

**Village of Cazenovia Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
October 14, 2019**

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

Absent: Zach Young.

10 Others Present: James Stokes, Village Attorney; David Cox; Ben Lockwood; Suzanne Munger; Jerry Munger; Letty Butterworth; Bob Butterworth; Helen Byrnes; Phil Byrnes; Tim Byrnes; Edward Braathen; Elfriede Dietrich; M. F. Snider; Bobbie Cleaveland; Bruce Kaiser; Jared Lusk; Colin Fazio; Diana Southworth; Dianne O’Donnell; Mike Laflair; Lisa Schaffner; Ed Kennedy, Jr.; Paul Barton; Mark Ruminski; Justin Fuchs; Alan Levinsohn; Bob Ridler; Margaret Bryan; Kate Hill;
15 Frank Snider and quite a few others who did not sign in.

* * * * *

20 R. Huftalen called the meeting to order at 7:00 and introduced the Board.

R. Huftalen asked for any changes to the minutes of September 9, 2019. S. McEntee pointed out an error on line 616. It should read: What goes to the plant has to be dealt with.

25 R. Huftalen made the motion to approve the minutes as amended. A. McDowell seconded. The motion carried with 5 in favor, 0 opposed.

* * * * *

Methodist Church, 21 Lincklaen St., Verizon, Antennas

30 R. Huftalen: The first applicant tonight is representing Verizon for some antennas. And I think the members of the Board have already seen an application. It requires site plan review. However, it’s in the Historic District. The applicant has already been to the Historic Preservation/Architectural Advisory Review Committee (HPC) and presented an application that is substantially architectural in nature. The reason why the application comes before the Planning Board is because it does also
35 require site plan review and the Planning Board needs to forward the application to the Madison County Planning Department. Our jurisdiction here is pretty administrative. Architectural approval has been conducted by the HPC. I want to make sure everybody understands that this has been presented to the HPC. HPC has forwarded it to the Planning Board for site plan review. This is replacing antennas that were in place on the Methodist Church.

40 Jared Lusk (representing applicant): T-Mobile had antennas on the steeple of the church. They took those down. Verizon is now going to take their space where they were on the steeple and replace them with Verizon antennas. And it’s a remote radio head. Also, adjacent to the church there is a 12-foot by 20-foot fenced area that will house the equipment necessary—the radios and things that
45 are there. Again, we were before the Historic Preservation/Architectural Advisory Committee back on September 23. They made a number of recommendations. On October 3, I sent you all revised plans that reflect their conditional approval. One of them was that we change the fence surrounding the radio equipment so that it has 5-inch wide boards with dog-eared trim, as opposed to a stockade

50 fence. They want the fence stained a neutral color to blend with the church. The antennas and
remote radio heads that are on the steeple and their mounting brackets will be painted to match the
color to the extent feasible with flat, nonglossy paint. There's an issue that we described to the HPC.
Heat comes off of the radio equipment, so painting them isn't always an option. If that's not
possible, we will try to find the color that is closest to that color, given the technical issues with
those. They need to be able to cool. So if we add paint to them, that will affect their ability to cool.
55 They want concrete filled bollards installed at the corners of the fence for the snowplow. They want
the wires serving the facility to be installed inside the church—as they are planned to be—except for
when they come out of the church to get to the radios. So it's pretty simple stuff, but we revised the
plans to reflect all of their conditions. So you have the revised plans in front of you. The original
application contained the plans and the simulated view after construction. You can see that we are
60 up there with the other antennas that are still there after T-Mobile removed their antennas.

R. Huftalen: Are there any questions from the members of the Board? Just for edification of the
public here, several years ago, we made a determination that the HPC would be granted the authority
to make architectural approvals without further approval from the Planning Board. It made sense at
65 the time and people felt that the HPC was the most appropriate place to make those approvals. So
this Board no longer has architectural jurisdiction over applications like this. We are seeing this
application because it also includes a site plan review.

R. Huftalen: I make a motion to approve the application subject to Madison County Planning
70 Department approval. A. McDowell seconded. The motion carried with 5 in favor, 0 opposed.

* * * * *

75 **The Landing at Burke Meadows, Planned Development District Application, Application Review Public Hearing**

R. Huftalen: We have a continuation of a public hearing to consider the application of Housing
Visions Unlimited for a zone change and we have the applicants here. They have made some
substantial changes that have been presented to the Village Board and been shared with the Planning
Board. And now, in conjunction with the continuation of this public hearing, I'd like to turn the
80 floor over to Mr. Cox to explain the changes and we will go from there. We will open the floor for
public comments after the Board has had a chance to comment and question.

