

TOWN OF SKANEATELES PLANNING BOARD
SPECIAL
MEETING MINUTES
April 25, 2017

Joseph Southern
Donald Kasper
Scott Winkelman
Douglas Hamlin
Anne Redmond
Scott Molnar, Legal Counsel
John Camp, P.E. (C&S Engineers)
Karen Barkdull, Clerk/Secretary

Member Southern opened the meeting at 6:30 p.m.

DEIS Review- Major Subdivision

Applicant: Tim Green/owner Loveless Farm Development
1194 Greenfield Lane
Skaneateles, New York 13152

Property: 2783 West Lake Rd
West side 051.-02-18.1
Vacant land:
East side 053.-01-39.1`

Present: Kevin McAuliffe, Legal Counsel; Jeffrey Davis, Attorney; Julian Clark, PE, Plumley Engineering PC;

Counsel Molnar: Reflect on the record that the Planning Board was called for reviewing the draft environmental impact statement (DEIS) submitted by the applicant for the Loveless Farm subdivision in anticipation of making a determination that the draft environmental impact statement is adequate and is therefore suitable for public comment to be considered a final environmental impact statement, and publication and notice to interested agencies with the environmental news bulletin for the DEC. etc. We are looking at the executive summary of the DEIS, and where necessary reflect upon the exhibits presented by Plumley Engineering to support positions. We don't necessarily need to review the description of the action as much as we need to review the environmental setting, the impacts, the mitigation which will reflect those impacts determined by the Board at its last full meeting. On point reviewing the environmental impact statement submitted by the applicant to make a determination that there are potential significant environmental impacts before it issued the positive declaration. I would recommend that we move to page 15 in the impacts and mitigation section and carry that through to page 47, the alternatives presented by the applicant.

Mr. Brodsky: Is this meeting more to determine the completeness of the answers or the agreement to the content of the answers.

Counsel Molnar: It is more to the completeness of the document, its adequacy set forth in the SEQR regulations.

Mr. Brodsky: So there is no requirement that the Board has to agree with these answers tonight.

Counsel Molnar: No.

Chairman Southern: But if you have questions or concerns.

Mr. Brodsky: Are there things that you may want to be explored more is the point.

Counsel Molnar: Please reflect that on the SEQR regulations that bind us all, the Planning Board has 45 days submission of the DEIS to make a determination of adequacy on the DEIS. To the extent the Board would like to see any of the impacts or issues more fully explained or supported, it will ask the applicant to re-submit the DEIS. Subsequently, once the applicant has done so and the Board determined that the environmental impact statement (EIS) is adequate for purposes of filing, publication and a notice of final EIS, and then the Board will make a finding of the file. Not so much to indicate that it agrees with the content or analysis provided in the EIS, but to indicate that it is final and therefore appropriate for the public and involved agencies to make comment on. Involved agencies have some authority or jurisdiction over the application.

Mr. Camp: What day are we on for the first 45 days.

Counsel Molnar: The DEIS was filed by the applicant on April 3, 2017, 45 days from that date is May 18, 2017, which is two days after the Board's next regular meeting. The Board can review the DEIS now, review it, in addition if necessary on the 16th, and we will have adequate time to either request re-submission or otherwise act according to the regulations. Do you agree with the dates Kevin?

Mr. McAuliffe: Yes.

Counsel Molnar: If acceptable, I recommend to the Board move to page 15 of the DEIS to review the applicant description of the impacts and the mitigation.

Chairman Southern: New members, is there anything additional you need before we start.

Member Hamlin: The note we got from John, my conversations with Scott, I do anticipate that I will have some questions.

Member Redmond: Some of the questions might be repetitive of content already covered since this has been out there for a while.

Chairman Southern: You can ask questions. You have to feel comfortable with the submission.

Member Hamlin: I was telling Scott today that I continue to eat the Loveless elephant one bite at a time.

Counsel Molnar: Just to back up, all of the Board members have had the opportunity to re-review the application together with the most meaningful action by the Planning Board that was the two meetings and the minutes thereof, prior to July 28, 2015 when the Planning Board issued the positive declaration. Attached to the positive declaration the entire transcript of the proceeding from June, which was a full paging of the environmental assessment form submitted by the applicant. It is those 152 pages of verbatim transcript and dialog that was very important

and meaningful for the Board members in reviewing the DEIS as it includes all of these significant impacts and complete description of them, etc. If acceptable, we will begin with page 15. The applicant gave us a presentation last meeting covering the overall history, project description, the purpose, a schedule and the project's relation to local, regional and state zoning plans and programs, as well as an overview of the permits and approvals still to be obtained by the applicant which are customary such as the DOT work permit for work in the fire lane, OCDOH approval for septic design to be ultimately designed once the subdivision is considered and/or approved.

Counsel Molnar read each section in the DEIS and elicited comment from the Board.

Section 1.a. The proposed action may involve construction on land where depth to water table is less than 3 feet.

Board comments:

Counsel Molnar: In connection with that section, I ask the Board to reflect on any meeting minutes and/or your understanding of the issue. If you have any comments please raise them at this point.

Member Winkelman: What was the characterization of the OCDOH with these perc tests? They pretty much in your binder say that it would have to be sand filter engineered septic fields. They cannot be the conventional. Why was the perc test so poor out there?

Mr. Clark: The nature of the soils and the perched water table. You have to have separation from any water, the perched water or ground water, so the water table required the system to be raised up to maintain the two-foot separation.

Member Winkelman: So, that would send up a red flag to me that there are some limitations to the property and that we would have to go to great lengths to engineer systems to fit on this property.

Mr. Clark: The study has been completed, they have done the perc tests and have identified where the septic systems can go.

Member Winkelman: They did 100 tests and the majority of them failed. The six-inch ones, the basic ones, some of those passed, is what the record reflected.

Mr. Clark: They identified areas where there were acceptable six-inch percs where they can put the septic systems for each lot.

Member Kasper: Many of the discussions were on the east side with the steep slopes. This word, "perched groundwater" on the septic, I have never heard that before about this subdivision. There was no discussion about the septic systems. My concern at the time is many of the septic systems are on the slope. I do not think there was any consideration for sheeting water coming down the hills hitting the septic systems. That was one of my concerns that it would wash right through the septic systems.

Mr. Clark: What you would have is grading around the leach fields that takes it from the bank.

Member Kasper: That was never shown on any plans. The word "perched groundwater" was never brought up by the previous engineers.

