

**COUNTY OF GREENE  
TOWN OF NEW BALTIMORE  
SPECIAL TOWN BOARD MEETING  
JULY 18, 2011- page 1**

**DRAFT**

**OPENING OF MEETING**

Supervisor O'Rourke called the meeting to order at 7:02 pm and the Pledge of Allegiance was said. Also attending: Councilman Norris, Zoning Board Chair Tooher, Vice Chair Covey, Member VanEtten; Planning Board Chair Rundberg and Member Johns, Code Enforcement Officer Blaisdell, Building, Planning and Zoning Clerk Loux, Town Clerk Brooks and members of the public.

Absent: Councilwoman Finke, Councilmen Byas and Meredith.

**MOMENT OF SILENCE IN MEMORY OF SALVATORE 'SAL' COSTANZA,  
FORMER TOWN COUNCILMAN AND TOWN SUPERVISOR**

**MOMENT OF SILENCE IN MEMORY OF GORDON KLIESE, FORMER ZONING  
BOARD MEMBER, TOWN COUNCILMAN AND TOWN SUPERVISOR**

Memories were shared of two excellent men and excellent town supervisors.

Supervisor announced there is not a quorum of the Town Board this night; if there is a quorum later, Old Business will be conducted toward the Resolution to Approve Payment of Claims.

**OLD BUSINESS**

- Resolution to Approve Payment of Claims

Without a quorum the Resolution to Pay Claims is **TABLED**.

- Budget Workshop

Supervisor stated this Special Meeting was called primarily as a Budget Workshop by the members of the Town Board. Some issues have already been brought to the Board's attention; there may be some that the Planning and Zoning Boards represented here will wish to bring to the Town Board's attention. It has been awhile since there has been a meeting of the Boards and it is important to do that. In that only 2 members of the Town Board are present, the agenda will proceed.

**NEW BUSINESS**

Discussion on Appropriate fee for Junkyard Licenses or Special Use Permits

First on the table is JB Car Services, who get a secondhand junk/autoparts dealer/junkyard license from the Town. Previously this was gotten along with the Special Use Permit from the Town Board. Special Use Permits were broken out by resolution of the Town Board and are now issued by the Planning Board; both Boards have asked the Building Inspector to make an inspection of the premises, the Town wanted to be certain the Code spells out some requirements with which the junkyard must be in compliance. Supervisor asked if Planning Board asked for its own inspection or the code enforcement officer; Chair Rundberg was not present when that was last done; one inspection was satisfactory.

Previously, the Town has charged Brockett's a \$100 fee for junkyard license but cannot find the source of that fee. The Town Code lists \$50 for new/\$25 for renewal, but was changed by Town Board resolution but didn't appear on the new resolution. Going back to the old Code and fee schedule does not bring us to the \$100 and Brockett's is the only of its type. The Special Use Permit is \$200 and typically that is charged for the first Permit, although at this time Brockett is the only renewing Special Use Permit. The ZBA has one annually-renewing applicant for a Use Variance; there is also an annual Use Variance. Supervisor has discussed with Attorney Wukitsch; should we have fees for renewing uses? There are criteria for compliance established; there is a need for inspection.

Supervisor said regarding Junkyard, Town Law specifically cites, in Code, requirements to be met for the license, controlled by Town Board, and that should be where the fee resides. But if

COUNTY OF GREENE  
TOWN OF NEW BALTIMORE  
SPECIAL TOWN BOARD MEETING  
JULY 18, 2011- page 2

DRAFT

Planning Board has strong feelings, and if the Board wants a fee for other renewables, Special Use Permits.

Councilman Norris said code enforcement officer's time is required, so a fee is needed.

Supervisor asked should the fee be \$100 for the license? for the Special Use Permit?

Chair Tooher asked if that was attached to the Permit renewal?

Supervisor felt just now it wasn't attached to anything, suggesting the fee be attached to the License, but a fee could be set for the License and for the Permit; there are options.

Councilman Norris felt they were two different fees; specifically junkyard should be one fee, but Special Use is broader application.

Supervisor said there could be other renewables foreseeable.

Chair Rundberg said where a license is needed, one fee seems to her to be enough; if it is a Special Use Permit, then that would carry the fee.