David Cox: I want to thank everyone for coming out. Cazenovia is a very dedicated community.
And this is where the public input and Planning Board process really helps is when there is public
85 input. So I appreciate and thank everyone for coming out. And I'm just going to give a quick
overview of where we started and where we are now. It has a lot to do with the input that we've
received. So it is an active process and a lot of your input has been heard and you will see the
revisions. Just to bring you back to when we first started, here is the kind of plan we had. There
were five townhouse buildings with six units each for a total of 30 townhouse units. And then we
90 had a three-story senior building in the back with 40 units. As we were kind of going through the
process, there were some concerns. Some people voiced concern about three stories. *It seems pretty
tall and seems pretty big. Most of the buildings in that area are not three stories. Can you do
anything about that?* The answer was yes. So we did a revised design that lowered it to two stories
from three stories. One of the other things we did, when we did that . . . There were some concerns
95 over density and traffic. So we dropped the number of units in the senior building all the way from
40 down to 33 senior units. So we decreased the density. One of the other comments we received

was on the townhomes. Here's the townhome we had before (displaying a rendering). We heard: *It's too long for a single family house. It doesn't quite fit in. Can you make it any smaller?* So we went back to the drawing board. We did a revised design. We took those townhouse buildings and took them from six units down to four units. So now they're much more narrow, much closer to a single family style look. Some of the other things that we heard along the way was, back to the density thing, *can we reduce more units?* So, we did, in fact, reduce the units. So remember, we started out with five townhouse buildings that had six units each. Now we've gone down to four townhouse buildings with only four units each. So down from 30 units. Now we're down to 16 units. So overall, we went from 70 units and now we're down to 49 units. One of the other things was on the original design, that the townhouses were much closer to Evergreen Lane and there were some public comments: *Can we increase that buffer? Can we provide more tree area?* So we revised the road, swung it up to the north quicker, and provided a much greater vegetated buffer in here to Evergreen Circle. At the last meeting we had, there was a comment about providing some additional screening here where there are no natural trees. So we have added some additional trees here to block any residents along Burton in their backyard--provided more screening there. There were also comments on: *What if it was single family?* So we did a single family layout just to see what would the site look like if we did single family home layout. We could get 36 lots on here. And then we calculated for traffic. If it was 36 lots, the traffic generated in the a.m. would be 27 trips in the peak hour and then in the p.m., it would be a total of 36 trips. First, I did the calculation for our revised development. The a.m. peak hour was 14 and the p.m. peak hour would be 17. So 27 versus 14, what we have proposed and then in the p.m. 36 versus 17 trips. So we have a lot less traffic under this proposed development than what it could potentially be with single family lots. The other thing we looked at was how many trees, how much buffer is left. So under this plan, there is 1.45 acres of tree area left and the proposed disturbance would be 13.5 acres. Under our proposed plan, there is 9.67 acres of tree area and 5.29 acres of disturbed area. So much less disturbance and saving a lot more trees around the area. One of the other things we did on the revised plan because there were some comments about this turn around the bend and safety. So we moved the proposed driveway location farther to the north to increase the distance from that curve there. So that provides some additional sight distance. The other thing that we did by losing some of the townhouse units is we are able to make our stormwater management areas much larger—about double in size. So we're able to detain even more drainage and reduce it even further. Let alone we also reduced the amount of impervious area so our drainage that we're producing is less, and we're detaining even more. So we were really able to attack the drainage scenario as well. So just a quick overview, there is a two-story senior building with 33 units. And then four townhouse buildings with four units each for a total of 16 townhouse units with increased buffer and more and better drainage. I think that kind of brings us up to speed with the revised design.

135 R. Huftalen: Thanks, Mr. Cox. Are there any questions or comments from the members of the Board or staff?

A. McDowell: What did Cazenovia Preservation Foundation (CPF) say about common housing units that could go on that land?

140 R. Huftalen: It was actually the Cazenovia Advisory Conservation Commission (CACC). There is also correspondence from the CPF. The CACC made a determination.

S. McEntee: I think that estimate was 24 or 25.

145 Mr. Stokes: 24 to 29, depending.

A. McDowell: Where did you come up with 36?

David Cox: Just from laying it out.

150

A. McDowell: Was 24 ever in the equation for you?

David Cox: We are not proposing single family lots. I was just making a comparison. If it were to be developed, it could be developed like that. That's all.

155

R. Huftalen: So the document that Anne is referring to, I think many of you that were at our last public hearing, heard comments from Mr. Don Ferlow representing the CACC. He had some extensive comments that he put in writing and submitted to the Board today. That's available as part of the public record. It largely restates many of the items he discussed at our last public hearing.

160

A. McDowell: I'll tell you what has really been a concern for the neighbors is that traffic study. I've been on the Board for a long time and I never saw the developer do their own traffic study. I'm wondering, because it is such a concern for the neighbors, if we could have an outside study done for the traffic.

165

Ben Lockwood: I will speak for the developer. He's [Mr. Cox] not the developer. He's my engineer. He is the third party. He followed the rules and regulations which will be studied by the Village Engineer and signed off on. It is his stamp and his firm's stamp, which is the most important. He is the third party.

170

A. McDowell: I didn't understand that. I was just thinking it would set a precedent.

Ben Lockwood: I don't understand traffic studies, quite frankly. I know we do them. I rely on the expert—our experts that we pay to do them.

175

A. McDowell: And I know a big, big concern is the screening. And I like seeing this. And I know for Emick Lane, those big trees that are the boundaries. Will they remain?

David Cox: I'm not sure exactly where you're speaking about.

180

R. Huftalen: Emick Lane is the connection.

David Cox: Yeah, we're trying to keep a buffer right along here with all that green space.

