedure decided
- Signage at South entrance for deliveries
- Geotechnical certification of road structure

Councilman Schuth spoke about the possible historic significance of some of the buildings on the Troutburg site. Mr. Wegman said if this is the case, an interested historical association may have the buildings.

A recess was called at 12:30 p.m. for approximately 25 minutes.

4. Consistency Review

CEO Hennekey asked for legal opinions on policies 11 and 12 of the Town Board LWRP Consistency Review, specifically about the proposed dock. Attorney Spitzer will investigate and determine what Board or Code Enforcement action must be considered.

The Board read and discussed each policy of a work in progress document – THE COTTAGES AT TROUTBURG Town Board LWRP Consistency Review, the findings and the rationale, and made a determination as to each one's applicability and consistency.

Policy 1 through Policy 10 - All in agreement that proposed project is consistent with the LWRP.

Policy 11- need to determine if the pier should be addressed – its pertinence, definition of non-moveable structure, its inclusion within the established coastal erosion area, and whether the construction affects its applicability. The Planning Board determined the pier was not within the coastal erosion area. Supervisor Gaesser will investigate answers to these questions.

Policy 12 – still awaiting legal counsel regarding the pier being subject to the zoning variance process.

Policy 13 through Policy 44 – all in agreement that proposed project is consistent with the LWRP. Some minor wording changes were recommended.

Reminders of upcoming meetings and year end business were given.

The work session was adjourned at 2:10 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Amy K. Richardson