Member Winkelman: The lots have moved a little bit. Because they haven't really fully designed any of the systems because the lots are still in flux and the subdivision has not been approved yet, it would be good to take a test lot on the steep slope and give us a scenario of the grading and the way the septic field would sit on the property and work and function, like lot 4.

Chairman Southern: or the center one.

Member Kasper: It was only presented that they did the perc tests and yes they can do a raised mound system, I don't think there was ever an actual design showing how they were going to handle it on a sloping lot. It was omitted.

Member Winkelman: The other thing that concerns me is the cumulative effect. When you do not have any septic fields on this farmland and all of a sudden, you have 15.

Mr. Clark: It is 15 over 47 acres. There are not all concentrated in one area.

Member Winkelman: But there still in the lake watershed where there was not 15 leach fields before. Generically, that would tell me that there is going to be some issues. The cumulative effort, we have talked about it before.

Member Hamlin: Back to perched water. You have referred to a geo-technical report previously provided to the Planning Board. Was that prepared by the applicant or was it prepared by someone else.

Member Winkelman: I think it was the bridge people, didn't they provide the testing for the footers on the south side of the ravine?

Mr. Clark: It was Empire Geo Services.

Chairman Southern: So Scott, you said you want to see the design to support the mitigation that they are claiming.

Member Winkelman: Yes, I think we don't have to see all fifteen, but on one of the more challenging sites. Which one do you want to see, we are going to be talking about surface water too. We may want to see the grading.

Member Kasper: One of the sloping lots.

Chairman Southern: Probably that larger lot on the east, number 3.

Mr. McAuliffe: With all due respect, I defer to the town engineer. I don't think that customarily in the context of a SEQR analysis, you are making a final determination that every system absolutely will work. People have presented to the board that ultimately the County Health Department and the City of Syracuse have to oversee the design of these. They have to be built in compliance with their standards on the land as it sits today, whether it has perched water or if it is a sand system. I have never seen anyone in the context of a SEQR analysis provide a designed sewer system. But, I defer to the town engineer.

Mr. Camp: Are you asking me if it is typical to design a septic system as part of a SEQR analysis?

Mr. McAuliffe: Yes, when we know that the subsequently has to be approved by all of these various agencies.

Mr. Camp: What documentation do you have from the OCDOH relative to this project? Have they issued any letters?

Mr. McAuliffe: Yes they did, it is in the exhibits as well.

Mr. Camp: There is typically a standard letter stating that they have looked at this preliminarily and we think that this is something that will work.

Member Winkelman: They said that the sand filter system have to be used on the majority of the systems.

Mr. Camp: Based on this letter I don't have any reason to doubt the content of the letter. That letter says to me that the final design has not been completed yet but the County doesn't see any reason that it couldn't be designed. It certainly not a letter of approval.

Chairman Southern: Just leave it with the County.

Member Winkelman: Let's continue with the environmental review, we seem to focus on this east side hill a lot and I'm curious about the stormwater and the shape of things and the look of things, and we might want a further visual thing.

Chairman Southern: I can understand if you want to challenge the County's design, if you don't think it will work. The County will approve the design. If you don't think, the County approved design will work and you want to challenge that.

Member Winkelman: I think when you have so many perc tests on 47 acres; they didn't have each of these lots on there and weren't going around and testing in each of the spots, I don't believe.

Mr. Clark: There were 100-perc test completed and where there were acceptable perc tests they laid out the septic systems. The plan shows where these ...

Member Winkelman: What was the date on those?

Mr. Camp: If I remember right, there were multiple rounds of tests because as the layout was changing they kept sending the testers back out to do the tests. That is what I recall as to what happened.

Mr. Clark: I think it is impossible to read into this scale the correlation of the initial area and the reserved areas and the perc tests that were conducted with each one. This is the document that the County determined then based upon perc tests in these areas, both the initial areas of the site and the reserved area 100% expansion space. That sand system is compatible with their customary design and could be created. This sheet S1 is part of eight sheets for the layout and design of every septic system; it just hasn't been finalized yet.

Member Kasper: When OCDOH approves a design, do they take into consideration for runoff water? The east side lots have the septic systems at the bottoms of the lots, so all of the runoff from the lots around the houses is in the driveways. The stormwater on those lots will be sheeting towards the septic systems. Does the County, when they look at a design, look at the drainage.

Mr. Camp: They typically do. They look at the slope surrounding the area and my guess would be that in this situation before it is finalized they will look at curtain drains and possible surface swales on the uphill side of these things. That would be typical of a situation like this.

Mr. Clark: That is all part of the DOH standards for septic systems.

Member Kasper: When and if this is approved, we have site plan approval for each lot. Will the septic systems be designed before our approval or only when they bring that lot in front of us?

Mr. Clark: For the health department to sign the subdivision, they will probably want to see each lot.

Mr. Camp: I believe that is standard procedure.

Chairman Southern: If the created lots are less than five acres a lot, then they require it.

Mr. Camp: Presumably, as each lot came before the board for approval, the septic design would be already done.

Mr. Clark: As long as the builder kept to the size of the house and number of bedrooms.

Counsel Molnar: In order for others who are unfamiliar with the document, to review it and understand our discussion points here, which is what we are getting to in adequacy for purposes of filing and notice and service upon interested agencies, etcetera, should we add to this DEIS that if the Planning Board approved the subdivision, nonetheless the OCDOH will have to approve all of the septic designs for each of the lots so that they are found adequate according to standards before the subdivision is approved by the OCDOH. The OCDOH has to sign it before the map can be filed with the County Clerk. Should we add that to the mitigation measures?

Mr. Clark: In the middle of page 17, it says that. The design of the individual onsite wastewater systems must be completed by a licensed professional engineer, reviewed and approved by OCDOH and accepted by the City of Syracuse. Construction of each system will be overseen by the OCDOH and the City. I know elsewhere in this document it says that it will come back as part of each lot's site plan approval.

Counsel Molnar: That is down below.

Member Hamlin: I have that question too, and maybe we should say prior to approval. I also have a question on the order of events. Do we approve the subdivision and then the County? Do we get documentation back from the County saying their good and then we approve?

Counsel Molnar: There is concurrent jurisdiction. The Planning Board has to review and approve a subdivision. For sake of discussion let's say yes it was approved, subsequently that subdivision map is presented to the OCDOH together with each of the septic designs for the

County to review and approve prior to its signing of the subdivision map. The subdivision map is signed by the Planning Board Chair, OCDOH, and so on, before it is entitled to be filed with the County Clerk to complete the process.