Chair Tooher asked if it could be a \$100 renewal fee for an initial fee set in the Code; pay one renewal fee, total; if any Town fee needs annual renewal, that fee would be \$100.

Councilman Norris said tradition to renew has been to charge ½ of the original fee.

Supervisor said initial Special Use Permit or Variance is \$200, adding that building permits are renewed for ½ of their original fee assessed.

Clerk Brooks felt that was the intent of prior fee schedule, with the \$50 new/\$25 renew.

Planning Board member Bill Johns joined the group.

Supervisor reviewed that the discussion was about Special Use Permits or Variances that come back before both boards. With Brockett, actually the Town may refund \$75 of that \$100 since we have no way to establish why we charged the \$100.

Chair Tooher asked has this charge occurred for quite a few [years]?

Chair Rundberg asked if it was because it was ½ the price of the Permit?

Supervisor said the number of years is not known; Attorney Wukitsch was not aware of this fee and asked if he was invoiced for the fee; no, he would simply come in or mail his \$100. Chair

Tooher asked wouldn't that refund be [for more years]?

Supervisor said attorney is looking into whether there may be a statute of limitations.

Member Covey asked if there was a fee resolution passed to establish the fee schedule, and it 'fell off'.

Chair Tooher asked to clarify 'fell off' - in copying or wasn't voted on.

Supervisor phoned prior supervisor, who does not recall and minutes reflect no discussion on the topic of junkyards; Supervisor is uncertain of intent.

Clerk Loux believed, in that junkyards are not permitted, and it appeared on the schedule, it would raise it again and give the appearance of a permitted use.

Chair Tooher asked if he was actually licensed as a junkyard. Is the fee tied to that?

Supervisor cannot establish correlation between that fee amount and a cause, and wonders if starting 'fresh' is the best tactic. The \$100 may represent ½ of a Special Use Permit, and it never had an amount; the annual resolution by the board to grant him the license also does not contain an amount.

Dick Brooks recommends cleaning up language; tie it to junkyard license since it makes sense and his is the only one and not objecting.

Supervisor likes the fee staying with the license, which stays with the Town Board to handle.

Regarding Renewable Special Use Permits, Supervisor suggests, unless you are being charged another fee by the Town, a party would pay some sort of renewal fee or get a credit for it against another fee. When you have a permit, there is some reason you want them to come back, and you would want that inspected by someone.

Code Enforcement Officer Blaisdell asked about a fire inspection.

Supervisor acknowledged the Town doesn't currently charge for a fire inspection, that are in statute as yearly, but if the Town did begin charging, that would be a fee and would exempt him from paying a Special Use Permit.

Chair Tooher said or get a credit for that towards any other fee.

Supervisor agreed.

Councilman Norris said fire inspections have to do with public safety, in statute every 4 or 3 years.

John Cashin offered that the Board could establish a fee for Special Inspections by the building inspector called for by Zoning Board or Planning Board.

COUNTY OF GREENE  
TOWN OF NEW BALTIMORE  
SPECIAL TOWN BOARD MEETING  
JULY 18, 2011- page 3

**DRAFT**

Chair Rundberg feels if Town Board is sending out the building inspector for the license, the Planning Board does not to go out again for same.

Chair Tooher said if he was getting a credit for his licensing fee, it wouldn't matter, and if you had a separate Special Use permit that required it there would still be authorization for the fee. Supervisor agreed, offering that if we have the junkyard license for \$100 and anyone who has another fee by the Town that they can get a credit for that toward the renewable Variance. Should the renewable Special Use Permit and Variance be half of the original?

Chair Tooher felt that was consistent, is there a reason to change it?

Supervisor said we use that mentality in other areas. The Boards may say to Special Use Variance person, you've been applying every year, you don't have to come back and so, no additional fee.

Clerk Loux clarified different Variance fees, Commercial and Residential, and certified letters have cost, relating to the public hearing.

Chair Tooher felt the renewal should pay the permit's costs.

Councilman Norris asked if the fee covers the cost, preparation of minutes, and inspection.

Supervisor asked would the group want to keep the Residential Variance at \$40?

Supervisor resists charging specific fees, \$40 for original Residential.

