

**Minutes for the Ticonderoga Planning Board Meeting held on
April 7, 2016 commencing at 7:00 p.m.**

Present: Stu Baker, Mike Powers, Scott Manning, Ben Leerkes, Don Meserve, Doug McTyier, Walt Lender, Tonya M. Thompson

Others: Bill Ball, Danielle Drinkwine-Holman, Ken Engler, Mark Carpenter, Sarah Latchford, Brenda Carpenter

Mr. Baker opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. with the Reciting of the Pledge of Allegiance.

Approval of Minutes

Resolution #2-2016 brought by Ben Leerkes, seconded by Scott Manning to approve the minutes for December 3, 2015. 4 - Ayes, 0 - Nays. Doug McTyier, Walt Lender, Mike Powers - Abstain. **Carried.**

Resolution #3-2016 brought by Walt Lender, seconded by Mike Powers to approve the minutes for March 3, 2016. 5 - Ayes, 0 - Nays. Ben Leerkes, Don Meserve - Abstain. **Carried.**

Site Plan Applications for Review

Mr. Lender excused himself from the sitting board at 7:02 p.m. citing personal involvement of the project and retired himself to the audience for questions.

Lender - 160.34-1-3.000 (74 Tiroga Beach Lane) - Single Family Dwelling

- Single Family - year round residence
- Built on site of prior home that was torn down last year
- Original home's set back was 35' from lake - per APA agreement - will construct a one story screened porch at 35' from lake, 50' set back will start the 2 story home
- Water - well, Town sewer
- Net Increase of Impervious surface is only about 280' (will have a larger rain garden to accommodate more than this net increase)

Discussion on the set backs of the old building along with the proposed structure and deed. The original building was as single story building with a set back of 35 feet. New APA regulations is 50 feet - he can build within the same set backs of the original building but can't build beyond that original height or width of those original set backs. The screened in porch is within the original set backs.

Mr. Baker inquired with Code Enforcement if those set backs were grandfathered under Town Code.

Mr. Ball stated that the Town has no issue with this plan.

Mr. Leerkes inquired about some specifics in the deed, shared costs.

**Minutes for the Ticonderoga Planning Board Meeting held on
April 7, 2016 commencing at 7:00 p.m.**

Mr. Lender explained that this is from the old deed when they shared a septic system and shared the private road. It is now Town sewer and it is a Town road.

More discussion was held on the rain garden and its location.

Mr. Lender stated that we are waiting on the Lake George Park Commissions Storm Water Permit and the APA should issue an Non-Jurisdiction letter.

Mr. Baker agrees that from this discussion there will be two conditions on the application, 1) Final Determination or Approval from the APA and 2) Lake George Park Commission Storm Water Permit.

Resolution #4-2016 brought by Ben Leerkes, seconded by Scott Manning to declare a complete application for Lender - 160.34-1-3.000 (74 Tiroga Beach Lane) - Single Family Dwelling. 6 - Ayes, 0 - Nays. **Carried.**

Resolution #5 -2016 brought by Don Meserve, seconded by Mike Powers to approve the complete application for Lender - 160.34-1-3.000 (74 Tiroga Beach Lane) - Single Family Dwelling with the conditions of receiving 1) Final Determination or Approval from the APA and 2) Lake George Park Commission Storm Water Permit. SEQRA is determined to be Type II and no action is needed (No Significant Environmental Impact). 6 - Ayes, 0 - Nays. **Carried.**

Mr. Lender returned to the sitting board at 7:15 p.m. to assume his membership duties.

ZAGA Real Properties, LLC - 150.1-1-22.200 (671 NYS Route 9N) - Event Barn

- Wedding Event Barn - back pasture between Nadeau's and the Golf Course
- No food or Drink
- Rent Barn
- Responsible for own caterer, own beverages
- Underground power - pushed
- No Running water (maybe drilled well down the line)
- Lavatory Trailer
- Gravel Parking

The Board held much discussion on this project.

Mr. Meserve inquired why anybody would invest in this venue and not have a water or sewer. Why not spend the extra money to put this in? He would like to see what DOH has to say.

Mr. Ball explained that this has already been approved, there has been a lot of time spent discussing this back and forth. It is perfectly legal, food and beverages will be catered in and they have no problem with that.

**Minutes for the Ticonderoga Planning Board Meeting held on
April 7, 2016 commencing at 7:00 p.m.**

Mr. Carpenter explained that this type of venue is happening all over the world, it is not as expensive and it is a different type of experience. We would like to try this for a few years first to see if it is even going to work and then we may eventually put in water and sewer. There is a very successful venue down in Stoney Creek and they do not provide any water either - the caterers bring it all in. We envision one or two weddings a weekend from May to October, but before any more investment we want to make sure it is a viable investment.