185

A. McDowell: That buffer is really going to be important. And then there are several houses on Burton Street that their backyard will face the whole development. I would really like to make sure that they are well buffered.

David Cox: Right. There are no existing trees here. So that's where we're proposing to plant some evergreens to create a nice buffer there.

190

A. McDowell: That would be very important. And the people on Evergreen Lane that you would really take into consideration that's their backyard.

David Cox: Absolutely.

195

A. McDowell: And it's great that the drainage pond would be bigger.

200

S. McEntee: Just another question or comment for clarification on the traffic study. I think I understood that John Dunkle would review that and basically give his thumbs up or thumbs down on that traffic study.

Mr. Stokes: He's reviewing all of the plans.

205

S. McEntee: There wasn't any raw data. I saw your summary data, which was extensive. If an engineer or Village Engineer is going to look at it, then I feel better.

210

R. Huftalen: Again, for the edification of the public and the rest of the members of the Board here, Jim has forwarded all of our documentation, as it has been getting revised, to John Dunkle. John Dunkle initially replied with some draft comments. When he first saw the project back in July, I believe he has asked for further information from you [Mr. Cox] and from representatives of the sewer district. He's been in touch with Bill Carr [Zoning/Codes Enforcement Officer]. As a Board, we will be relying on John's opinion as our Village Engineer. Any questions we have for John, I would like to make that part of what we do tonight is to identify areas that we want him to give special focus to. I told him we would be back in touch with him after tonight's hearing to make sure that he's dialing in on the aspects of the project that we feel require the most scrutiny.

215

220

S. McEntee: The traffic study would be one. Getting his stamp of approval. Also for the wastewater and also the drainage. Starting with the wastewater, what is the advice from the Town and from John Dunkle on whether and wherever all this feeds into the main that goes on down to the sewage treatment plant, if there is sufficient capacity? I think that's a question we have to ask for any development in the future, given the presentation we had in July.

225

R. Huftalen: And as of late last week, I was cc'd on some emails back and forth between John, Bill Carr and Jim Cunningham [Cazenovia Wastewater Treatment Plant], trying to determine where best to put the flow meters to determine what the flows would be under storm conditions. So it's something they are working on. I think we can ask John to provide more specific details on that stuff.

230

S. McEntee: And then on the drainage, just to carry on with that, I know there are going to be retention areas that are developed. And you've commented, and it's in the minutes, that the drain in the street is actually above the level of where the water collects currently at the western edge of that property. Will there be a drain added to the retention areas?

235

David Cox: Yes. There would be a new connection from the retention area to the storm sewer so there won't be sitting or ponding water in there. Except when it rains, it will pond up. But after 24 hours or so it will drain out.

S. McEntee: But there is a direct drain?

240 David Cox: Yes.

S. McEntee: My next question, going downstream from there, where does it go? My concern is that it goes to the backyards of the properties across Burton Street. Do you know where that goes?

245 David Cox: There is a storm sewer right in Burton Street that we're connecting into. And then it goes across. There's a catch basin right in the driveway to the school. And then it continues on and dumps. There's an outlet pipe where it actually discharges to a swale that runs in the back of these properties right here and it flows all the way towards Clark Street. And then there's another end section that the water goes back into a pipe in Clark Street and then travels down Clark Street
250 towards the creek.

S. McEntee: And I'll just comment, to me, that's unacceptable. I think that's going to make the situation in those backyards worse. I don't know what your thoughts are, Adam.

255 A. Walburger: We've been concerned about and had discussions of the carrying capacity of that line and you have substantially decreased the impervious areas and increased your retention basin area, which should ideally reduce the runoff rate under storm conditions. How is that change reflected in the adequacy, or inadequacy, of the size of that 8-inch line headed to Clark Street? Is the project getting back towards that sizing? That was the question at the larger project size, that in order to
260 fully pipe across to Clark Street, the existing pipe size, which is not in the scope of this project, was not of adequate carrying capacity. If I'm wrong, please correct me in front of everybody. But now you have reduced the size of the project, increased the infiltration basin size. So how do things line up now? I would assume it's more in alignment. Is there a numerical number on that? Are we headed in the right direction? We don't have the engineering data.

265 David Cox: We are definitely headed in the right direction. We're making the situation better. The problem is that even if I took this property and made our discharge zero, the 8-inch pipe is still undersized for all the contributing area. Even if I took the entire project . . .

270 R. Huftalen: Dave, can I interrupt you for just a second? When you say, "we made the situation better," are you referring to better from your prior iterations or better from existing conditions?

David Cox: Both. We've made it better from existing conditions. We studied the amount of runoff coming off the property right now as it stands today. And we are substantially less than that under
275 proposed conditions. And from our last iteration, we made the ponds even bigger, so we're detaining even more.

A. McDowell: Did you change the impervious material by making the whole unit smaller? And by how much?

280 David Cox: There is less impervious area, correct. I don't have that on me right now. Obviously, reduced from five buildings that were six units to now four buildings that are four units. So we lost a lot of that roof area. And this clubhouse building has been removed as well. The clubhouse is going to be in the senior building. So we've lost all of that roof area.