Chair Tooher felt being a residence it was determined to not be exorbitant.

Supervisor asked what ZBA would recommend? Member Shelly VanEtten is present.

Clerk Loux doesn't recall a Residential Special Use Permit.

Supervisor suggests if someone wanted an ATV track or a construction company for Special Use Permit- \$40 or 200?

John Cashin suggests a 2-family in single-family zone.

Chair Rundberg considers Commercial as a two-family.

John Cashin clarified in the NYS Building Code for 4-family; Coeymans is \$100 and Catskill is \$80.

Chair Tooher asked for Residential? She thought \$40 was low, even just for covering clerical time cost.

Councilman Norris asked when that fee was established.

Supervisor said 2006.

Chair Tooher asked was it established then or carried over then.

Clerk Loux didn't recall the Variance changing cost.

Supervisor said in 2001 it appears as \$40 and \$200; unsure how long in effect.

Clerk Loux thought at least 1995.

Supervisor thought, given research, building inspector time, to up it to \$80 and have it renew at \$40.

John Cashin said it is to the benefit of the applicant, so that cost should be born by applicant, not taxpayers in general.

Supervisor said the group could recommend Noncommercial increase to \$80, and Renewable for Special Use and Variance would be 1/2 of original minus any other Town fees applied to that property or business.

Chair Tooher said it must associate with the application.

Chair Rundberg said a sign would have a fee.

Chair Tooher said it must be tied to the same application.

Councilman Norris suggests Junkyard License is all by itself and not be used in any of these examples, at \$100.

Supervisor said a credit would be given for a Town fee applicable to that application.

Councilman Norris asked for an example.

Chair Tooher offered, the Junkyard License. [laughter]

Supervisor said as Code Enforcement Officer Blaisdell is suggesting, in the future the Town may wish to charge for fire inspections as other towns; that would be 'applicable fee'.

Councilman Norris asks if subject pays for Junkyard, he gets credit for Special Use Permit. But he feels fire inspections must be separate as they have different criteria.

Clerk Loux asked for wording 'established junkyard', so it doesn't appear as a current use.

Member Johns asked who decides if it is a renewable fee? Planning Board? ZBA?

Chair Tooher said when the permit is issued initially by Planning Board or ZBA.

Supervisor said if the Board says to return every year, or every 3 years?

COUNTY OF GREENE  
TOWN OF NEW BALTIMORE  
SPECIAL TOWN BOARD MEETING  
JULY 18, 2011- page 4

**DRAFT**

Supervisor said another item that didn't transfer to current fee schedule resolution: the inspection of Replacement Lateral; we charge a new Sewer Hookup Fee. If an existing home has a problem with the lateral and must dig it out, Wastewater Treatment Plant Operator Jim Polverelli needs to go out and inspect; the Town wants to know about the digging, and previously charged a fee. The Sewer Hook-up Fee was \$75; Sewer Repair Fee was \$50 because Wastewater Treatment Plant Operator had to inspect to determine compliance.

Councilman Norris clarified Repair Fee is missing.

Chair Rundberg said, if the sewer problem was with the homeowner's line, and if they have to dig it up, then it should be 1/2 of original Sewer Hookup Fee.

Councilman Norris suggest Sewer Hookup Fee at \$80, repair for \$40.

Supervisor repeated, and it sounds like what other towns are charging, and it occurs when time is required of Jim who finds the line on the many Sewer District maps.

Supervisor asked if there were any other fees to discuss, remembering Code Enforcement Officer Blaisdell's wish to discuss Demolition Fees. Now we charge only if within 100ft of property line, and there is no stipulation of size of the building.

Supervisor said in prior discussions it is valuable to know property documentation on contractor, assurance that it is not jeopardizing another building, also concerns about how the debris is handled. It could be hazardous materials, or taking away the asbestos, and the cost of removing debris can impact the speed at which it is removed from the site. Once it is taken down, and evidence is shown to assessor, and we have no assurance that the site gets cleaned up, and assessment value goes down. Some other towns have that. If it's a business not within 100' of property line, it may have material in it to cause issues.

Member Johns felt if the owner has hazardous waste or other issue, the owner has a problem but not the Town's problem.

