

**Village of Cazenovia Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
February 12, 2018**

5 Present: Rich Huftalen, Chair; Adam Walburger; Stephen McEntee; Don Raleigh.

Absent: Anne McDowell.

10 Others Present: James Stokes, Village Attorney; Lauren Young; David Muraco; Louis Muraco; Dan Kuper; and Bob Ridler.

* * * * *

15 R. Huftalen called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and introduced the Board.

* * * * *

20 R. Huftalen asked for any changes to the minutes of January 8, 2018. R. Huftalen made the motion to approve the minutes as submitted. A. Walburger seconded. The motion carried with 4 in favor, 0 opposed.

* * * * *

25 Mr. Stokes reminded the Board to ratify the conditional sign approvals from last month that were contingent on comments from the Madison County Planning Department.

CCLF Senior Housing, 24 Nelson St., Sign, Site Plan Review

30 R. Huftalen stated that the Board has received a favorable response from the Madison County Planning Department who returned it for local determination.

R. Huftalen made the motion to ratify the prior approval for this sign. A. Walburger seconded. The motion carried with 4 in favor, 0 opposed.

* * * * *

35 **Carriage House Village Apartments, Sign, Site Plan Review**

R. Huftalen noted that the Board has received a favorable response from the Madison County Planning Department who returned it for local determination.

40 R. Huftalen made the motion to ratify the prior approval for this sign. A. Walburger seconded. The motion carried with 4 in favor, 0 opposed.

* * * * *

45

Lincklaen House Realty, LLC, and Cazenovia College, Boundary Line Change for Parking Lot, Public Hearing

50 R. Huftalen explained that this is for the parking lot located north of Albany Street and east of Lincklaen Street and identified as Tax Map #94.52-1-45, 94.52-1-51, and 94.52-1-52. The two landowners are doing a swap and creating a lot line change.

55 Dan Kuper came forward and said there was a permit from 2000. This was originally three lots that involved the Lincklaen House, the carpet store, the college, and the theater. Right now, the heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) for the theater is on Lincklaen House property. There is a piece of equipment belonging to Lincklaen House that is on college property. This has been in the process for quite a while and this is the final legal clean up so maps can be filed at the county.

60 R. Huftalen asked for any questions from the Board or from the public. Hearing none, he made a motion to close the public hearing. The motion carried with 4 in favor, 0 opposed.

65 R. Huftalen made a motion to declare this an Unlisted Action under State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR). No other agencies are involved. The approval will not have any significant adverse effect on the environment. No further SEQR action is required. It is recommended that a Negative Declaration be prepared and filed. S. McEntee seconded. The motion carried with 4 in favor, 0 opposed.

70 R. Huftalen made a motion to approve the subdivision request as submitted. S. McEntee seconded. The motion carried with 4 in favor, 0 opposed.

* * * * *

New Venture Assets, LLC, Amended Special Permit and Site Plan Review, Architectural Review for the Proposed Phase II of the Cazenovia Market Development

75 This is to include a mixed use residential and retail/financial services use with drive-thru window, as well as a separate residential apartment building on the premises immediately east of the existing Aldi grocery store commonly known at 2390-2392 U.S. Route 20 (Tax Map #95.3-2-20).

David Muraco and Louis Muraco were present.

80 R. Huftalen: We have gotten some information since our last meeting. We have received a review letter from our Village Engineer, John Dunkle, who reviewed the overall grading plan, the partial grading plan, overall utility plan, site details, emergency access plan, and the SWPPP (Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan) revised and has enumerated several technical suggestions. It is correspondence among engineers.

- 85
1. Site grading on the west side of the mixed use building should be modified to prevent runoff flow across the driveway and into the street.
 2. Inverts and pipe sizes of all culverts should be provided.
 3. Sizing dimensions should be provided for all the outlet protection areas at all pipe ends.
 - 90 4. The lengths and slopes of the vegetated pre-treatment swales shown on the plan do not match the design in the SWPPP.