285

S. McEntee: Maybe I'm misunderstanding something. I have the impression that today very little from that property goes into the storm sewer. It just kind of collects at the bottom. Unless there's a heavy rain and then it overflows into the street then goes down the storm sewer.

290 David Cox: There is a storm pipe. It does take water from this property where it does pond. There is a drain there.

A. Walburger: It just hit me, the series of attachments from early October here, and there was a lot of back and forth on water supply accuracy, sewer supply accuracy, which is still under
295 investigation. And the infiltration tests. Can you sort of summarize everything that was submitted in those reports for a verbal record?

David Cox: Sure. So we talked about water first. We looked at the existing water system. They do flow tests where they actually go out there and they put a meter on one hydrant and then they go
300 open another hydrant and they measure how much flow is coming out of that hydrant. And then they go to the other meter and see how much the pressure drops. That kind of gives you a value of how much pressure and flow you can get out of the existing system. So once we have that, then we can actually model our proposed system of when we put our new line in, we connect it to Emick Lane here, we can model the water and the pressure and flow and see how all that changes. We put
305 our demands in. If there's a fire on this project, we take the sprinkler demand. We take the pumper truck hooking up to the hydrant and start drawing flow out of it. And we measure how much the pressure drops and how much flow is going through all the pipes to see if there's adequate water. So, you want at least 35 psi under domestic conditions just normal without a fire, which we have over that, and then when you do a fire flow scenario, you want to have at least 20 psi in the system.
310 And we meet both those criteria for that. And then on infiltration tests, we went out there and did infiltration testing. So you dig a hole and then you actually fill it with water and then you time how long it takes to drop one inch and then you keep filling it up and you measure how long it takes to drop one inch. And you keep doing that until your time stabilizes. When you do it the first time, it might drop fast because the soil is absorbing the water. But then if you do it, and do it, and do it,
315 and you get your time to stabilize, then you know that's your infiltration rate.

S. McEntee: A question about that. I'm looking at that analysis. There are six different perc [percolation] holes. Can you show us where on the property those six holes were drilled?

320 David Cox: So we had two in back here for the infiltration basin that is proposed back in here. Two tests here in the infiltration basin that was here. And then two tests down here where the infiltration basin was down there.

S. McEntee: On the last one, were you pointing to the southwest corner of the property?
325

David Cox: It was actually in the north northwest where it was before.

S. McEntee: Is there any particular reason you didn't choose the low point on the property?

330 David Cox: Oh, so this is where the third infiltration basin was. This on here is just a dry pond. So for our calculations, that is just for storing water. It doesn't need to infiltrate. Infiltration basins need to infiltrate. So that's where you have to do the infiltration testing.

335 S. McEntee: So in the southwest corner where water tends to collect now, will there be a drain from that area?

David Cox: Yes. That will be tied into the Burton Street storm sewer.

340 R. Huftalen: Before I open it up to the public, I'd just like to set down a few guidelines. We've had a really respectful and reasoned discourse over the course of these meetings, and I want to continue in that tradition. We first got this application on June 10 at our regularly scheduled Planning Board meeting. We had a subsequent meeting July 8, another meeting August 12 where we had some public comment. August 19, we opened a public hearing and received full public comment. We
345 continued that to last month, September 9, and continued it again to tonight. So I've got extensive notes on comments that I've heard to date. I've got highly detailed and excellent minutes that Marlene [recording secretary] has done. All of these members have been at every one of those meetings. And so in the interest of being respectful of others' time and allowing people to offer new comments, I'd ask you to keep comments concise. Please, there's no need to reiterate material that
350 has been discussed in prior meetings. I'd like people to shoot for a target of three minutes for their comments. With that being said, I can assure you that, as evidenced by this questioning, the members of this Board take this job very seriously. And there's people I respect and admire that are on both sides of this discussion and are looking at the thing thoroughly and see things differently. And so I think in the interest of doing that, please refrain from clapping. We're trying to gather
355 more information and be in a position to make the best decision on behalf of the community. And so I just appreciate everybody's help in making that happen. And I want to give everybody the opportunity to get their opinions on the record here. And for Marlene's sake, please identify yourself even if she knows who you are. It helps everybody. With that, I'll open it up to the floor.

360 Suzanne Munger: I would like to continue the discussion on drainage. Some of what I heard tonight makes me more distressed than I was. The amount of rainwater that is falling on this property is not going to be changed by your project. The water is going to be there. You are just diverting it and actually creating more that needs to be diverted because of impervious areas.

365 David Cox: Whenever you increase impervious, you do increase the amount of runoff. That's why we have to put in our stormwater management areas to detain that.