Chair Tooher said NYSDEC has the oversight, owner can dispose of asbestos, but if it is a contractor, that contractor must be licensed.

CEO Blaisdell told story of individual taking down a 3-story structure with a mini-excavator.

Chair Rundberg reminded but if it was on the individual's property.

CEO Blaisdell said if he witnesses it[unable to hear]

Chair Tooher said the Town doesn't regulate stupidity.

Supervisor asked if there is debris, eyesore, safety concern for neighbor.

John Cashin said all demolitions should have a permit and then a certificate of completion.

Supervisor said if there were a demolition permit we would have that control in place; currently we are issuing a demolition permit only if within 100feet of someone's property.

Chair Rundberg said it doesn't come off the tax rolls unless it is inspected.

Supervisor said no inspection would happen if there is no demolition permit; a low fee would be a mechanism to insure cleanup for Building Department and Assessor's update. If someone doesn't clean it up, it comes off the tax roll, and we lose that tax, possibly falling back to the county.

John Cashin said the county wants to be notified of all demolitions in Greene County anyway because there's a chance they'll end up with the property. They don't want someone paying a contract \$100,000 when Greene County can do it for \$30,000 and not be left 'in the hole'. The only way the Town can relay that is by having a demolition form.

Supervisor said if permit must be taken out, the assessor has the information, too.

John Cashin said if an unsafe building is going for back taxes, with the demolition permit

Greene County wants to know in order to do it cheaply, since county will own it.

Councilman Norris felt two issues: the fee and the 100ft clearance.

Supervisor said the 100ft clearance is in the Town Code, in the building permit regulation exemptions.

Supervisor offered to have one fee within 100ft and smaller fee for all other; all demolition permits could be same cost.

Chair Rundberg said, as a farmer, she has a problem with a fee and must pay to take down her small barn.

Member Johns suggested to better define what kind of a building and how big?

Supervisor suggested per square foot, no charge up to a certain square footage.

Chair Tooher agreed with Chair Rundberg and suggested looking at other towns, a wood structure with no threat, to need a fee on top of the problem of the loss of the collapse.

Member Johns added to then need an engineer to certify it was torn down.

COUNTY OF GREENE  
TOWN OF NEW BALTIMORE  
SPECIAL TOWN BOARD MEETING  
JULY 18, 2011- page 5

**DRAFT**

Chair Rundberg added that picking up may be unsafe but it is on her land, and to think of the small operation, too.

Chair Tooher suggests looking at what other agricultural communities do.

Supervisor felt it wasn't the Town's responsibility to regulate which contractor is hired to be reliable, but is concerned that Town isn't left with the junk, loss from the tax roll and to have a link with the assessor's office. Supervisor attempted to find fee schedules online, difficult.

Chair Rundberg agrees that someone-building or assessor- needs to see the site before it comes off the rolls.

Supervisor felt assessor preferred it be the building department, not the cost of the value of home, it is the cost of the debris or safety issue.

Chair Tooher asked couldn't there be an Inspection Fee to get it off the tax rolls?

Member Johns said it is still necessary to define what you're inspecting for.

Supervisor asked those attending to contact other towns.

Regarding Fencing, CEO Blaisdell said many fence issues have risen, reality is owner cannot maintain the side not owned when it is on the property line. As time goes by, questions arise as to who owns the fence and how fence can be used or treated. A lot of municipalities have 2 foot variance to own land on other side. Pasture is irrelevant. Privacy fences on the property line.

Supervisor clarified a permit is required when over 6 feet tall.

Councilman Norris clarified must be 2 feet from boundary.

Chair Tooher said must 'grandfather in' whatever is out there.

Councilman Norris asked any type? No, 2 foot high is irrelevant. Privacy is deserved, but not on the property line, cannot be maintained.

John Cashin likes the idea and tells his residents to keep the two foot clearance; asked do you want a survey to determine the line.

Chair Tooher said whether on or 2 foot away you must know where the line is.

Supervisor said now the Town must verify the line, or the individuals squabble.

Dick Brooks said that was half the fun of owning property- squabbling.

CEO Blaisdell offered same with shrubs planted on the property line or a foot away.