Chairman Southern: Any other questions or concerns regarding this item.

Counsel Molnar: I have a question concerning the SWPPP. The discussion on the SWPPP is that it will be finalized as part of the DEC SPEDS permit. The technical review and approval will come from Skaneateles as completed by the Town Engineer. It is subject to periodic inspection, and I wonder if the mitigation and description should be adjusted to also reflect an inspection schedule.

Mr. Clark: The inspections are weekly as required by the state regulations during construction.

Member Winkelman: Who inspects it, the builder?

Mr. Clark: The architect, professional engineer.

Mr. Camp: Some municipalities rely on the applicant's engineer, some municipalities have their own engineer, and it varies.

Mr. Clark: There is a report that gets filled out after each inspection, filed with the town and filed on site.

Counsel Molnar: Should we articulate that inspection schedule right here in the documents so everyone knows it is a weekly thing, or is that something adequately addressed as is?

Member Kasper: Those are standards as part of the SWPPP.

Mr. Camp: I think it is fair to say that it is a standard part of the state permit; I don't think it hurts to add it but the standards have been in place for 10-15 years.

Chairman Southern: So it is redundant.

Mr. Brodsky: Scott has a good point as it has obviously raised a point of confusion here with the document. I would be good to put it to rest and show how it all fits together.

Counsel Molnar: But if it is redundant then it is redundant. This entire process is going to lead to the adequacy of the DEIS, considering it final publishing it for public comment and involved agencies, and I suspect, a public hearing on it.

Member Winkelman: So let's make it obvious for everybody.

Counsel Molnar: What I am saying is that it will be discussed yet again. We are looking at adequacy, and this will be discussed in full at a public hearing on this topic. If you believe that this document with a proposed discussion will satisfy and I think conclude a mitigating measure proposed by the applicant, then there is no further need to adjust the document.

Member Winkelman: Lets add that language, I think that's good, weekly review by a certified professional.

Mr. McAuliffe: Point of clarification on your part, I completely agree with what you are saying, I think that is something we could add after a final after we have received comments on everything, rather than changing the document now before going out to the public. The public is going to comment on it and we are going to respond to every public comment. During the process, someone will say that it has to be done weekly and the final DEIS when we get to that, points could include that information for point of clarification and response to the board's questions or community questions.

Member Hamlin: I might suggest that if our additional language is indicating that we will be complying with the standards then let's refer to the standards, so that we don't create language here that disagrees with the language later. What I am saying why don't we say that it is going to comply with whatever the letter of the law is in terms of the standards we are following.

Mr. Camp That's a safe practice.

Mr. Clark: I think somewhere in this document we state that the SWPPP will be prepared and complied with.

Counsel Molnar: It is on page 17 in the first full paragraph discussing the SWPPP.

Mr. Clark: Right, but there is additional SWPPP discussion further on in the document where we talk about stormwater. In the permits and approval section, we may also have it.

Mr. Camp: End of the first full paragraph on page 17, it says that a SWPPP meeting DEC and town standards can be prepared. I am sure it is stated elsewhere in the document.

Member Winkelman: Could you clarify, when you go to build the houses on the eastern slope, they are going to have to excavate a lot, what does the excavation do to the perched water? Is there potential for seeps coming out of the hill or more ground water coming to the surface?

Mr. Clark: There could be occasions where you would have to handle stormwater or ground water as you are doing construction. It is not uncommon. You can do swales, you can send it to a stormwater basin, and the water can be handled.

Section 1.b. The proposed action may involve construction on slopes at 15% or greater.

Board comments:

Member Winkelman: So the slopes that will be created are just going to be 17° behind the houses when they regrade, I thought they were going to be greater than 17°.

Mr. Camp: Degrees or percent Scott.

Mr. Brodsky: The town regulates by percent.

Member Winkelman: So 17° is 30%.

Mr. Clark: That's what these cross-sections show.

Mr. Brodsky: You changed from a 12% to a 15% in the narrative.

Mr. Clark: 15% was the SEQR level, but the town has 12%.

Mr. Brodsky: Did you calculate approximately or at some point, is the acreage discussed and identified. You say it is less but you don't say how much. The last paragraph on page 18, "Following construction, the overall area of >15% slopes of ground surface will be less than current conditions." So above you say 21% of the project site is in excess of 12% and that is document. I was curious as to what the new conditions will be.

Mr. Clark: I do not have the numbers in front of me. It looks like some rough calculations were made for that statement. We know we have this area of steep slope and we are leveling it out in that area of steep slope to make a level area for a house. We are not going anywhere making steeper slopes outside of the boundaries.

Mr. Brodsky: The strategy is for the leveling out the area for the individual homes but then you are making 30% slopes around the homes as I recall.

Mr. Clark: Yes.

Counsel Molnar: The area of 30% created after creating the site for the residence is not to be built upon so it will remain unimproved.

Mr. Clark: Right, it will be landscaped.

Mr. Brodsky: The town permits building in slopes between 12 and 30% and prohibits building in slopes 30% and above.

Mr. Camp: The intent to that is the existing natural slope. To me, it doesn't really speak to what you create, although that is certainly important to consider. The standard maximum slope for a usable grassy area is 1:3 that is easily mowed with a push mower. Steeper than that can be mowed with a push mower although it becomes more arduous.

Member Hamlin: I will go back to the perched water table for a minute. As we set the houses into the slope, if there is ground water above a ten-foot basis, do we know that there isn't now based on the previous discussion of perched ground water. If there is perched ground water three feet down and you are setting a house in there, you just have to engineer around it.

Mr. Clark: Yes.

Counsel Molnar: Will that be addressed in the SWPPP?

Mr. Clark: Yes, I think we even stated that.

Counsel Molnar: Yes on the top of page 19, "The SWPPP and Erosion & Sediment Control Plan will include a section addressing the steep slopes and how they will be handled during construction."

Mr. Camp: It would also be addressed in an individual lot grading review as part of site plan review.

Mr. Clark: Back to page 17, we say that the SWPPP is addressing the perched water table and how we would handle it.

Member Kasper: The reason you are excavating into the slopes is to lower the house because of the visual impact. Trying to reduce the visual impact, you are creating a lot more problems with surface water. You are also creating a visual impact of the house sitting in a large excavated bowl. These conditions were created because of the visual impact.

Mr. Clark: They were created to mitigate the visual impact you people had identified.

Member Winkelman: That was one of the alternatives to dig down and lower the house.