Mr. Meserve asked if the facilities are going to be there on a regular basis or just moved in for the events.

Mrs. Latchford agreed that the lavatory trailer would be a seasonal rental, not an event by event.

Mr. Ball added that the existing horse barn does have a working bathroom, however it does need to be upgraded. They own that structure as well.

Mr. Lender asked about the rating of the access bridge across the brook and the road.

Mr. Ball stated that the bridge is rated for log trucks.

Mr. Carpenter added that IP has a right-of-way on the road.

Mr. Leerkes asked about the plans for the fields in general.

Mr. Carpenter noted that the fields will continue to be hayed, and possible grape vines put in at a later time.

Signage was questioned.

Mr. Carpenter explained that there will be no additional signage, but there is a current totem pole with signs. We are planning on replacing that pole with similar signage possibly a bit smaller.

Mr. Baker stated that APA project description states no signage proposed other than temporary parking signs.

Mr. Carpenter believes it is for no new signage.

Mr. Baker asked if the future signage is subject to Planning Board approval.

Mr. Ball stated yes, unless it falls under the current sign regulations.

Resolution #6-2016 brought by Ben Leerkes, seconded by Doug McTyier to declare a complete application for ZAGA Real Properties, LLC - 150.1-1-22.200 (671 NYS Route 9N) - Event Barn. 7 - Ayes, 0 - Nays. **Carried.**

**Minutes for the Ticonderoga Planning Board Meeting held on
April 7, 2016 commencing at 7:00 p.m.**

Resolution #7-2016 brought by Scott Manning, seconded by Ben Leerkes to approve the complete application for ZAGA Real Properties, LLC - 150.1-1-22.200 (671 NYS Route 9N) - Event Barn. 7 - Ayes, 0 - Nays. **Carried.**

Mr. Leerkes would like to congratulate the applicant and his vision on doing this.

The board agreed that it is going to be a great project.

Additional Business

Signage

Ken Engler is here tonight to discuss signage. They are looking into erecting some signs for Fort Ticonderoga and would like input. He explained that back in 2004 people asked why there was not a sign when you approached the Monument Circle from the South directing people straight through to get to Fort Ticonderoga. There is Penfield Museum, Mt. Hope and Mt. Defiance there. DOT took the position that they would put a sign there only if there were further directional signs telling people how to continue on down Montcalm Street to get to the Fort. We have been going back and forth on this for a few years, but recently - tied in with some other applications from Matt Courtright at the Chamber of Commerce, DOT came back and said now, due to the effort of The Pathway through History there is signage for Fort Ticonderoga within the Hamlet and therefore we will put a sign south of the monument approaching. We can't seem to get anybody to respond to tell whether they intend to tell people to turn left and continue 270 feet up Wicker Street or straight on Montcalm Street. In Dot's method of thinking, they very well might say go North on Wicker Street because the one sign that we can find directing people further to Fort Ticonderoga is up on Wicker Street in front of McDonalds telling you to turn right on 22 and 74. We may still be back to the condition in order to help out the downtown business and get traffic to go down through town to still comply with the idea to put a couple of signs on Montcalm Street directing people straight to the Fort. We are kind of questioning is this off premises advertising or is this a Historic Site sign, is it an admissible sign? We suggest that we get the state to release the standard Historic Site design for the new Pathway through History, maybe even furnish the signs and put them on Montcalm Street to continue the direction, but the question is does the Planning Board have concern or jurisdiction that they have to approve these signs.

Mr. Baker asked if the signs would be placed within the public right-of-way?

Mr. Engler doesn't know what is considered public right-of-way. There is a sign that has popped up for Lake George Boat Inspection Station and that is into the sidewalk. That location and that size is appropriate along with that color that complies with the APA preference.

**Minutes for the Ticonderoga Planning Board Meeting held on
April 7, 2016 commencing at 7:00 p.m.**

Mr. Baker noted that this board typically deals with review of projects on private property, not within the public right-of-way. The board is not sure that they actually have jurisdiction over this request.

Mr. Lender agrees that we would not have jurisdiction, but they certainly can make a statement in support of it. The Board agrees.

Mr. Baker would like to support a sign to a State Historic Site. He does not want to give the impression that they are promoting signage for private businesses within the public right-of-way.

Mr. Engler added that there is a cost once the sign is up. Maintenance - keep it from fading, this could be something that the Town could do, however it is for the better of the Fort, maybe they can take care of it.