Chair Rundberg said but neighbor can do whatever they want with their part.

Supervisor said CEO has contacted quite a few towns who do 2 feet.

Chair Rundberg agreed with Chair Tooher, it is the owner's responsibility to know where the line is.

CEO Blaisdell felt down the road it could eliminate animosity between neighbors.

Member Johns said could leave on the two property owners, if they don't they can settle.

John Cashin said with area variances they sign off on 30 feet from line.

Regarding Agricultural Buildings, Supervisor said NYS Building Code states that Town has no control over agricultural buildings; situations where agricultural buildings are built and setbacks have not been met, looking at 2 buildings that have come in and no one wants to tell a farmer, two have come in for building expertise, could have voluntary permits.

Farmers are appreciative of information, should we have permit we don't charge for.

John Cashin confirmed Town of Coeymans does not charge; it is for compliance with zoning.

Councilman Norris said John Cashin addressed the committee; it would be helpful to know if a building does not comply.

Chair Tooher asked as a courtesy inspection.

John Cashin explained the Building Code exempts from structural, but still must comply with zoning, could be called a Zoning Permit or grandfathered in.

Supervisor said Town finances revolve around tax rolls revenue, a paper trail; that is how it works.

John Cashin added that a 200x400 square foot building may be constructed and the assessor may never know.

Supervisor added that a business does that, pays a permit, and it appears on the tax roll; having the proper tracking device provides for everyone paying their fair share.

Member VanEtten didn't imagine that many farmers would put a building too close to the road.

Chair Rundberg feels most farmers know their property lines.

Supervisor said we've had a couple, it happens, and Member VanEtten couldn't imagine spending the money and not knowing.

COUNTY OF GREENE  
TOWN OF NEW BALTIMORE  
SPECIAL TOWN BOARD MEETING  
JULY 18, 2011- page 6

DRAFT

Supervisor said some of us envision a farm as being very large; some small farms and buildings meet the agriculture requirement.

Chair Tooher said they're required to comply with zoning anyway, so have no charge for it.

Clerk Brooks asked rather than zoning permit, include agriculture, or 'for agriculture'.

Member Johns said Ray can go out, take a few pictures, write up something for Assessor, without a separate data collector, no need to have two people doing same collection. It can be constructed to provide information to the person building it.

Supervisor asked for any other items.

Regarding the Certificate of Occupancy search, requested for purchase or refinance, the title company or attorney usually wants it "yesterday". Town of New Baltimore is lower than surrounding, \$15. Supervisor is curious what the title companies actually bill for that service, is it billed dollar for dollar.

Clerk Loux related one applicant who did his own search to avoid being hit with a big bill.

Chair Tooher asked how long the search took?

Supervisor answered, many variables, how old is property, how recently a building permit, could have construction.

John Cashin said the file is pulled, insure every thing has a certificate of compliance or occupancy, are there any code violations, and look at new construction. Coeymans charges \$25, Greenville \$50, and Catskill \$100. New Baltimore is \$15.

Supervisor would like to contact a title company.

Member Johns suggests a bank officer, could be two different answers.

Councilman Norris asked who collected the fee.

Chair Rundberg asked who is charged the fee.

Supervisor said the person applying for the mortgage.

Chair Rundberg commented no fees are this small now.

Supervisor said may have a co search for 100, but were billed by New Baltimore for \$15.

Councilman Norris said this is about raising the C-O search fee. \$25?

Supervisor would like to check with title and mortgage companies.

Councilman Norris said not concerned with their answer, as much as what our cost is.

Chair Tooher said if they're going to charge \$100 whether we charge \$15 or \$50, then we'll charge \$50, we don't want necessarily to have people pay more.

Councilman Norris said if the code enforcement officer spends an hour or two doing this, maybe \$30 is fair.

John Cashin said there is no typical, there can be multiple items, 20 minutes to ½ hour.

Clerk Brooks said the challenge here is getting it done at once, fitting it between phone calls, visitors, letter, and we've seen folks buy one for a property they are interested in and have not yet bought. It doesn't fall under FOIL.

Ray Blaisdell suggests a statement for so many working hours.

Chair Tooher recommends a Rush Fee for those needing; in a rush, people are willing to pay more.