5. The SWPPP states that the residential area runoff will be pre-treated by 450 ft. of vegetated swale before reaching the I-basins. However the grading plan appears to show that less than half of the area will actually be directed to the east side vegetated swale.
- 95 6. A rain garden is an inappropriate treatment practice for the southerly portion of the residential site, as the tributary areas exceeds the limits for a rain garden. Instead, it should be designed as a bio-retention practice with at least 2.5 ft. of soil media. Also, infiltration tests are needed in this area if no under-drain is to be used.
7. Infiltration tests are needed for the proposed infiltration basins serving this area.
- 100 8. Please review the information provided for the storm sewers and detention elements, as lengths and slopes and elevations are missing, or appear to conflict with the some of the design elements noted.
9. The design and construction of the Village street, sidewalks and water line extension serving the residential area should be in accordance with the previously approved specifications and details for public infrastructure, and will require the posting of appropriate securities.
- 105 10. Village and Health Department approval of the design and details of the private residential sewer collection and pumping system should be required prior to issuance of any building permits for this area.
11. The engineered design details of the proposed box culvert stream crossing must be approved by the Village and USACE (United States Army Corps of Engineers) prior to issuance of any land disturbance or building permits for the residential area.
- 110 12. Village and Health Department approval of all potable water backflow prevention devices is required prior to issuance of a CO (Certificate of Occupancy) for any building.
13. Additional spot elevations, dimensions, and construction details should be provided for the proposed cul-de-sac. It appears that an easement will be needed to fully encompass the cul-de-sac pavement.
- 115 14. Snow management for the cul-de-sac and southerly parking lot should be coordinated with the Village DPW (Department of Public Works).
15. The type of sidewalk in the residential area should be confirmed with the Planning Board, as the plans appear to show several different material types.
- 120 16. Stormwater Basin Cross Section 3 should be re-titled. It appears the outlet structure rim elevation for Basin # 1 should be 1305.5. (sheet C-14).

125 R. Huftalen: Obviously, John has conducted an extensive detailed review of the drawings. I know he has been in consultation with your engineer on an ongoing basis. Our Board just received this information earlier today. To me, it doesn't look like there are any major problems to be addressed. But certainly, all of these items need to be taken care of in order to proceed. I don't know if there is anything new with this. This is your fifth meeting in front of this Board. Are there any changes or things we should be made aware of since our last meeting?

130 David Muraco: The John Dunkle letter has already been answered. I think we supplied you with a packet from Naperiala. There really are no problems.

135 R. Huftalen: I presume all of those things have been part of an ongoing discussion with your engineer.

140 David Muraco: We responded probably 10-14 days ago with full revised drawings, which probably answered every single thing. The only thing we did with the plan is the Village street on the back side. We made these double doors for entrance ways. The double doors were already there. These were windows, so we made them doors.

R. Huftalen: Do you mean the façade facing the Village street?

145 David Muraco: The Village street, yes. On the engineering plans, we extended the sidewalks for all three retailers. We put in the sidewalks that John Dunkle talked about. We extended the sidewalk down the front of the building facing north only half way down, which is consistent with the storefront. It just wraps half around the building heading north. That's about it.

150 R. Huftalen: Another piece that should be entered into the public record is that we received a determination from the Madison County Planning Department. They returned it for local determination. I will read these into the minutes:

155 *The proposed "Theophilus" building replaces the single-story "bank" and "retail 3" space originally proposed for this location. The proposed "Theophilus" building is a true mixed-use building with office and retail space on the ground floor as well as a community space and two upper stories of apartments. As stated in our original review of this project, true mixed-use is not only possible on this site but better achieves the Village's code for the VES-MU district and the Village's Design Guidelines. This change represents exactly the type of improvement to the project that we tried to suggest be considered in our original review.*

160 *The proposed drive-thru has also been reconfigured to the south side of the proposed building which is an improvement for the Route 20 viewshed (a priority of the Design Guidelines) and likely an improvement for pedestrian activity (a priority of both the VES-MU district and Design Guidelines) given the orientation of the previously approved buildings on this site.*

165 *Additional parking (69 spaces) is shown over what was originally proposed (25 spaces). While we commend the developer for stating that more parking will only be added at a later date if truly necessary (shown as "banked parking" on the site plan), a quick calculation shows that the increased parking may already be in excess per the Village Code 180-113. The proposed*
170 *12 apartments require 1.5 spaces per Village Code = 18 spaces. Parking for the other uses is a bit trickier to calculate without more detail on number of employees, layout of true customer space (as the Village Code states retail requires one space for each motor vehicle used directly in the business, plus one space for each employee at peak shift, plus one space for each 120 square feet of business floor area accessible to customers), but even if you calculate the first floor uses as retail*
175 *(counting the proposed bank use as retail likely inflates that amount of parking necessary) at the fullest capacity it only equals 48.3 spaces rounded to 49 paces, i.e. 5,800 sq ft retail/120. This is a total of 67 spaces (18+49) which is close to the 69 proposed here, but as we described the amount of parking we calculated is likely high as we calculated it as retail space and not all of that space will be open to customers. Moreover, the Village Design Guidelines state that "off-street parking is*
180 *required by the zoning code. It is preferred that less than the required is provided with the Planning Board approval." The Village Design Guidelines also recommend the use of landscaping within parking lots which incorporated and enhanced to what is presently proposed especially with the parking area being larger.*

