

TOWN OF CLARKSON
PLANNING BOARD – MINUTES

July 20, 2010

Board Members

Don Osborne – Chairperson
John Jackson
Scott Hanko
Dave Virgilio
Tom Schrage

Support Board Members

Richard Olson, Town Attorney *
John Paul Schepp, Town Engineer
Chad Fabry, Building Inspector/Code Enforcement
Ursula Liotta, Building Department Coordinator
*excused

CALL TO ORDER

D. Osborne called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. with the Pledge of Allegiance and reviewed the agenda.

NEW BUSINESS - continuation

1. **Klaus & Debbie Pakusch** – Application for a lot line change (dividing 1 into 2)
363 Lawton Road, Tax Acct. #40.02-1-15, Zoned RS-20

D. Osborne addressed SEQR by stating that the Conservation Board reviewed the long-form EAF and recommended a Negative Declaration. The Determination of Significance is incorporated herein.

617.20
Appendix A
State Environmental Quality Review
FULL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM

Purpose: The full EAF is designed to help applicants and agencies determine, in an orderly manner, whether a project or action may be significant. The question of whether an action may be significant is not always easy to answer. Frequently, there are aspects of a project that are subjective or unmeasurable. It is also understood that those who determine significance may have little or no formal knowledge of the environment or may not be technically expert in environmental analysis. In addition, many who have knowledge in one particular area may not be aware of the broader concerns affecting the question of significance.

The full EAF is intended to provide a method whereby applicants and agencies can be assured that the determination process has been orderly, comprehensive in nature, yet flexible enough to allow introduction of information to fit a project or action.

Full EAF Components: The full EAF is comprised of three parts:

- Part 1:** Provides objective data and information about a given project and its site. By identifying basic project data, it assists a reviewer in the analysis that takes place in Parts 2 and 3.
- Part 2:** Focuses on identifying the range of possible impacts that may occur from a project or action. It provides guidance as to whether an impact is likely to be considered small to moderate or whether it is a potentially large impact. The form also identifies whether an impact can be mitigated or reduced.
- Part 3:** If any impact in Part 2 is identified as potentially-large, then Part 3 is used to evaluate whether or not the impact is actually important.

DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE — Type 1 and Unlisted Actions	
Identify the Portions of EAF completed for this project: " Part 1 " Part 2 " Part 3	
Upon review of the information recorded on this EAF (Parts 1 and 2 and 3 if appropriate), and any other supporting information, and considering both the magnitude and importance of each impact, it is reasonably determined by the lead agency that:	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	A. The project will not result in any large and important impact(s) and, therefore, is one which will not have a significant impact on the environment, therefore a negative declaration will be prepared.
<input type="checkbox"/>	B. Although the project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect for this Unlisted Action because the mitigation measures described in PART 3 have been required; therefore a CONDITIONED negative declaration will be prepared.*
<input type="checkbox"/>	C. The project may result in one or more large and important impacts that may have a significant impact on the environment, therefore a positive declaration will be prepared.
*A Conditioned Negative Declaration is only valid for Unlisted Actions	
<u>Pakusch Subdivision</u> Name of Action	
<u>Town of Clarkson Planning Board</u> Name of Lead Agency	
<u>Donald F. Osborne</u> Print or Type Name of Responsible Officer in Lead Agency	Title of Responsible Officer
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Donald F. Osborne</u> Signature of Responsible Officer in Lead Agency	<u>Ursula Liotta</u> 7/14/10 Signature of Preparer (if different from responsible officer) Bldg Dept Coordinator
<u>20 July 10</u> Date	

D. Osborne made a motion to accept the Conservation Board's recommendation; second by J.Jackson; unanimously carried.

TOWN OF CLARKSON
PLANNING BOARD – MINUTES

July 20, 2010

Corey Tufano, from DDS Engineers, introduced himself and presented the instrument survey/Mylar. JP Schepp stated that on June 15, 2010, this Board requested input from the Conservation Board since the creation of the second lot will create a potential creek crossing situation for that lot; further, the Town requested that an access easement be provided where Brockport Creek is accessible on both properties. The easement has since been created with R. Olson's approval, and the Liber and Page will be noted on the Mylar after it is recorded.

T. Schrage made a motion to grant the Applicants' request for the lot line change; second by D. Virgilio; unanimously carried.

OPEN FORUM

Debbie Palumbo, 139 Pesh Homes Trail, introduced herself and stated that her husband is in the process of applying for a Federal Firearms License; that they used their home address on the application since they do not have a separate business address yet; that they have been unable to find a suitable property to purchase for the business they hope to open. Mrs. Palumbo asked if the Town could provide her with a letter stating that it was okay for them to have a retail operation at that address.

The Board discussed the matter and advised Mrs. Palumbo that the Town could not provide the letter, but suggested that she and her husband look for property zoned Highway Commercial or Commercial (retail) to rent or own, that would allow for the retail sale of firearms, and would satisfy the requirements of the Federal Firearms License application.

OTHER

Re: Liberty Cove Subdivision, Sections 4 & 5

JP Schepp advised the Board that William Holding contacted him this date with regard to the recent sale of Lot 42, Liberty Cove Subdivision, on the NE corner of Mission Hill Drive (Section 4) and Amenity Drive (Section 5). W. Holding asked if he could run 140 feet of drainage pipe on the NE corner of the lot at the time of the new build, although that work was initially intended to be completed as part of Section 5. JP Schepp stated that since the proposed work was already designed as part of the preliminary site plan approval granted on May 5, 2009, he approved the work to be done.

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES from June 15, 2010

D. Osborne made a motion to approve the minutes; second by S. Hanko; unanimously carried.

NEXT MEETING: August 3, 2010

ADJOURNMENT:

D. Virgilio made a motion to adjourn at 7:30 p.m.; second by T. Schrage; unanimously carried.

Approved 8-3-10

Respectfully submitted,

Ursula M. Liotta
Building Department Coordinator