Mr. Powers noted that if we have the signage, Highway would probably put it up.

Mr. Baker would like it noted that we don't have jurisdiction over this, but we will certainly support it.

Resolution #8-2016 brought by Ben Leerkes, seconded by Don Meserve strongly supporting the erection of signage directing tourists to Historic Fort Ticonderoga through the downtown area of Ticonderoga from the Southerly entrance of the monument. 7 - Ayes, 0 - Nays. **Carried.**

Signage Discussion - continued:

Mr. Ball expressed his concern over the sign ordinance, personally he believes that sandwich boards are very effective, but there is no set design standards or time frame. He feels they should only be out during business hours and that should be for every where. Also, for temporary signs, we have received a letter from DOT that we are going to be held liable for allowing signs to be put in their right-of-way, we cannot condone any signs in their right-of-way. They would need to go to the DOT.

Mr. Powers inquired about election signs, to they get a pass from us?

Mr. Ball stated that we can say where they can be and how long they can be there.

More discussion on election signs.

Mr. Ball stated that with discussion with the Town board members this is a necessary evil, these signs and he is sure that the Planning Board will be asked for their input.

Mr. Lender agrees that we need a set of sign regulations, and over the last few years signs have just happened because they don't fall under the ordinance.

**Minutes for the Ticonderoga Planning Board Meeting held on
April 7, 2016 commencing at 7:00 p.m.**

Mr. Powers believes that we need to pull this out of that proposed Zoning Ordinance that was voted down and critic it for recommendation to the Town Board.

Mr. Leerkes believes that we need to do this along with reviewing the Storm Water Management plan.

Mr. Baker agreed, next months meeting (May) will focus on review of the sign code language. He asked Mr. Ball to really take a look at it as an administrative standpoint that it is doable. (Mrs. Thompson will re-send the information to the board.)

Mr. Powers would like to set a deadline - have the review done and recommendations to the Town Board by July.

Storm Water Management Plan

Mr. Baker is curious to know what the Town Board is actually looking for. The document has been referred to us as a whole, however, it contains both code language as well as a lot of public infrastructure projects.

Mr. Leerkes questioned some of the info in the document, such as requiring almost every body to have either rain barrels or gardens. How are you going to do this??

Mr. Ball stated that you should hold retain rain water on your own property.

Mr. Lender stated that there are grant programs out there that will share costs for rain gardens, there are incentive grants out there. With some regulations and some incentives we can pull it off.

Mr. Powers is not convinced that we can require everyone in the Town to do this. He does not feel that this is thought through.

Discussion was held on storm water issues within the Town and the proposed Storm Water document.

Mr. Meserve does not believe that this is a plan to adopt, it is more of an overall view. It is hard for him to read and say that it is a good idea. Yes, storm water management is a good idea, but you have to be able to figure out exactly what you are going to do and when you are going to do it.

Mr. Baker wanted to ask more of a direct question - on page 9 and 10 of the Storm Water management plan, there is specific code language that they are recommending that the Town adopt to address future storm water management. This basically presents the out line for future storm water plans that this board would see with site plan and subdivision applications. Is everybody comfortable with this language to recommend to the Town Board to adopt this into code?

**Minutes for the Ticonderoga Planning Board Meeting held on
April 7, 2016 commencing at 7:00 p.m.**

The board needs to review these pages again.

Mr. Baker reiterated - let's all do a close read of this document and be ready to specifically address, at the very least to recommend, that storm water language for inclusion in the Town Code. We can also look beyond that in the plan and comment on the proposed public projects that are recommended in here. At the very least, he would like to see this board have a recommendation to the Town Board on the Code Language.

More discussion was held on Storm Water issues.

Solar

Mr. Meserve mentioned that a solar company is sending out flyers around the North Country encouraging large land owner to recommend leasing their properties to them.

Mr. Ball agrees that we will need to firm up the solar regulations in light of the new school project.

Discussion was held and decided that solar will be the next item for the agenda as soon as review is done on Sign Codes and Storm Water Management.

May's Planning Board Meeting - Review for recommendation the Sign Code and review for recommendation the code language in the Storm Water Management plan.

Mr. Ball handed out some forms that the board had previously worked on to update those currently in use by the Town for various items such as subdivisions, applications, etc. Mrs. Thompson will look up the previous discussion on these forms and forward them to the board.

Resolution #9-2016 brought by Ben Leerkes, seconded by Walt Lender to adjourn at 8:36 p.m. 7 - Ayes, 0 - Nays. **Carried.**

Respectfully submitted, Tonya M. Thompson, Town Clerk