185 *Overall, this multi-story, mixed-use building creates a significantly different space than what was originally proposed and is more in line with the vision described in the Village's VES-MU district and Design Guidelines.*

R. Huftalen: Any comments or reactions from the Board on that?

190

S. McEntee: You didn't point out anything regarding sidewalks.

David Muraco: That's what we had on this side here. We had sidewalk entries. And then around the side facing Route 20. We extended that a little more.

195

S. McEntee: Did John Dunkle's letter mean that?

R. Huftalen: He talked about making sure we understand.

200 S. McEntee: Are we supposed to have a sidewalk along the entire length of the new Village street?

Mr. Stokes: I had pointed out the subdivision regulations require that as well as the VES-MU.

S. McEntee: Meaning all the way back through the residential section?

205

David Muraco: I was hoping to do some heavier landscaping back there.

Mr. Stokes: Just along the street.

210 David Muraco: It needs to be on both sides of the street?

Mr. Stokes: No, that's the walking path on the west side. Could you extend the sidewalk on the east side of the street closer to Route 20? Can you continue that so it goes all the way up so that people can walk out of your apartment buildings and walk down?

215

David Muraco: (Pointing to the plans.) And do away with that?

Mr. Stokes: It's up to the Board.

220 David Muraco: It would make more sense. I would cross at this point here and we can take the sidewalk up through the apartment piece.

Mr. Stokes: That's a suggestion.

225 David Muraco: And not do this. This is going to nowhere. I would much rather do that. I have no problem with doing that.

Mr. Stokes: It should go all the way up to the far end of the parking lot so they can walk from there to your apartments and then continue down to the community building without having to walk in the street.

230

David Muraco: Agreed.

R. Huftalen: We want to address point 15:

235

15. The type of sidewalk in the residential area should be confirmed with the Planning Board, as the plans appear to show several different material types.

R. Huftalen: I think we are talking about real plowable sidewalks built to ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) standards on that side of the street and it makes more sense.

240

Mr. Stokes: And maintained year around.

R. Huftalen: If there are no comments from the Board, I will open it up to the public. Are there any comments or questions from the public? (There were no comments from the public.)

245

S. McEntee: John noted that his review did not include submitted landscaping or lighting plans. Did we already review such plans?

R. Huftalen: We approved a landscaping plan in the overall subdivision. But I think we need to address some of those details. We had a discussion with the Tree Commission on the roadside landscaping. But this needs more serious discussion.

250

A. Walburger: It's important to remember that the plan and discussion were for the central Aldi project only. That is the portion that is codified right now.

255

R. Huftalen: That's the portion that was approved.

A. Walburger: I'm comfortable in acknowledging that there is further detail to be developed on the landscaping plan. We have the basis for the plan as established by the pattern for the Aldi project. Obviously, there is continuation of that with the appropriate changes that were already recommended in the execution of that for the Route 20 section. As I think Jim was alluding to for the southern most residential section, we didn't have anything more than this overhead sketch for a landscaping plan. We are at an absence of information that needs to be developed. If we acknowledge that it needs to be developed and are comfortable with that, I would be okay with moving forward. That's my thought process on it.

260

265

David Muraco: We did answer that in our package, which I have right here. We have a photometric plan for lighting. That is to John already. The walking trail was already approved. There was a lot of discussion and recommendations from Tom Tait. Further into the project, I would like to do as much landscaping as I can, especially on the backsides of the apartments down through where there is nothing. This is pretty heavy here. But down through here, I would like to do more, as long as it is consistent with what has already been constructed there.

270

R. Huftalen: I asked Jim to put together a resolution for us to consider. I make a motion to close the public hearing. A. Walburger seconded. The motion carried with 4 in favor, 0 opposed.

275

R. Huftalen: I would like to take the resolution point by point and talk about the different things we think we might want to have the developer address. Jim, do you want to talk about the high points of this?

280

Mr. Stokes: A lot of it is just “whereas” clauses. I think we will just start in the middle of the second page.