Suzanne Munger: But it still all goes to the same place. It's going into the retention ponds, the dry ponds, the line across the road. It is also going to come through our backyards. That will not
370 change, except you're adding impervious zones which increases the amount of runoff even though you're containing it temporarily. You cannot decrease it unless you get the rain to decrease. The Village was at the bus circle pumping water into our backyard last week because it couldn't get out of the bus circle. And we went and complained about that because they could have at least put it in the ditch. Don't put it in our yard. I don't know the entity to address this to, but it seems reasonable that instead of having an open ditch through our backyard and the school property, there should be a
375 continuation of a culvert or storm sewer. Anybody know why that can't be done and why it hasn't been done? That would at least direct the water toward . . . That's where it's going anyway is to a pipe on Clark Street, right? So it's just this very small area where it's open water and it's free to wick itself into our backyards and our basements. And then whatever goes into the pipe is, I guess,
380 reduced by a certain amount. But I do have to compliment you for the changes you have made. You have listened and I appreciate that. I'm still not convinced that it's not going to affect our property

values and our lives. So all I can do is ask questions I think are legitimate. Another question for David, what's the length of construction for this project?

385 Ben Lockwood: Conservatively, 18 months.

Suzanne Munger: At what point do you put in this drainage containment system? Even though, once you get it in, I'm not convinced it's not going to make our lives worse than better. But paved roads are the last thing that goes in. Construction is messy, it's muddy, water goes everywhere.
390 What about that 18 months? What are your plans to minimize, if not control, the water runoff during this construction phase when the impervious zones are complete and the retention ponds are not?

David Cox: The number one thing they do when they start construction is they install their erosion control measures. There is silt fence and things like that to try to prevent erosion from leaving the site. So that's step number one. The second thing they do is actually construct those stormwater management areas because they need the water to go someplace. So that is the second thing that they do.
395

Suzanne Munger: How is the water directed toward those areas?
400

David Cox: Through swales until the storm sewer can get put in. The storm sewer gets put in, in part, when you're doing earth moving. So the storm sewer gets put in way before you put in roads and things like that.

Suzanne Munger: Okay. Traffic. I don't pretend to be knowledgeable about traffic studies at all, so I don't know enough to trust or distrust Mr. Cox's traffic study. However, traffic does not exist on Burton Street just in the hours in the morning and afternoon when the school buses come. Once the school buses leave at 8:00, immediately that bus circle fills up with parents taking children to preschool and they walk from the bus circle down to the preschool. Parents coming to the school to do whatever it is they're doing there. The school has an average of about 50 to 52 students. Not every student is there every day. Some are on two-day programs, three-day programs, five-day programs.
410

Ben Lockwood: Preschool, right?
415

Suzanne Munger: Preschool. I beg your pardon. You're absolutely right, the preschool. And they are much more at risk than the school students because the school students get driven in the bus right up to the door. They are not at risk out on the road, but the preschool students are. And moms come by with two extra kids, so they are walking with three kids. Each child has to be dropped off and picked up. So each child generates two traffic trips per day between 8:30 and 9:15, between 11:00 and 12:15 and then at 2:30-3:00, then at 5:30 when the after school programs are. So there are four times during the day when a great portion of these 50 students are being dropped off or picked up. So the traffic study does not reflect that. And that is simply a characteristic of this neighborhood. It doesn't mean that traffic studies on Albany Street might be conducted differently, but I just ask you to remember that's not the only . . . The school bus traffic . . . The people that are savvy avoid Burton Street when the school buses are running because you don't want to get stuck behind a school bus. And there are ways around that. I do have a question. When will you be voting on this?
420
425

Mr. Stokes: Not tonight.

430

R. Huftalen: We will be having a discussion amongst the members of the Board. We are not going to be voting tonight.

Suzanne Munger: How will we know that?

435

440

445

450

455

R. Huftalen: We will discuss it right here in public in front of God and everybody. I shared with the members of the Board here the Full Environmental Assessment Form Part 2 that we will be reviewing to make a SEQR (State Environmental Quality Review) determination. And I would invite any members of the public to look on the DEC (Department of Environmental Conservation) website. It has a listing of the considerations and how we need to make determinations. We will be doing that with the advice and guidance of our Village Engineer. As our dialogue with Steve earlier discussed, we rely on the expertise of the Village Engineer. We are fortunate, on this Board, to have very skilled engineers and people who ask detailed questions. Recognizing your concerns, there are certain things that are more philosophical in nature than engineering in nature. And to your point about an open ditch on the other side of the road from the project, those types of considerations, some Board members may feel they're appropriate to discuss in light of current conditions that may be changed by a project. But again, whether or not this project goes forward, our sewage treatment plant needs work and help. So those types of considerations. I'm open to input from the rest of the members of the Board. We don't have a building moratorium in the Village. It is a consideration for certain. We don't want to tax our infrastructure more than necessary. At the same time, we must recognize there's inadequate infrastructure that exists in your backyard, in particular. And whether or not that's appropriate to consider in light of a project that, again, from an engineering point of view must improve post development conditions to improve upon existing conditions. I think everybody on this Board would agree that would be our mandate. Is it a fair question? It will be a point of discussion amongst the members of this Board as we consider this project.

460

465

A. Walburger: Rich, I think it's important to point out to help answer Ms. Munger's question. There's going to be a construction management plan and in that there's going to be a stormwater management plan [Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP)] that has to be filed or reviewed by the engineer, Dunkle, who will determine if the steps enumerated are adequate to maintain the conditions needed as required by the DEC and the other prevailing entities during the course of construction. I, as another fellow engineer, have faith that Mr. Cox's firm is going to lay out everything the way it should be. That's part of the process. John Dunkle will review that and make sure when we get to that stuff that it's adequate and compliant.