Member Kasper: Their choice on alternative, not ours.

Counsel Molnar: That excavation is one point also of the other large impact that we will discuss later in the document.

Member Kasper: Trying to mitigate one thing created another problem to mitigate.

Mr. Davis: From a ground water or perched water perspective, I don't know if I would agree with that. Whether the houses were set in or not, they would still need a foundation and design there. You are still going to run into ground water at the three-foot level even if you were going to keep the proposed height at 35 feet. You are still going to need a foundation in there; you are still going to do grading, so I would say that those issues were created as a result of lowering the homes. Perhaps you are going to go a little deeper into the slopes, but it is not created as a result of it.

Member Winkelman: Greatly exasperated.

Mr. Clark: Not greatly, because it can be handled.

Member Winkelman: We could live on the moon if we want to but this is the Skaneateles Lake watershed, this is unfiltered drinking water for the City of Syracuse. All of the stormwater documents say that the best thing to do for storm water is to leave places undisturbed, and this is a lot of disturbance on these hills, and that is what we are assessing and its impact on unfiltered drinking water of Skaneateles Lake. That is the one thing in our comprehensive plan over and over is to protect the lake and that is what we are doing here.

Counsel Molnar: For purposes of the discussion and reviewing the document for adequacy, do we think that the mitigation discussion provided by the applicant is adequate for publication and providing notice for all involved agencies.

Member Kasper: To their satisfaction.

Chairman Southern: It has to be to our satisfaction. The information is there for the purposes of the hearing.

Member Kasper: I wasn't convinced that they mitigated it.

Counsel Molnar: Are there any possible additions to the section that would better explain the mitigation.

Member Kasper I think the mitigation is on the individual lots when they build the houses. Not as far as the overall approvals. When the individual lots are going to be planned, that is where I am not confident that they have come up with a proper plan, the unknown.

Counsel Molnar: I think what we are looking at here is this document and the adequacy of the information presented for purposes of providing this and filing this as a final, and then circulating amongst the interested agencies, and publishing it so that it can be commented upon by others.

Member Kasper: Then yes, they have achieved that.

Section 1.d. The proposed action may involve the excavation and removal of more than 1,000 tons of natural material.

Board comments:

Member Kasper: I don't think there is a problem, it is normal for a construction site. It will not be done all at once and I think they are true to their mitigation.

Chairman Southern: Right.

Member Winkelman: I think John had spoken to that in his email too.

Counsel Molnar: Are there any additional comments, suggestions or addition material for this section that is needed to be provided for its adequacy.

Member Winkelman: Adequate.

Section 1.f. The proposed action may result in increase erosion, whether from physical disturbance or vegetation removal (including from treatment from herbicides):

Board comments:

Counsel Molnar: Should the statement "Deficiencies in the erosion control are to be documented and report to the contractor" also include "and corrected by the contractor".

Mr. McAuliffe: So Scott, to your question, to the final we should add in other comments, we could make it clear that all deficiencies will be reported to a contractor. Under the DEC law and regulations, he must correct it.

Counsel Molnar: I think that is important to note for others who are reviewing and commenting on this document. That is my opinion on that.

Mr. Camp: I think when Scott is suggesting changes before it is published or reviewed; he is thinking that it may minimize public comment to help the public understand it better.

Counsel Molnar: Any board discussion and comment on the mitigation in this section.

Member Winkelman: Sounds adequate, I like what you added.

Member Hamlin: the paragraph you added that says that the ponds associated with the subdivision will be inspected periodically for sedimentation and so forth, is that part of a regulation and by whom and for how long? Is that in perpetuity that someone is checking on?

Mr. Camp: The DEC law and permit required has a requirement that some party be legally responsible to maintain any facility, whether it is a single lot or commercial, it is that owner, if it is a larger municipality then it could be the municipality, if it is a residential subdivision it is often a HOA or some other arrangement.

Counsel Molnar: And there is a proposal for this subdivision to include a HOA Will it also include a drainage district, will one be formed?

Member Winkelman: We had discussed something about that.

Mr. Camp: I think it was discussed but I don't think it got to any resolution.

Mr. Brodsky: I though the HOA at some point was dropped.

Counsel Molnar: I think it was still part of the application. There are multiple common areas that need to be managed.

Mr. McAuliffe: You absolutely have to have one.

Counsel Molnar: So the stormwater ponds associated with the subdivision will be managed by a HOA, inspected periodically for sedimentation and make sure that they retain the expected capacity. Is that accurate.

Mr. Camp: I would say so.

Counsel Molnar: Are there any other suggestion additions to the section or clarification points required by the board for section 1 f.

Member Winkelman: Adequate.

Section 2.a. Identify the specific land forms: The classic V shaped shale ravine, the steep slopes on both sides, the tributary at the bottom of the ravine, and deep woodlands to be fragmented by the bridge.

Board comments:

Member Winkelman: I think some of our rationale was the effect of the bridge modifying the two points at the top of the bank. That wasn't really discussed where the footers, and the possible erosion of things because of the deep footers that will be on both sides of the bank.

Mr. Davis: The footers will be placed outside of the top of the bank. The bridge was extended in design from the original comment, extended further outside so it was off of top of bank. The footers would not be impacting the top of bank or the ravine. The single span goes from those footers, making the span a longer distance because of the footers being pulled back off of the top of bank.

Chairman Southern: The placement of the bridge is reflected on the small maps, correct? Originally, the bridge was up stream further and it was brought down here, which made it shorter.

Mr. Davis: Correct. There was also in this location it was deemed to be less visible from a field location that may have been done with some consultation. The footers were pulled off the top of bank so they are sitting back away from the top of bank.

Mr. Camp: If I remember correctly, there was one field visit discussion that the thought was that it would be less visible if it were moved downstream.

Mr. Davis: Originally, it was going to come in instead of that bend in the road, it was going to come in with a bend and go straight across. They brought that it to the second bend and across the bridge because it would reduce the visibility.

Member Winkelman: It will also have less impact on the property to the north. The older location was right there at the property line as it came on to lot 1. I have had this discussion with the board before; the top of the bank is soft shale that has been eroding for 10,000 years. That soft shale at the ravine is still shaping itself and those footers are eventually are going to be at the top of the bank. That is only my concern, and that was part of our rationale. You've explained that you have set them off the bank.

Member Hamlin: Were there any visuals done of the bridge? I know there was a discussion of the views from various angles.

Member Kasper: There were none.