R. Huftalen: We cite all of the elevations and overall layout plans, floor plans, the various building elevations.

285

Mr. Stokes: I want to point out that I think John had gotten more plans than what we had in the file here. His email indicated additional plans, so those aren’t recited.

290

R. Huftalen: This would just be a preliminary conditional approval, is that correct?

Mr. Stokes: Correct.

295

**RESOLUTION
OF THE PLANNING BOARD
OF THE VILLAGE OF CAZENOVIA**

**RESOLUTION GRANTING PRELIMINARY AMENDED SPECIAL PERMIT, SITE PLAN AND
ARCHITECTURAL APPROVAL FOR PHASE II OF THE CAZENOVIA MARKET
SUBDIVISION**

300

WHEREAS, New Venture Assets LLC (“Applicant”) has been previously granted final plat approval and special permit approval for a subdivision consisting of three (3) lots for mixed use commercial and residential lots on approximately 10.7 acres zoned Village Edge South Mixed Use District (“Cazenovia Market Subdivision”), including the most easterly lot located at 2390/2392 U.S. Route 20, being known as tax map parcel no. 95.3-2-20, (hereinafter the “Development”), and

305

WHEREAS, the Applicant has presented revised plans for Phase II of the Development consisting of a mixed use commercial / residential building and three individual apartment buildings, and

310

WHEREAS, the Applicant has presented the following development plans prepared by Napierala Consulting Professional Engineer, P.C. and Macknight Architects:

- 1) Overall Layout Plan, C-5, last revised 12.1.17
 - 2) Elevations, A-201, last revised 12.1.17
 - 3) Elevations, A-202 (2 sheets), last revised 12.1.17
 - 4) Elevations, A-203, last revised 12.1.17
 - 5) Elevations, A-204, last revised 12.1.17
 - 6) Floor Plan, A-101, last revised 12.1.17
 - 7) Floor Plan, A-101, last revised 12.1.17
 - 8) Elevations, A-201 (Apartments), last revised 12.1.17
 - 9) Elevations, A-202 (Apartments), last revised 12.1.17
 - 10) Floor Plan, A-1 (Apartments), last revised 12.1.17
- hereinafter referred to as the “Phase II Plans”, and

315

320

325 **WHEREAS**, a negative declaration has previously been issued for this action pursuant to Title 6 N.Y.C.R.R., Section 617.3 et seq. of the Regulations relating to Article 8 of the New York Environmental Conservation Law of New York (SEQRA).

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Village of Cazenovia hereby grants preliminary amended special permit, site plan approval and architectural approval of the Phase II Plans for the Cazenovia Market Subdivision, and it is hereby further
330

RESOLVED, that final site plan, special permit and architectural approval of the development shall be granted upon the submission of, and Planning Board approval of the following:

1. Detailed Site Plan, Grading Plan, Utilities Plan and Landscaping Plan for the Development in accordance with Code section 180-142 (D)(2)(b);
- 335 2. Lighting Plan showing location and design of all exterior lighting, photometric analysis and manufacturer cut sheets for all fixtures;
3. Amended storm water pollution prevention plan;
4. Engineer’s report comparing impervious surface calculation with original plans and demonstrating continued compliance with Code requirements;
- 340 5. Exterior building materials manufacturer’s specification sheets and material samples.

and it is hereby further

RESOLVED, that the final site plan reflect

- 345 1) A sidewalk along the entire easterly side of Village Street “C”, to and including the parking lot at the southerly end of the cul-de-sac, along with modifications of the sidewalk on the westerly side of the Street in accordance with the Planning Board discussion,
- 2) Sidewalk connections to the westerly entrance to the Theophilus Cazenove building,
- 350 3) An infiltration/planting strip within the parking area east of the Theophilus Cazenove building parking lot,
- 4) Re-labeling of what is denoted as “Internal Drive D” as “Future Village Street D”.

and it is hereby further

RESOLVED, that the “Banked Parking” shown on sheet C-5 is not approved. Any future increase in parking area must be specifically approved upon further application to this Board, and it is hereby further
355

RESOLVED, that any drive through canopy and related architectural features must be specifically approved upon a further application to this Board, and it is hereby further

RESOLVED, that no business identification signage is hereby approved. All signs must be approved with actual tenant names upon further application to this Board, and it is hereby further
360

RESOVED, that the following comments by the Village Engineer shall be addressed prior to final approval:

1. Site grading on the west side of the mixed use building should be modified to prevent runoff flow across the driveway and into the street.
2. Inverts and pipe sizes of all culverts should be provided.
- 365 3. Sizing dimensions should be provided for all the outlet protection areas at all pipe ends.
4. The lengths and slopes of the vegetated pre-treatment swales shown on the plan do not match the design in the SWPPP.
5. The SWPPP states that the residential area runoff will be pre-treated by 450 ft. of vegetated swale before reaching the I-basins. However the grading plan appears to show that less than
370 half of the area will actually be directed to the east side vegetated swale.
6. A rain garden is an inappropriate treatment practice for the southerly portion of the

residential site, as the tributary areas exceeds the limits for a rain garden. Instead, it should be designed as a bio-retention practice with at least 2.5 ft. of soil media. Also, infiltration tests are needed in this area if no under-drain is to be used.

- 375 7. Infiltration tests are needed for the proposed infiltration basins serving this area.
8. Please review the information provided for the storm sewers and detention elements, as lengths and slopes and elevations are missing, or appear to conflict with the some of the design elements noted.
- 380 9. The design and construction of the Village street, sidewalks and water line extension serving the residential area should be in accordance with the previously approved specifications and details for public infrastructure, and will require the posting of appropriate securities.
10. Village and HD approval of the design and details of the private residential sewer collection and pumping system should be required prior to issuance of any building permits for this area.
- 385 11. The engineered design details of the proposed box culvert stream crossing must be approved by the Village and USACE prior to issuance of any land disturbance or building permits for the residential area.
12. Village and HD approval of all potable water backflow prevention devices is required prior to issuance of a CO for any building.
- 390 13. Additional spot elevations, dimensions, and construction details should be provided for the proposed cul-de-sac. It appears that an easement will be needed to fully encompass the cul-de-sac pavement.
14. Snow management for the cul-de-sac and southerly parking lot should be coordinated with the Village DPW.
- 395 15. The type of sidewalk in the residential area should be confirmed with the PB, as the plans appear to show several different material types.
16. Stormwater Basin Cross Section 3 should be re-titled. It appears the outlet structure rim elevation for Basin # 1 should be 1305.5. (sheet C-14).

400 Dated: February 12, 2018

R. Huftalen: I don't know if we discussed an infiltration planting strip, but that is going to help address some of the stuff talked about.

405 David Muraco: Similar to Aldi's strips.

R. Huftalen: It was in the Madison County Planning Department suggestions.

410 A. Walburger: I am certainly in support of that condition. I just want to make sure we are all on the same page for the location, type, and construction of the sidewalk: Eastern side of the Village street connecting the existing sidewalk shown through to the parking area on the south side of the cul-de-sac. So that's a little reconfiguration down here. I am certainly in favor of the stub path that heads over to the trail. The whole project, one of the major design points was connectivity to the trail systems, etc. It is a logical location to have it across the street from the residential areas. I think

415 a small trailhead stub is appropriate. But construction of the whole path and hooking into the section on the south side of Village street D is no longer necessary if there is an actual poured sidewalk on the east side of Village street C.

420 Mr. Stokes: So you are suggesting where they have shown a little crosswalk area farther to the north, they could just put that down where they are showing the stub farther to the south?

A. Walburger: That is correct.

425 R. Huftalen: Do you mind marking that up for us?

S. McEntee: Did you say that stub leads to nowhere? There is no trail coming out of the woods there?

David Muraco: I really haven't verified how far that is in there.

430 Mr. Stokes: In theory, it is supposed to get you back to the existing trail.

David Muraco: We will find it. It's not going to be on my property. That's Lucas.

435 R. Huftalen: I think the sidewalk on the backside of Aldi is specified as a real plowable sidewalk, right? It is showing the same construction as in front.

440 A. Walburger: I think you are right, Rich. I stand corrected. The brown on the drawing is representative of the stone dust path in the north section of the development. Then the gray speckled is poured concrete. If that's the case, I would retract getting rid of the northern crosswalk marking also because there is additional concrete sidewalk there. My intention was not to change any part of the south side of Village street D. Don't eliminate that crosswalk. You need that because there is a sidewalk on the opposite side.

445 R. Huftalen: You would terminate the sidewalk right there? Only with one sidewalk crossing the bridge on the east side instead of the west side?