Ray Blaisdell reminded that an overnight at the Post Office was \$10.95.

Chair Tooher said even an extra \$25, whatever the group thinks is right.

Supervisor asked Councilman Norris if this should be brought forward.

Councilman Norris asked when the last raise occurred.

Supervisor said 2006 is prior resolution.

Member Johns asked if there was a realtor in the town; answer: yes, Louise Warner.

Supervisor said building permits are within range of neighboring towns.

Clerk Brooks said that was the focus in 2006.

Supervisor asked, with Member VanEtten present, too, was there anything to bring to Board's attention. She had conversation with Chair Tooher with regard to Open Space Recreational, and Use Tables. The three sections could be removed without a local law, just captioning.

Clerk Brooks related that many callers find the tables easy to understand.

Chair Tooher felt it wasn't the table itself, it was the issue- Residential, Commercial, Light Industrial.

Clerk Loux related she is getting fewer calls from real estate agents since it was made available online.

Supervisor asked toward take out headings.

COUNTY OF GREENE  
TOWN OF NEW BALTIMORE  
SPECIAL TOWN BOARD MEETING  
JULY 18, 2011- page 7

DRAFT

Supervisor asked for thoughts on Open Recreation.

Chair Tooher thinks to eliminate open recreation in the town, [laughter] adding the problem is we cannot define everything, but we all know what brought issue to light.

Supervisor said no method to consider whether size of parcel impacts the decision to decide to allow, no method to consider setbacks from neighbors, and no method for evaluating number involved and volume of use.

Chair Tooher said it is about trying to define ahead [of time], different size parcels have different impacts with activities.

Supervisor added, and where located, hamlet or residential, and this was residential.

Chair Tooher said this was a problem where located, and yet had it been in the back of the parcel, it probably wouldn't have been a problem.

Councilman Norris said the trigger was a quality of life issue brought to the Town Board.

Supervisor said the Code Enforcement Officer initially 'punted' it.

Chair Tooher continued, ... that was punted to ZBA.

Councilman Norris said, ... and who did a good job of handling that.

Ray Blaisdell said they recreationally use the backyard; this is an oddball issue.

Chair Tooher said this was quality of life issue, when folks are using their property and negatively impacting neighbors, what do we do as Boards, how do we address it, is there wiggle room in the Code?

Supervisor said this was a whole road of neighbors who reacted.

Chair Tooher added there was a noise issue; no one wants a noise ordinance, but when something is just next door it is an issue.

Supervisor added dust and kids, young adults and coming out on the road.

Councilman Norris said this is not unique to our area; a case in Florida was handled in a similar way, and it becomes a property rights issue.

Chair Tooher said when you have 100 acres, you do have different rights.

Supervisor said this had been a tough one, hopefully won't have another soon, anything else coming up?

Supervisor asked about the trailer issue.

Chair Tooher said that someone had been given a one-year term. Once the term was up, we wanted them to get rid of the trailer that had been allowed under special circumstances. But in trying to bend over to help, costs are incurred to the Town, inspections, public hearings. [unidentified] we gave the person a date, 60 days to move that, or if there was hardship, and she did neither.

Supervisor asked if the party was now past the date; answer: yes.

Councilman Norris said he'd had discussions, too.

CEO Blaisdell said she'd been given additional time due to rain, wetlands, difficulty with tractor trailer to move it; and he'd spoken to gentleman who was to take it out. Today is her last day.

Clerk Loux said she will get instructions as to where she can come.

Chair Tooher said a violation is appropriate, been given the benefit of the doubt, rain made it difficult, and no destruction of property required.

Councilman Norris said to reach out to the ZBA, direction to take could be a summons.

CEO Blaisdell asked how far to go, gentleman has the equipment, why hasn't it been moved, why haven't decks been removed or skirting. It sits there, empty.

Chair Tooher said if given a violation, and not gone by 30 days, hit with penalty.

Supervisor asked what fine for this type of violation.

John Cashin answered, \$250/day from the day out of compliance.

Chair Tooher said if 30 days given, you are subject from that day forward, \$250/day, then the ZBA 'punts' to the Board.

Supervisor asked cannot that charge be levied against the property?