Mr. Davis: There were no visual simulations of the bridge, just the homes.

Chairman Southern: The abutments for the bridge are placed outside of the 100-foot setbacks of the stream.

Mr. Davis: Yes, I believe. I am trying to remember the discussion.

Member Winkelman: The other thing we discussed was during the construction, how are you going to construct a long span bridge, getting access to the north side. Extra trees may have to be taken down to get the crane in place.

Member Kasper: Very large cranes.

Counsel Molnar: Are there any other comments or suggestions for this section?

Member Winkelman: Adequate

Chairman Southern: Adequate.

Section 3.1. Other Impacts (Surface Water).

Board Comments:

Counsel Molnar: Are there any other comments or suggestions for this section?

Member Winkelman: What is the common practice for retention ponds that are down near the ravine that will have a pipe coming out into the ravine? How do you get the water down the steep slopes of the ravine? Do you armor it all the way down? Do you carry that water all the way to the bottom level? What is common practice for outlet pipes and overflow?

Mr. Camp: On previous versions of design, it showed a full armoring of a swale from the top of the bank all the way to the bottom. That happened to be in an area that has already eroded. There is a natural draw to the field now that goes down that is causing some, what I would consider, minor erosion. There is a very visible scar going down the bank now. The general plan previously was to maintain the drainage outfall at that point and armor it all the way down. They were going to lay a pipe in the ditch and then fill it over with rock, and then shape the rock to form a channel to create a double conveyance method down on the slope. That is what was proposed at one point that I thought made sense since it got the water safely down and also stabilized that scar.

Member Winkelman: And in theory, the water shouldn't be coming down in such a torrent as it had in the open fields. The ponds should retain the stormwater and slow it.

Member Kasper: Slow it down.

Mr. Camp: The final design of the pond would probably have a multi stage output structure. The small stage would be 2-3 inches in diameter, as water rose it would have larger ways to get out. For most of the storms, the water would be throttled down through a small orifice.

Member Winkelman: I always wondered how you get it from the top of the bank to the bottom without causing more erosion. That sounds like a good plan.

Section 4.h. Other Impacts (Groundwater).

Board Comments:

Counsel Molnar: Are there any comments or suggestions to this section.

Member Winkelman: This past summer was a dry summer and we did have some requests to extend the water district out County Line Road and Andrews Road so water is an issue for some folks. But it sounds like the two test wells are going to be adequate enough.

Counsel Molnar: Is it also proposed that lot 1 is drawing its water from the lake, that it will supply water to the other lots, if necessary.

Chairman Southern: No.

Mr. Davis: You have to set up a quasi-municipal system with service to all of the lots or have each one of them go out with their individual pump lines out into the lake.

Mr. Camp: You would have to design a public system.

Counsel Molnar: Are there any other discussion comments.

Member Winkelman: Adequate

Chairman Southern: Good.

Section 8.f. The proposed action may result, directly or indirectly, in increased development potential or pressure on farmland.

Board comments:

Member Kasper: I don't know if they have mitigated it or if they can mitigate it. It is supply and demand. If the subdivision is successful and sell for big dollars, it will put pressure on the farmers to sell. With this subdivision, you would give, other developers thought of developing. If there is money to be made, houses to be sold on the lake, then it is a demand area. I don't know how they can mitigate it.

Member Winkelman: The residential development south of the eastern parcel I don't think is a good example of what we want the whole watershed to look like. I believe the codes specify it discourages large-scale subdivision and that is not something that we want to continue. The comprehensive plan states that specifically.

Member Kasper: This is a large-scale subdivision for our town. Most of our town is one and two lot subdivisions.

Member Winkelman: I believe that is how the Greenfield Lane got subdivided. It was piece meal over the years and it wasn't designed at all. After it was all said and time it was wow that is large scale.

Member Redmond: Going through it that was my overall concern. This project is not really in keeping with the intent of the zoning that is to prevent large scale residential. This to me feels very large scale residential. Absent changing the zoning designation, I don't know. Yes, there are other residential developments in that area, but I don't think they were all proposed as a 15-lot subdivision.

Mr. Clark: Remember that it is 15 lots on 47 acres, and not 15 lots on 15 acres or 15 lots on 20 acres.

Member Winkelman: It is two acre zoning.

Member Kasper: Two acres is a lot unless it is a conservation subdivision.

Mr. Brodsky: I just have to remind you that it is meeting the density requirements. Two acres is a minimum lot size, which easily translates into a sense of density. This subdivision is maintaining that two-acre density or lower, but it has a smaller lot size, and that is permissible. They cited it in here and in the code that an open space subdivision is something that you wish to encourage. I would caution you that large scale, though this feels large and obviously larger than what you are used to is an undefined term.

Member Winkelman: That was the comment from the Onondaga County Planning Agency. They had thought it was a suburban subdivision.

Mr. Brodsky: I think it might be later on in here to address that specific issue, but I want to caution you on reliance on the concept of large as it is judgmental on what it means. Once you get past that intent statement, the code says nothing on how many lots to allow. It says two acres.

Member Kasper: The SEQR say how it is impacting.

Member Winkelman: And the precedent of development in the lake watershed before. That is what they are basing it on.

Member Kasper: They did mitigate it going to an open space subdivision.

Mr. Brodsky: That is part of their argument.

Mr. Camp: It may be worth the board hearing that in other parts of the County this would indeed be considered a small subdivision.

Counsel Molnar: For present purposes of assessing the adequacy of this response and the mitigation measures proposed, do we feel that this language should be adjusted prior to a determination of adequacy that is to include any of these topics. For instance, the subdivision as proposed is an open space subdivision.

Member Redmond: I would include that.

Mr. Brodsky: I would like to suggest that there be more discussion of the surrounding land use patterns. If they are going to argue that there is a pattern there, then they should substantiate it better in this narrative. How its overall pattern of development compares to the surrounding area or not. If they want to argue that, it is not adequately mitigated.

Mr. Camp: Do you think this is the place for that.

Mr. Brodsky: It needs to be connected to or come up later on in the alternatives. It has raised the issue here in terms of farmland and may be more valuable to distinguish between the east and west sides of the road because they have different characters.

Chairman Southern: I would hate to put too much weight behind open space subdivision when there is conservation subdivision also available in this area. The conservation subdivision would go twice as far at limiting the size of subdivisions as does the open space.

Mr. Brodsky: It has an effect on the overall yield of lots.