A. Walburger: Correct. That is my recommendation.

450 R. Huftalen: That makes sense to me. You still have a connection to the trail and a crosswalk between the two residential buildings. As part of the final detailed landscaping plan, I think that is what we would want to see. Maybe we are getting into excessive detail, but for your point #1, I would say: Detailed Site Plan, Grading Plan, Utilities Plan and Landscaping Plan that incorporates a sidewalk per our discussion here on the east side of what should be labeled future Village street D.

455 Mr. Stokes: I would just modify the section later on where it talks about sidewalks.

R. Huftalen: Again, we do want to make sure it is understood that it is going to be dedicated as a Village street. That is something we need to address specifically.

460 Mr. Stokes: To the extent that what they call Internal Drive D is shown on the final drawings and should be labeled Future Village street D.

465 R. Huftalen: Part of our consideration is when these are public streets and public sidewalks, we have to plow them. We don't want to get too crazy with sidewalks everywhere that no one is walking on. With the landscaping plan, there wasn't big love for the stone dust that got incorporated in front of Aldi's. The Tree Commission said to cancel it.

David Muraco: I would rather not install a stone dust path. If they don't have it, why am I doing it?

470 R. Huftalen: They do have it, actually. They ended up installing it even after we told them not to.

Mr. Stokes: I don't think it was ever taken off of the plan. The Tree Commission didn't like it, but it was already part of the approved plan.

475 David Muraco: I already have sidewalks that I'm installing. They don't have sidewalks. We are already making this sidewalk/walkway. I don't know where people are coming from that are going to be walking through this path.

480 R. Huftalen: On the final landscaping plan that we will require, we will want to see the details of the tree plantings that correspond. It will almost be a mirror image of what exists in front of Aldi's, including dwarf lilacs marking the entrances. We talked about it at the last meeting.

485 David Muraco: I think we already submitted that. Again, you may not have that in your file. We can revisit it. Is that another meeting?

R. Huftalen: If we want any of these conditions, we would need to see the drawings and approve them in order for a building permit to be issued.

490 David Muraco: Administratively?

Mr. Stokes: The Board would approve it at a meeting, but you wouldn't necessarily have to come. A lot of this is going to be just engineering review. Once that's done, it is essentially self-enacting. But there will have to be one more approval by the Board.

495 R. Huftalen: The same thing with the signage. The Village Board got it returned for local determination for a text change in the law. What are we missing? Anything?

500 A. Walburger: We talked about reconfiguring of sidewalks. We talked about the infiltration strip consistent with the Aldi parking lot. We are allowing for engineering review of the site lighting. This Board has not seen it, but John Dunkle will tell us if there is something that is nonconforming, so I'm okay with that.

David Muraco: Like I said, we submitted the photometric plan already.

505 A. Walburger: I think Mr. Dunkle's comments should be easy to enact. There is nothing there that can't be accommodated inside this site plan.

R. Huftalen: We talked about a potential hammerhead versus cul-de-sac.

510 Mr. Stokes: John Dunkle had mentioned snowplowing of the cul-de-sac and the parking lot. Does
this Board see any advantage to having a hammerhead there instead of a cul-de-sac? One of the
thoughts being that street snow could be plowed to the west. With a cul-de-sac, as they go around,
it's going to get plowed into the parking lot. That is something the engineers can talk about. I
wanted to check on the Board's preferences. Plus there would be less pavement to remove in the
future if that connection is ever made.

515 David Muraco: We will discuss it with the engineer.

R. Huftalen: For everyone's information, Bill Carr (Zoning/Code Enforcement Officer) reviewed it
and saw no problems with emergency vehicle access.

520 Mr. Stokes: At this point, the only edifications to the resolution would be at the top of page 3: A
sidewalk along the entire easterly side of Village Street "C", to and including the parking lot at the
southerly end of the cul-de-sac, along with modifications of the sidewalk on the westerly side of the
Street in accordance with the Planning Board discussion. And a fourth one: Re-labeling of what is
525 denoted as "Internal Drive D" as "Future Village Street D."

Mr. Stokes: We can recognize that some of these things have already been done.

530 R. Huftalen: Given those changes, I make a motion to approve the resolution per Jim's suggestions
and changes. A. Walburger seconded. The motion carried with 4 in favor, 0 opposed.

* * * * *

535 R. Huftalen asked if there was any other business to be brought before the board. Hearing none, he
made a motion to adjourn the meeting. S. McEntee seconded. The motion carried with 4 in favor,
0 opposed.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:47 p.m.

540 Respectfully submitted,

545 Marlene A. Westcott
Recording Secretary