Chair Tooher felt this situation that would be appropriate, plenty of opportunity to comply, a courtesy was extended.

Supervisor felt ZBA went out of their way; in hindsight, do you need tools available?

Chair Tooher feels the Board tries to give people a lot of consideration of circumstances but, repeatedly, people take advantage, making it difficult. The next time you allow it, with repeated inspections and follow-ups, it is a lot of time and that costs the Town money.

COUNTY OF GREENE  
TOWN OF NEW BALTIMORE  
SPECIAL TOWN BOARD MEETING  
JULY 18, 2011- page 8

DRAFT

Member Covey said courtesy and grace was extended, and compromise went above and beyond the call of duty, and would do again to help but this has gone past that point.

Chair Tooher said compliance is the issue, if you ask for certain conditions so the Board will allow an action and you don't meet those conditions, it is a hardship on the Town.

Supervisor feels a renewable fee is better policy.

Chair Tooher said the discussion must be on the record, everyone feels badly, the board changes, and then members must come up to speed.

Chair Rundberg asked whether the violation money stays in town coffers; answer: yes.

Supervisor said the last resort is court, and hate to have to do that.

CEO Blaisdell said he gives guidance, how they grasp and use it is their choice, and some people take the negative route; then we do additional paperwork and phone calls.

Chair Rundberg suggests ZBA, when they give expiration date, make the applicant aware of the fines, i.e. please realize there is a fine of \$250/day.

Chair Tooher thought that was a good idea. No more to discuss.

Planning Board

Supervisor said one item being tackled is NYS Thruway signage and asked if there was any other item to discuss.

Chair Rundberg added a wish to have fire department involved early on in the site plan development. With signage, contacted Planning Federation- very helpful, but there is nothing available but Thruway regs.

Member Johns suggests amending the zoning law, that signs intended primarily for viewing from the Thruway should conform to the Thruway regs. Then, if in residential area, commercial activity is already occurring, the sign is still and less a problem than the Thruway. The Town needs to be notified in some way that it is going up, whether to determine for whom it is intended, a building permit. Also, some commercial interest may be putting up sign, may not own land in Town, where is the point we come in contact but with the building permit.

Supervisor said there is a sign permit; how would we define 'viewing from the Thruway'?

Member Johns said that is the question, leave it vague.

John Cashin said the Thruway Authority controls all signs within 600 feet of the road.

Member Johns suggests a 30 foot maximum.

Chair Rundberg has the NYS Thruway regulations.

Supervisor said we wouldn't be leaving ourselves open to freestanding billboards?

John Cashin said right now, by size limitations.

Supervisor said even if we adopt the Thruway's regs? To avoid a situation?

Chair Rundberg said anything existing is grandfathered, no new ones.

Clerk Loux asked don't we have sunset clause on billboards.

Chair Rundberg said yes.

CEO Blaisdell added that there is new technology.

Chair Tooher felt they are distracting, wondering what will the sign will say next.

Discussion ensued.

Supervisor asked if other towns have adopted Highway Law 88.

Member Johns said we can 'punt' to the Thruway.

Chair Rundberg has more details and will bring in to Supervisor.

Member Johns said when you put up a sign, is it visible from both 9W and Thruway? Most would not be primarily for the Thruway.

Supervisor said, theoretically, to get a sign permit, if it was not for viewing along Thruway, he may decline it for zoning regulation and 'punt' to ZBA or site plan review. If an existing business, the permit application would go to CEO Blaisdell; he makes that determination, Thruway viewing or no, and if he, as zoning officer, feels that it doesn't fit in he declines it.

Clerk Loux stated sign permit fee is currently \$10.

John Cashin said Catskill flat fee for signs is \$100.

Clerk Brooks recalled an IDA call asking fee; when she answered, 10, they asked 10 what.

CEO Blaisdell felt it was low.

Clerk Loux said at one time the sign fee was low; due to going through site plan process and going out for inspections.

Supervisor asked could it be different if applicant was not incorporated in Site Plan Review.

Chair Tooher asked to go back to the credit idea; a credit within the Site Plan review. If independent it could be \$100.