Chairman Southern: That may be the only handle we have to deal with large-scale development, especially in the watershed. We can't require a conservation subdivision.

Mr. Brodsky: No, but you can require an open space subdivision. This is all going to come up later in this document and I think it is an important discussion to be elaborated upon that is not flushed out here. In terms of this particular issue of farmland, I would distinguish the east and west sides of the road as a discussion item and maybe make it a more substantial discussion of how those two sides of the road are different. They are going to argue that it is not and they are going to need to substantiate that argument better.

Member Winkelman: So is with the impact to agricultural resources that will come back later.

Mr. Brodsky: The overall design is going to come up later and maybe alternatives. The question now before you is effect on farm operations and agriculture, the pressure on farmland.

Member Kasper: It is not going to effect the operation of the farmland right now. It will be pressure on the farms to sell in the future for development.

Mr. Brodsky: I would like to suggest that it needs to be explained better.

Member Winkelman: I kind of object to the statement that the active farming on the parcels themselves have been abandoned. They were farmed by Mr. Loveless right up to the day the Green bought the property. They were the ones that abandoned it.

Chairman Southern: Other statements?

Section 9.a. The proposed action may be visible from an officially designated federal, state or local scenic or aesthetic resource.

Board comments:

Counsel Molnar: Are there any Planning Board suggestion of comments to this section?

Member Winkelman: My comments are that prior to the evergreen trees being planted there and when Mr. Loveless use to manage that as a farm, you have substantial views, not only of the lake but of the meadow down below as well. There were deer down there all the time. I worked at Laxton's nursery and go up and down that road a million times and they were always out. You could actually see the deer and the meadow while you were driving in a car 50 miles an hour. Not to mention the grand view of the lake. These things we are basing our visual assessment on now is not what it historically was or potentially could be as an asset in an open space subdivision to maintain conservation values of that view of the lake. It is what it is.

Member Kasper: It is a change from the lake on the east side of the lake looking to the west side of the lake. Now it is open farm fields being farmed and hayfields, and putting houses there is going to change that look .We are losing those spots all along the lake that is part of the lake with houses in open fields. It is going to be just another field that you are going to lose. The houses will probably blend into the rest of the houses after they are built, and it is a big change.

Member Winkelman: This gets to the open space subdivision. I mean you want to preserve open space and not get little glimpses over a sculpted landscape that you can barely get a glimpse of the lake that might not be sustainable ten or twenty years when we will be gone. Who is going to be there to maintain that thing? That is what an open space subdivision is, that you can put into plans a view that is protected in perpetuity. I don't feel that that is part of the plan. It has great potential too. It is what it is.

Counsel Molnar: Are there any questions concerning the mitigation measures proposed and or suggested conditions that are required for adequacy.

Chairman Southern: It is hard to picture how you could further mitigate that view other than what they have proposed.

Member Winkelman: Not put houses on that view. We have been saying that since day one.

Chairman Southern: I will grant you that Scott. That is the ultimate.

Member Winkelman: They have given us open space on the west side but not the rural view on the east. It is what it is.

Chairman Southern: Enough information to move ahead?

Member Winkelman: Sure.

Chairman Southern: We are going to continue on for another hour and call this meeting at 9:30 pm. We will establish another meeting for May 9, 2017 at 6:30 pm.

Member Winkelman: My one question about Brook Farm is the existing substantial buffer of forested vegetation, is it on the applicant's land or on Brook Farm?

Mr. Davis: I believe it is Brook Farm for most of it. There is a large stand of pine trees between there at Brook Farm and lot 1. The Brook Farm clearing for the lake as you know is not straight out but more at an angle. At Brook Farm, looking at the lake off to the right is the large stand pines and evergreens that will remain. On the backside of that, after you cross the property line there is the buffer of trees there that will remain undisturbed as part of the development as well.

Member Winkelman: They don't have the buffer on the applicant's property as much and they are relying on the buffer.

Chairman Southern: They own the buffer so it will not get tampered with for Brook Farm. Do we feel there is enough to carry forward to move on?

Section 9.b. The proposed action may result in the obstruction, elimination or significant screen of one or more officially designated scenic views.

Board comments:

Counsel Molnar: Are there any suggested comments or additions for this section in terms of adequacy?

Chairman Southern: The only problem I would have is that just because it is not listed, doesn't make it any less of a view.

Mr. Clark: That is why we really discussed it a lot in 9a and as far as the topic of 9b was. The proposed action may result in the obstruction, elimination or significant screen of one or more officially designated scenic views.

Mr. Davis: There is a distinction between the two. Under the SEQR form, in order to classify it has to fall into a designated scenic view. It is a view that people enjoy, but technically, under the SEQR classification, it has to be a designated view. We have addressed it in both ways by saying it is not designated but nonetheless mitigation measures have been taken into account to address the concerns raised by the board regarding the view that you see.

Member Winkelman: But the comprehensive plan still calls out to preserve views of the lake whether it is specified or not. The potential for an open space subdivision, how you would perfectly define open space is that view Mr. Loveless preserved meticulously of the meadow and the woodlands down there at the ravine and the view of the lake. It was gorgeous and the potential is there to preserve something for the ages. That is kind of, what we go for in an open space subdivision but not this one.

Counsel Molnar: Are there any questions or concerns that can be added to this or suggestions or additions to this section?

Chairman Southern: I think we are all set.

**Section 9.c. The proposed action may be visible from publically accessible vantage points.
i. Seasonally, and ii. Year Round:**

Board comments:

Member Winkelman: One thing I did notice is that your photo of neighborhood focuses on the south of the proposed project. The properties to the north are a steep contrast, they are heavily wooded, Brook Farm, and other houses that you can barely see. There is a boat launch, Dr. Renner's place are all heavily wooded and established. It is not at all like Greenfield Lane up there that you are focusing in on to the south of you.

Mr. Davis: I think north just along the lake, obviously you have Brook Farm, you have Torrisi property, Goetzmans.

Member Winkelman: Goetzmans, boat launch

Mr. Davis: boat launch, I think you have four houses along the water between the boat launch and the Brook Farm property. In the photo it is not Greenfield Lane that is depicted there, it is Wagon Wheel. Greenfield Lane is further to the south.

Counsel Molnar: Are you suggesting that an exhibit to the proposed mitigation measure be adjusted to more particularly be focused on the site that the surrounding development to the south?

Member Winkelman: Yes, it is a small little snapshot of the suburban sprawl.

