

APPROVED

JOINT VILLAGE/TOWN OF CLAYTON

PLANNING BOARD

September 3, 2020

The meeting opened at 7:00 pm with **the following members present:** Chairman Doug Rogers, Dave Crandall, Therese Christensen, Paul Heckmann, Kevin Patchen (alternate), Duane Hazelton, Patrick Dewey. Also sitting in with the board was Lori Arnot. Absent was Fred Bach.

Also Present: Susan Kenney, Recording Clerk

Townpeople Present: Jonathan Taylor, Alan Heberling, Jim Kenney, unknown couple (no sign-in sheet)

Chairman Rogers began with a statement that this meeting had no scheduled hearings, so it would be a workshop session. There would be no voting, so no stand-in for the absent member was required. He added a reminder that the members needed to complete their online sexual harassment training as well as the online workshops to meet the continuing education training requirements. It was noted that on some of the continuing education sessions, there was no way to indicate that it had been done.

Chairman Rogers informed the board that for the next meeting in October, there would be at least two hearings, one for a proposed bunkhouse on Grindstone Island, and the other for a deck at the Clipper Inn.

At 7:06 pm, Jonathan Taylor presented information on a proposed project in the village, a remodel of part of a building on Merrick St. to go from a two-family dwelling to a three-family dwelling. The details of the project are still very much in flux, and some of the proposed changes would need to go to the Zoning Board of Appeals to seek a variance. Board members asked about available parking, the schedule for building, and whether the building was on the historic register. Mr. Taylor was informed that he would need to bring to the next meeting drawings to show the layout of the building and the proposed parking.

Beginning at 7:20 pm, several topics were discussed by the board, and are summarized as follows:

1. **Feedback from the board on the proposal from an ad hoc committee** formed to study a Planned Development District (PDD) for the town, and the disagreements with that document and the proposal from the Town Board. Questions raised included spot zoning, interpretation of the plan, and the Town Board's specific disagreements with the committee's proposal.
2. **The new sign law being written by the Village Board.** Questions raised included the differences between the village's proposal and the planning board's proposal, a possible merger of the two documents, and the possibility of needed procedural changes to allow the boards to work together.

3. **Feedback on the town's solar legislation** and the lack of required information from a current project on solar storage batteries. Questions raised included the specific conditions required by the board when the project was approved, the lack of a proper site plan, the lack of response to the board's requests, a necessary amendment to the solar law to cover solar batteries, and the ability of enforcing a municipal inspection of all solar projects before a utility inspection.
4. **Difficulties with the Oot project**, including proximity to a road and a right-of-way, the lack of a proper topographical plan, and the possibility of having the Planning Board and the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) work together on potentially controversial projects.
5. **The Van Reenen project in the village**. Questions raised included the project's compliance with the conditions laid on it by the ZBA, continuing complaints from neighbors, and the Zoning Enforcement Officer's lack of authority to dictate what can be placed in a public right-of-way.
6. **Short-term rentals and Air BnBs**. Questions raised included the number of Air BnBs in the town, the lack of adequate parking, requirements to be placed on Air BnBs such as those laid on hotels and motels, and the issues being faced in Lake Placid concerning Air BnBs.
7. **Other concerns** brought up by the Board members. These included a poorly done deck project; storage units on Strawberry Lane; the increasing number of rock walls and barriers being erected along the St. Lawrence which destroy the natural look of the river; a junk yard without proper screening; a recommendation that all PDD applicants be required to put up the money needed for a third-party review of the site plans; the necessity of having complete applications before any approval; and the need for the town, village, and ZEO enforce the laws and ordinances on the books, as well as decisions by the Planning Board and the ZBA.

At 8:42 pm, **MOTION** was made by Duane Hazelton, second by Pat Dewey, to adjourn the meeting. Motion was passed with all in favor.

Respectfully Submitted,

Susan Kenney, Recording Clerk