470

A. McDowell: We wouldn't be able to make a determination, would we, until we hear from Mr. Dunkle?

475

R. Huftalen: Yes, so we're certainly not going to make any determination tonight. And, again, we will not be in a position to review the SEQR document tonight.

480

Lisa Schaffner: I have a couple of things I'm thinking about. One is the traffic study. One day for 3-1/2 hours. I understand what your theory is and your thought process of in a residential neighborhood at 3-1/2 hours times it by maybe 7 would give you the traffic pattern. Except our neighborhood is not just a residential area. It's not a typical go to work at 7:00 and come home at 5:00. We have a factory at the top of the hill that lets out at 4:00. They have two shifts. There's also the preschool that Suzanne brought up. There is the elementary school. We also have Niagara

480 Mohawk [National Grid]. We have several businesses in the area. We have a recreational park. So
a traffic study in a residential area, I understand how you came up with your numbers. But ours is
not just a residential area. We have several other things that pertain to the traffic coming and going.
And it fluctuates. It is never a given. Some days, there could be no traffic. If the school is having
back to school night, you can't find a parking spot. You can't even drive down Burton Street
because cars are parked on either side. I would like to have a true traffic study done. The other
485 thing I was thinking about is what about the Federal wetlands? What is the setback for Federal
wetlands? What does the DEC say about how far you need to be from the Federal wetlands?

490 David Cox: Federal wetlands are governed by the Army Corps of Engineers. There is no setback
for Federal wetlands. There is a 100-foot setback for DEC wetlands, which is governed by DEC.
But Federal wetlands have a 0-foot setback.

Lisa Schaffner: So you could build right up to that wetland?

495 David Cox: Yes. You are not allowed to disturb it. You can disturb right up to it, but you can't
cross over it.

Lisa Schaffner: The drainage across the street in the Burton Street bus circle does not drain, as
Suzanne said. I have pictures of the water just running off and flooding Burton Street. They have to
actually put cones out so that the buses and the children don't walk into the water. So how are you
going to improve that? You're just going to add to it so it is going to become increasingly higher.
500

505 David Cox: So right now, when Burton Street is flooding and that's partially because this property
is contributing drainage to that during a peak rain event. So if there's nothing detaining water, all
the water is hitting at the same exact time. So the way stormwater management works is you detain
that water when it's raining and everything else is hitting those critical points. Then over time when
that 8-inch pipe has had a chance to clear and the flooding has gone down, then this pond will slowly
let out its water when the capacity of the pipe is not flooded, when there is capacity in that pipe, it
lets it out slowly over time.

510 Lisa Schaffner: My other question is . . . Drainage on that property is about 3 feet above street
level. Are you going to lower that? Because right now, it does not work. It is 4 feet above the street
level where that drainage is for that property.

515 David Cox: Depending on where you are on the frontage of the property. At the north end of the
property, the property is up above street level, probably a good 4 feet, like you said. As you get
closer to the southern property, the property is actually lower than the road, so it has a varying effect
across.

520 Lisa Schaffner: But the drainage does not. There is a swell there on the south side that water
collects into. But actual drainage where the water should run off into is above street level. That's
why it is running across the street.

525 David Cox: There is a drainage pipe on the southern side which is probably, I could look, I'm
guessing it's 2 to 3 feet below road grade, but it is buried in the weeds back here and doesn't
necessarily have great flow. It needs to be cleaned out.

530 Dianne O'Donnell: With the redesign where you placed townhome number one in the parking area and moved the road closer to Nancy Holland's property, with all the asphalt and everything there with townhome one, she will have more drainage in her yard. Her yard is actually pretty soaked most of the year. The drainage she has now, all the water coming down from the hill now, without the structures there, she has a small little river that goes to one side of her home. The other part of the flow from the top of the hill goes onto the other side of the property. The drainage goes in there and then it goes out onto the road. Her property right now, without the structure that you put there, she will have more water issues in her backyard. How is that going to help her?

535 David Cox: That's a great question. So right now, the land just slopes towards her property. So there is nothing preventing the runoff and drainage from flowing directly into her property. As part of our development, we actually will be putting in swales along the property line. So when water comes down, hits that swale and then goes around her property, it gets diverted to the stormwater management area. So we will be directing stormwater drainage away from her property and help
540 prevent her from getting additional drainage.

Dianne O'Donnell: With moving the road, how close is it to her garage?

545 David Cox: It's probably 35 feet from her garage. I'm doing an eyeball guess here.

Dianne O'Donnell: So it's now supposedly going to be sort of directly across from the Munger's, the entrance? That's not 35 feet from her garage. I want to gauge a little bit more. She is unable to come to the meetings. She is not able to leave her home.

550 Ben Lockwood: Thanks for bringing your slide rule.

David Cox: Wow! A little off. It's about 28 feet.

555 Dianne O'Donnell: 28 feet from her garage?

David Cox: Yes.

Dianne O'Donnell: And right now she has no buffer. Are you going to put a buffer there? How tall will those trees be when you plant them?