Mr. Davis: This is the view directly across from the site and the most visible. If you go north of the site and try to take a view back at the site, the woods that are on the Brook Farm property will screen all of the homes from that view if you will.

Member Winkelman: Just panning to the north

Member Hamlin: wider view; shoot it from farther south toward the northwest.

Mr. Camp: Is this taken from the area of the pink house?

Mr. Davis: the photo is taken from out on the lake.

Mr. Clark: There is another picture where you can see the shoreline

Mr. Davis: That picture is from the eastern shoreline.

Member Winkelman: There you can see north of the proposed project.

Mr. Davis: That is the wider-angle view from the opposite side of the lake.

Member Winkelman: What you can't see a whole lot of houses in that area

Member Kasper: It is only woods to the north; you do not see any houses. They are adding on to what is there with more houses.

Section 9.d. The situation or activity in which viewers are engaged while viewing the proposed action is: ii. Recreation or tourism-based activities:

Board comments:

Counsel Molnar: Are there any questions or comments or adjustments to the section for purposes of adequacy?

Member Winkelman: Just my usual statement that the potential could be the view of the lake that would enhance tourism traveling up and down 41A with gorgeous view of meadow and lake instead of rooftops.

Chairman Southern: Further concerns on views from the lake? (no response) I guess we can precede, Scott.

Section 9.e. The proposed action may cause a diminishment of public enjoyment and appreciation of the designated aesthetic resource:

Board comments:

Counsel Molnar: Are there any suggestions or comments for adjustments to this section for purposes of adequacy?

Member Winkelman: I am just not sure of the sustainability of the mitigation measures to protect the view from 41A.

Member Hamlin: Scott, can you go into a little more detail on that statement.

Member Winkelman: You used to be able to see the meadow and the forest and huge expanse of lake,

Member Hamlin: I agree, they are already affecting that.

Member Winkelman: When people move in they will plant trees in their front yard that will eventually get bigger. The side yards, the back yard might be regulated. Who is going to regulate that over the long time, who is going to manage that. Eventually it is going to be gone, 10, 20 years.

Counsel Molnar: In connection with the open space subdivision, there is a potential condition concerning the landscape plan and planting, correct?

Mr. Brodsky: Yes.

Counsel Molnar: To the extent that can be mitigating measures, should it be?

Member Winkelman: I just think the maintenance of it over the long haul is a burden on the homeowners association and it becomes neglected and will eventually go back to nature and block the view.

Mr. Brodsky: It is something, Scott is correct, that can be written into the HOA for the management of the open space.

Member Winkelman: Sure, I am just questioning the sustainability. The town's efforts and the HOA's efforts We already have a diminishment of the open space and I am just questioning the sustainability of it.

Mr. Brodsky: The question is whether they should add it to this document now and let it be analyzed by the public going forward. Does it need to be added to the document.

Member Winkelman: I would say it needs to be added to the final EIS.

Chairman Southern: You are talking about the regulation of the individual home sites by the HOA.

Member Winkelman: No, I'm talking about the management of the open space between the buffer and the road in back of the houses. The managed landscape, the sculpted landscape, or whatever.

Mr. Brodsky: That land would be owned by the HOA, and that could be regulated by the association. Scott is concerned about its likely failure.

Member Winkelman: But sure, that we could write the management for the landscape plans anyway.

Mr. Brodsky: Then maybe you specify control of the species or whatever to maintain views. The question before you now is whether it needs to be included in this document now.

Counsel Molnar: We can think more about that issue between now and the next meeting. If the board wishes, we can address this with the applicant as an adjustment to this section by adding a discussion of the mitigating measure of the landscape plan and the adherence to it, will it effect in moderating the diminishment of the public enjoyment and appreciation of the designated resource. If acceptable, move on to 9f.

Section 9.f. There are similar projects visible within the following distance of the proposed project (for all location intervals):

Board comments:

Counsel Molnar: Are there any comments or suggested adjustments to this section.

Member Hamlin: So there is no specific mitigation proposed indicating that because it meet zoning code.

Member Kasper: Because it meets what is there, that is their argument.

Member Winkelman: That is their argument. There have been people on the board that this is a poor use of the conservation analysis and the open space is fragmented and not a good open space subdivision.

Chairman Southern: Is there anything else that could be added to help here? So this is enough information for the community to comment on?

Mr. Davis: You have to go back to the comments from the Planning Board that caused a concern here. I understand the discussion and there have been a lot of comments raised on how to preserve the town's character and discussion regarding the open space subdivision, but if you look at the two bullet points under 9f the community. Where building is allowed is a philosophical question almost. For an applicant to address that in a mitigation measure in an EAF is impossible. The next question was probably most of the point. There are no similar land uses on the west side except at the five-mile mark. The comment was that could perhaps be slightly misstated as there is similar development in the area. There is probably again no mitigation method that could be done pointing out the fact that this type of development doesn't start at the five-mile point on the lake, it is quite frankly adjacent to it.

Member Winkelman: So the first bullet point is to preserve the town character we do a conservation analysis and preserve some open space and protect the natural integrity of the open space, views and things like that.

Mr. Camp: Scott, I think what the applicant is stating is that the first bullet is not an adequate reason for denying that as there are . . .

Member Winkelman: similar projects.

Mr. Camp: questioning the validity of that bullet.

Member Redmond: The issue being raised isn't the applicant's fault or problem, it is a flaw in the zoning. They are complying with the zoning but the zoning isn't necessarily protecting the town. It is a larger issue.

Chairman Southern: I think we can move on.

Section 11.c. The proposed action may eliminate open space or recreational resources in an area with few such resources:

Board comments:

Counsel Molnar: Are there any comments or suggested adjustments to this section to assist with adequacy.

None

Section 17.d. The proposed action is inconsistent with any County plans or other regional land use plans:

Board comments:

Counsel Molnar: Are there any comments or suggested adjustments to this section to assist with adequacy.

Chairman Southern: I think it is fine in terms of adequacy for the purposes of future discussion.

Mr. Brodsky: Would it be helpful to have some exhibits in reference to the city plan and the zones it is in and not in?

Member Winkelman: I think I have those booklets.

Section 18.d. The proposed action may interfere with the use or enjoyment of officially recognized designated public resources.

Board comments:

Counsel Molnar: Are there any comments or suggested adjustments to this section to assist with adequacy.

Chairman Southern: None

Section 18.f. The proposed action is inconsistent with the character of the existing natural landscape.

Board comments:

Counsel Molnar: Are there any comments or suggested adjustments to this section to assist with adequacy.

