

**MINUTES OF THE TOWN OF FORT EDWARD PLANNING BOARD MEETING  
HELD ON WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 14, 2016 AT TOWN HALL COMMENCING AT  
7:00PM**

Chairman Belden called the meeting to order at 7:10pm

Pledge of Allegiance

**PRESENT:** Chairman Belden  
Valerie Ingersoll  
Joseph McMurray  
Donald Sanders, Jr  
Zachary Middleton  
Frank Wells  
Max Fruchter

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Andrew Steves, Lucas Dobie, Town Engineer Jim Houston and Town Attorney Mary-Ellen Stockwell

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES: MOTION** by Frank Wells, Seconded by Donald Sanders, Jr to approve the minutes of the meeting of October 12, 2016 **ALL AYES**

**BUSINESS:**

**Doty Machine  
35 Sullivan Parkway  
Boundary Line Adjustment**

**Lucas Dobie:** We are looking for a boundary line adjustment to allow for future development.

**Max Fruchter:** Jim did a very good job on notes.

**Jim Houston:** Where does Doty fit in with Sullivan Parkway Holdings, LLC?

**Andrew Steves:** Doty Machine is Sullivan Parkway, the name changed when Mrs. Miller bought out in September, 2014.

**Jim Houston went over his comment letter regarding the project:**

- 1) Tax Map Number should show on the plans, no reference on maps and the current property owners should also be shown on the maps.
- 2) Applicant form – 233sf does not correlate with the existing and proposed parcel data.

**Andrew Steves:** The 233sf parcel is to clean up roadway for the Williams Farm.

- 3) Application states that there are no existing non-conforming conditions on the property. The applicant should provide some clarification as to whether or not the existing property meets with the minimum frontage requirements notes for cul-de-sac.
- 4) The plan for Stevens Lane does not show the existing and/or proposed frontage on Sullivan Parkway and it should. Perhaps the boundary line adjustment can be modified to eliminate the minimum frontage non-conformance. Is it possible to shift the line?

**Zachary Middleton:** The line is non-conforming because they don't have road frontage. They need 100 feet and they only have 50 feet.

**Jim Houston:** You can't make a non-conforming boundary and make it worse. If they could get another 10-15 feet they could make it work.

- 5) The map associated with Stevens Lane property is titled a "topographic survey" but there is no topographic information shown on this map/plan. This map should be retitled.
- 6) Regarding the Stevens Lane map, the bearings and distances around the entire area to be conveyed should be shown on this plan/map. We want it on the map to compare to the existing.
- 7) There is inconsistency between the bearings shown on the two maps/plans for the same lot line. The lot line due south shows 0 degrees, 0 minutes off by 14 or 15 degrees.

**Andrew Steves:** They were done 2 different ways one was magnetic.

- 8) Per Section 87-3.1.c of the Town Code, the plans for both the granting and receiving properties should show the location of wells and septic systems. Also, the application should include a draft deed of the proposed properties after the adjustment is made. This did not appear to be included in the application package. Sullivan Parkway had, but not on Williams. Draft deeds after properties are made should also be included.

**Mary-Ellen Stockwell sent the following memo to Chairman Belden:**

- For precedent purposes, mylar and boundary line adjustment deed-language should state parcel being conveyed should be no new parcels being formed.
- Make clear these are 2 separate applications for 2 separate boundary line adjustments. Sullivan Parkway to Williams Farm, LLC and Williams Farm LLC to Sullivan Parkway.
- Draft deeds should be prepared
- Planning Board needs 2 separate public hearings for 2 separate applications.
- An agricultural data statement should be submitted stating this is no longer a working farm.
- Wells and septic systems should be noted on maps, which Jim also noted.

**Chairman Belden:** According to Washington County web map it states there is no road frontage; neither Hudson St. nor May St. goes to the parcel.

**Zachary Middleton:** The cul-de-sac also stops before the parcel.

**Donald Sanders, Jr.:** There is no road frontage now, 50 feet is not a lot but I do not see a problem. It would be a Zoning Board determination.

**Joseph McMurray:** Basically they are swapping a large boundary to get a little parcel. Also there is a potential for Doty to build all the way to the lot line.

**Chairman Belden:** They would run out of permeable space before that.

**Andrew Steves:** They have 50 feet of road frontage now; they would have 65 feet after the adjustment.

**Chairman Belden:** When Sullivan was supervisor, the road was supposed to go all the way down instead of cul-de-sac. The Town has an easement to the property.

**Mary-Ellen Stockwell:** The Board can ask the applicant to answer questions they want to know about road frontage.

**Lucas Dobie:** They are looking for a private road so do they go to the Town for an easement? What Board is saying is any further project would be dead in the water without road frontage. They want to develop so could the ZBA exempt lack of road frontage?

**Chairman Belden:** The applicant has 2 options; they can go back to Mrs. Miller at Doty Machine and say they need 100 feet of road frontage or they can go to the ZBA to get minimum road frontage.

**Mary-Ellen Stockwell:** 50 feet of frontage is not shown on any maps so the Board would need more information.

**Valerie Ingersoll:** On the map Doty shows proposed parking on the plans over a test pit. Is it allowable to cover a test pit?

**Mary-Ellen Stockwell:** The application is for a boundary line adjustment. The applicant should remove future site plan development from the map to avoid confusion.

**Valerie Ingersoll:** There is a discrepancy on acreage on existing and Short EAF. One says 45 and one says 40 acres.

**Mary-Ellen Stockwell:** They have included both 5 acres for Doty and 40 acres for Williams Farm on total acreage. Applicant is going to need 2 separate SEQRA reviews because there are 2 separate boundary line adjustments.

**Donald Sanders, Jr.:** If we say 50 feet road frontage doesn't currently exist, Town has the right of way. If the Town agreed to 65 feet would that work?

**Mary-Ellen Stockwell:** The Board needs to set a public hearing and the applicant can come back to answers questions.

**MOTION** by Zachary Middleton, Seconded by Max Fruchter to set a public hearing for January 11, 2016 at 7:05pm **ALL EYES**

**MOTION** by Max Fruchter, Seconded by Joseph McMurray to adjourn the meeting at 8:17pm **ALL EYES**

DATED: December 22, 2016

\_\_\_\_\_  
Valerie Ingersoll, Planning Board Member