560 David Cox: Usually they're around 6 feet—5-6 feet—when you plant them. Obviously, they will grow up to be 30 or 40 feet tall.

565 Dianne O'Donnell: She is one of many neighbors who will be affected by this. She lives in her bedroom because she is bedridden. So all she is going to see now is a townhome, the lights from all the traffic coming down the road. How is that going to be . . .

570 David Cox: So luckily the buildings here will actually block, when cars are coming down the road, the headlights will actually be blocked by the buildings. So that will be blocked there. And she will be able to see the top of the townhome until these trees are able to grow up.

Dianne O'Donnell: What is the distance from the property line of my house, which is next to Mrs. Holland's house, to where you're going to start digging? What's the distance? Nancy Holland

575 is right there where you put in the new buffer. I have a small sliver right next to Nancy Holland and then there's Paul Barton's land. So all three of us will be extremely affected by how close you're digging there.

David Cox: Probably about 140-150 feet from your house.

580 Dianne O'Donnell: Are there going to be swales on Mr. Barton's property and our property? We also get run off as well.

David Cox: Yeah, there's going to be swales on both sides to really try to prevent any water from going onto adjacent properties and contain it on our site.

585 Mr. Stokes: Just informally so everybody understands the process, the Planning Board at this stage is going to be making a recommendation to the Board of Trustees. They will also make a SEQR determination. But they are not approving this particular plan as such. So if the Board of Trustees approves the change to Planned Development, it comes back to this Board for final site plan approval. So this plan can be modified in that next stage as well. What you see here is not necessarily the exact plan that would be approved, assuming we get to that point.

R. Huftalen: Thanks, Jim.

595 Tim Byrnes: Earlier tonight you were asking about the buffer between Emick Lane and the proposed development. Could we get an answer from the developer or the engineer, whomever is responsible, is it your intention to clear cut and then plant new 6-foot trees?

Ben Lockwood: Absolutely not.

600 Tim Byrnes: Or are you going to retain? Because you were asked specifically if you were going to keep the heavy vegetation and existing taller trees. It was not answered with a yes or no. It was *we will have a buffer*. Is it going to be the existing buffer?

605 David Cox: Yes.

Tim Byrnes: You're not going to touch the existing buffer?

610 Ben Lockwood: There will be an existing buffer. But I'll answer for Dave. Until we get final site plan approval, exactly where everything goes . . . Can I tell you this tree is going to stay, that one's going to go? No, but it's in our best interest to keep as many mature trees on that site as possible. That's the God's honest answer. Can I definitively tell you what's going to go down right now? No, but we've already made a lot of changes. We hear you. We want to save as much as we can. It's expensive to cut down the trees and we don't have any interest unless a road runs right through it or a building.

620 Tim Byrnes: This question is probably for the Board and you may not have the answer. Assuming the project goes through, at what point will you or somebody discuss stop signs and speed limits for the connection? I live on a corner. You can't make that a continuous road. Who is responsible for that aspect?

R. Huftalen: The site plan review would have details of what the configuration of the roads would be as per the requirements of the Village Code and recommendations of the Village Engineer.

625 Mr. Stokes: A speed limit would be up to the Village Board. It's either going to be 30 or 25. Those are the only two options.

Tim Byrnes: I'm more worried about stop signs than I am the speed limit.

630 Mr. Stokes: That's up to the Village Board as well. But they would propose it on their site plan and it's most likely what it'll end up with.

635 Bob Butterworth: I agree with most people that they feel that you have listened. But there are a couple of questions from this Board that we haven't received yet. Could you put up the map that shows the original development? Where would the sewer line go from this development? Not storm—sanitary.

640 David Cox: Sanitary sewer goes down the road and then ties into the sanitary sewer on Burton Street. Then it goes up towards Clark, and then down Clark.

Bob Butterworth: As of today, I talked to Jim Cunningham. He said no evaluation has been made of the Clark sewer to take this additional flow at this point in time. So I don't know if it's going to be done or not. But I think that's important to know. My understanding is that it is an 8-inch line.

645 David Cox: Yes.

650 Bob Butterworth: And now we're adding an increased density flow to that line. Can it take it or not? And if that's creating a problem with that line because it's lacking capacity—or almost at capacity—and you bring it over capacity, who would replace that line? If it's a Village sewer, we all pay for that replacement.

655 David Cox: One of the things I did do was I looked at those sanitary sewer record maps to see exactly where all the sanitary sewers are and where they go. And I looked at what are all the homes and properties that flow into those sanitary sewers. And then I used the standard rates for how much single family homes contribute, school, businesses, and did a calculation of how much sanitary sewer capacity there is.

Bob Butterworth: So capacity?

660 David Cox: Right.

Bob Butterworth: But not of that pipe with conditions of infiltration and inflow?

665 David Cox: Right. The one thing I cannot calculate is infiltration because that's a huge unknown. The only way you can calculate that is with flow meters. Which is what Jim Cunningham was suggesting was where to place the flow meters.

Bob Butterworth: As of today, he doesn't have an answer who's going to do it or when.