Chairman Southern: No, go with what they have.

**Unavoidable Environmental Impacts,
Alternatives and
No Action Alternatives**

Board comments.

Counsel Molnar: Are there any comments or suggested adjustments to this section to assist with adequacy.

Member Winkelman: Why are we discussing return on investment, what does that have to do with the Town. If he is doing land speculation, I don't quite understand why that's been mentioned.

Counsel Molnar: Is that a mitigating measure to try to achieve full build out to complete a return on investment?

Member Kasper: Than has nothing to do with the Planning Board. If the developer makes a profit or does not make a profit is not our concern.

Mr. Brodsky: I am wondering if this would be a good location to discuss some of things that were previously discussed in terms of zone change. Recognize that although it would not be favorably received, but you have mentioned conservation subdivision, they have in essence mentioned conventional subdivision, are there options that should be discussed by the applicants of design of this project. There may be a more suitable or compatible arrangement of lots for this site.

Counsel Molnar: A proposed mitigation measure being an alternative of a conservation subdivision.

Mr. Brodsky: Yes, that design strategy

Counsel Molnar: Would result in a reduction in the number of lots.

Mr. Brodsky: Part of what, and you have observed before, is the water issue is in part due to trying to mitigate a visual impact. The design that they propose is in essence creating some impacts that need to be mitigated. So the question is, are there design alternatives they have not

submitted or should be discussed that should have by their nature less impacts to begin with and do you want them to try and discuss that. It is somewhat a philosophical question and it is difficult and I am sorry about that.

Chairman Southern: What it seems to come down to, the only mitigating factor that will satisfy everybody is a reduction of lots. Whether you do it by doing a conservation subdivision or whether you do it by the applicant's voluntarily reducing lots/

Mr. Brodsky: I would also like to throw into the mix of a re-allocation where they can move lots from the east side to the west side for example as a strategy. Maintaining the number of lots but they shift the placement. That has not been discussed either.

Member Winkelman: One of the main reasons that Mr. Loveless maintained such a nice view across the road was that his house was on the west side right there on the road. There can be lake views from the houses on the west side along the road. I would rather have the open space on the lakeside than the west side of 41A. There are a number of different configurations they could do with the open space that I don't think they have complied with the conservation analysis and they have basically built in the high conservation value lands and it looks like a conventional subdivision especially on the east side. Pretty conventional.

Member Kasper: Can you fill us in, they submitted the DEIS, we had a positive declaration, this is their argument to that. We are discussing re-subdividing and that is not really, how they proceed, right? We gave our thoughts why we gave the positive declaration, so what happens now. You are going to make this public.

Counsel Molnar: The list of supporting materials, together with this DEIS will determine to be adequate for purposes of addressing the findings the Planning Board attached to and made part of that positive declaration. Once that is determined to be a final EIS, it has to be circulated, published, and otherwise provided to the public for comment for a period of at least 30 days. The public hearing may be scheduled at the recommendation of the Planning Board and that comment period must be held open at least 10 days after the public hearing closes. Then the Planning Board must make a determination based upon the final EIS, the record that is made up of comments, and public information received. The final EIS must be prepared within 45 days after the public hearing and 60 days after filing of the DEIS, whichever occurs last. Subsequently, there will be a preparation of findings by the lead agency. The Planning Board as lead agency is responsible for those findings. A lead agency must issue those finding no sooner than 10 days and within 30 days of the filing of notice of completion of the final environmental impact statement. SEQR regulations require that all other parties and agencies to prepare the finding to the lead agency within 10 days but this is not an open comment period and the lead agency is not required to respond. Finding and a decision may be made simultaneously by the lead agency. A positive finding means that the project or action is approvable for consideration of the final EIS and demonstrates that the action chosen is one that avoids or minimizes adverse environmental impact of the EIS and weighs and balances them with the social, economic and other factors for consideration. That is where we are headed.

Member Kasper: So at some point we are going to accept the submittal.

Chairman Southern: As adequate or complete.

Counsel Molnar: It is not a decision on your part, simply a decision that it is adequate for purposes of circulation, publication, etcetera, to other interested agencies.

Member Kasper: After the time frame and all that we are going to make a decision if it is. We will review it because we are lead agency, and we are going to comment that we are in agreement or not in agreement with their findings.

Counsel Molnar: If you would like to pursue in attorney advice where we go from here, I would be glad to do so.

Member Kasper: I think it might be wise. We made comments why we didn't think they mitigated it, which is really what we weren't supposed to be doing.

Counsel Molnar: No, we are only determining adequacy.

Member Hamlin: I have a question about adequacy. We have been through this once and determined with some notes that parts of it are adequate. Eventually we will determine that all of it is adequate for what is here. The discussion around other options are not presented by the applicant at this point so can we determine that this is less than adequate based on options.

Counsel Molnar: Request a re-submittal that includes additional mitigation or alternative measures that mitigate against the impacts.

Member Hamlin: To mitigate against the impacts already identified here. We are talking about other alternatives, conservation subdivisions and so forth that were not proposed. Can we use that as inadequacy of this document.

Counsel Molnar: I propose we have a discussion in attorney advice session to more fully review those issues, but I think it would also be an opportunity at the next special Planning Board meeting to call to sort them out and make a final determination on the May 9th date.

Chairman Southern: I agree. We will continue our meeting on May 9th, and we will devote how much of that meeting we need to attorney advice session.

Member Winkelman: I have one more question for tonight, you said you are going to impact eight acres of wooded area. It seems like more than that with the common driveways, and the cul-de-sac. Did EDR come up with the eight acres and that lot 1. Eight acres seems like a small figure because you have the leach fields and you can't have trees in the leach fields. That is something we should verify. That was on page 46.

Counsel Molnar: Since May 9th has not yet been determined to be a special meeting day called by the Chair, I recommend that the Chair entertain a motion to hold a special meeting, approve it and we will subsequently under the open meetings law provide notice.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Hamlin and seconded by Member Redmond to schedule a special meeting on May 9, 2017 at 6:30 pm. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmance of said motion.

Discussion

Chairman Southern notified the board that he will not be available for the site visits on Saturday. Mr. Camp stated that he is also not available but will visit the properties prior to Saturday and send out his comments to the board.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Kasper and seconded by Member Winkelman to adjourn the meeting. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmance of said motion. The Planning Board Meeting adjourned at 9:39 p.m. as there being no further business.

Respectfully Submitted,

Karen Barkdull, Secretary/Clerk