COUNTY OF GREENE  
TOWN OF NEW BALTIMORE  
SPECIAL TOWN BOARD MEETING  
JULY 18, 2011- page 9

DRAFT

Chair Rundberg said no, not \$100.

Councilman Norris said maybe \$25.

Supervisor asked \$25 for an existing business; could still have a site plan. Or a home.

Chair Tooher asked how much time was usually involved.

CEO Blaisdell said as long as it meets setbacks, how it's being anchored, or powered, paperwork, phone complaints, re-measuring and challenging.

[unidentified] asked if a sign was required for a home occupancy.

Supervisor explained a certified public accountant, working from the home, wanting a sign, in a residential area with unhappy neighbors, even the width of posts. Sign by road too.

Supervisor asked for any items that may be coming 'down the pike'.

Chair Rundberg said the assisted living facility project is still alive.

Clerk Loux said attorney has done some things but not enough to come back to the Board yet; month before last, the setback of a driveway from sideline property line was an issue. If driveway comes in and then runs parallel with the road, what distance is required from the road?

Member Johns and Chair Rundberg said that particular shape was desired.

Clerk Loux said they referred to the chart and driveways did not appear.

Supervisor asked if we had that before?

John Cashin said the only control is where it/the driveway comes out onto the road.

Member Johns said he believes he wants to subdivide, how close could it be to his own driveway.

John Cashin didn't believe there was any regulation with that regard.

Councilman Norris asked should there be?

Clerk Loux said the result could be a driveway on the property line and a two-lane road, snow removal up the road.

Councilman Norris said and the setback of the driveway.

Councilman Norris asked and the length of the driveway.

Chair Tooher said the setback for the length of the driveway has to be from the property line.

Chair Rundberg asked but this is parallel to the road.

Member Johns added ...and parallel to the rock.

Clerk Loux said in one place it is very close to neighbor's property.

Member Johns said the geography of the land was the influence; that issue was still undefined.

Chair Rundberg will call Planning Federation; Charlie Hite, surveyor, was deferred to.

Councilman Norris asked if it was a safety or aesthetic issue.

Chair Rundberg thought a curiosity issue; she will research.

Discussion ensued.

Clerk Loux has had the question posed before.

Supervisor asked was road frontage in the subdivision another issue?

Clerk Loux said yes, been saying 60 feet is required for any private road going in.

Supervisor asked if that was spelled out in Code?

Clerk Loux didn't think so.

Supervisor restated the question as, in the case of a subdivision, how much do you require road frontage to be for each parcel; old Code had certain number of feet.

Clerk Loux offered that we said 60 feet then, if someone is subdividing a parcel. But if you use the 60 feet, you could end up with 'keyhole' lot.

John-Cashin said there is an allowance for 'flaglots', 50 feet.

Clerk Loux thinks requirement is for 50 feet for anyone putting in private road. Over the years, Planning Board has always said 60 feet.

Chair Rundberg commented 5 on each side for safety.

Clerk Loux continued that a private road is not necessarily built that wide and if, that going in ever some day, there's more development, and they want to make it a Town road, they have the width there.

Hearing no more from the Planning Board's side, Supervisor appreciates having the Boards take the time to come together and felt time was valuable.

Chair Rundberg said it was a shame not to have full Board.

COUNTY OF GREENE  
TOWN OF NEW BALTIMORE  
SPECIAL TOWN BOARD MEETING  
JULY 18, 2011- page 10

DRAFT

Supervisor added Councilman Byas had business out of town, Councilwoman Finke had an illness, hadn't heard from Councilman Meredith prior to start of meeting.

Supervisor said the Town Board had determined to start the 6month budget process tonight. CEO. Blaisdell commented that the daytime telephone calls, often for him, can be rough. He recommended contacting the telephone company, to add 'this call may be monitored for security or training purposes'; this may divert a caller.

Chair Tooher suggested, 'please maintain civility when dealing with Town employees'.

Chair Rundberg said she had hung up on a caller, for same reason.

Supervisor suggested saying, 'until you can deal with me in a civil fashion, I'm going to have to disconnect' or 'please hang up and dial the town supervisor'; workplace violence training addresses this.

With no quorum, Supervisor adjourned.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:46pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Janet A. Brooks  
Town Clerk