670 R. Huftalen: Those are the emails I was referring to that I was cc'd on late last week and Bill Carr's intention is to look into it on Tuesday—tomorrow. So there are questions about who owns flow meters. It's under active investigation, I can assure you.

675 Bob Butterworth: The request I would make is that it be done during a rain event when the school is in session. You want to find out if, for example, some manhole pops, they consider that a sanitary sewer overflow. Then the regulatory people—the DEC—get involved. Like I said, it's nice what you have done so far in terms of the change and listening. I think you can put in bigger trees. That line is a critical issue. Plus the other things I've asked about: *How can the treatment plant handle it? What's the impact on the treatment plant? You don't know what's going to happen with the*
680 *brewery, so what is the impact there?* I think everybody knows the treatment plant needs some work.

R. Huftalen: I'm putting a couple of extra stars next to storm sewer for extra scrutiny.

685 Bob Butterworth: Sanitary sewer. The storm sewer got hit hard enough.

R. Huftalen: I misspoke. Sorry.

690 David Cox: I realize when I look at flow, not taking into account I&I (infiltration and inflow), but just taking into account flow from actual toilets and uses that the Clark Street was only about a third full. It still had two-thirds capacity left.

695 Bob Butterworth: Remember what you said at the first meeting. Typically, the treatment plant flow peaks at a ratio of 6:1.

David Cox: It peaks at 4:1. That's with the peak flow of 4:1. That's with using those peak factors.

700 Justin Fuchs: I'm going to try to agree with your request of not trying to hit on things that have already been hit on, but I haven't had answers from a couple of them. The first one is the groundwater tests. You said that you did the six different locations with the permeable test, but how about digging down and finding out if there's groundwater already on this land? That if you start digging and all of a sudden you run into it and now you have free flowing water? Has that been brought into consideration?

705 David Cox: We have not done a geo tech on the project yet. Geo tech gets done prior to construction. But if there is any groundwater, for instance, if there are any basements or you hit groundwater, you've got to waterproof the building and put in foundation drains to collect that and take it to the storm sewer.

710 Justin Fuchs: And then it's more water to deal with whatever we've talked about, which I'm not going to hit on. But I thank you. All I'm going to say about the traffic study is that I agree that people would be more comfortable if a different company did it. I'm not saying that you fudged the numbers or anything like that. I'm not saying that. And you went out there and thank you for doing that. But I agree that there needs to be some more time involved in that, like a whole day or putting
715 those little speed bump things out that count the cars. I don't think 3-1/2 hours is a really good measurement to do that. Talking about the roads: The new one, you don't have to put up the map,

but the turn from the hammerhead off of Emick into the new street, I believe that curve, it has been brought to my attention that it's not wide enough for fire trucks. Is that a correct statement?

720 David Cox: Emick Lane?

Justin Fuchs: Nope. So coming from Emick down . . . That curve right there. Correct.

725 David Cox: A fire truck can navigate that. I think the one comment that Bill Carr had was that we put a concrete sidewalk around the back of the building for fire and emergency access, he wanted that increased from 10 feet to 20 feet.

Justin Fuchs: The size of the lots on your plan down here for single family, what are the sizes of those lots?

730

David Cox: They have to be at least 10,000 square feet per the zoning code.

Justin Fuchs: Do those lots take into consideration that wetland where you can't build on them?

735 David Cox: Yes. So this separate little corner right there, there is wetland there.

Justin Fuchs: I'm not very certain with the taxes and whatnot, but you will get tax breaks, obviously, for building this now. I think I would talk for everybody that I would rather see 26 to 30 single family homes come in here that are going to pay next to full taxes; school, property. Yes, they are STAR exempt, but I would much rather see that to boost our community with taxes than something like this come in here and get tax breaks. We're trying to revitalize this village. And I'm going to go ahead and say that again. I agree that Cazenovia needs something like this for seniors. I just don't think this area is the correct place to do it. So, in closing, again, I urge you guys to look at different lots and take that into consideration for the Board.

745

(Applause from the audience.)

R. Huftalen: Do you care to comment on the tax situation?

750 Ben Lockwood: We will pay the taxes per the statute that is on the books. It will be a contributing thing. If anyone built 31, yeah, that's probably going to pay more taxes just because it's a much more intense use of this land than what we're proposing—or even the 26.

755 R. Huftalen: This is beyond our purview as the Planning Board. Maybe it's my misconception, but there's no PILOT (payment in lieu of taxes) arrangement. In other words, your property and school taxes will be paid on the full assessed value of this project. Is that a fair statement?

Ben Lockwood: It will be paid on the statute of the State based upon the income that the property derives.

760

Jerry Munger: Just to add some information, I looked at the tax rolls for Burton Street, Evergreen Lane and Emick. There are 56 properties, not including undeveloped land. And that represents almost \$10 million worth of assessed value—9.9 million. And I used a figure of 18. If 18 homes were developed in there at the same rate, it would generate about \$2.8 million of assessed value

765 for that property. Ben can comment further, but my understanding is that the tax base for the property will be based on not gross income, but some formula of net income. Almost like a [unintelligible] earnings. So maybe you can comment on what you think that number might be compared to say, close to \$3 million for the property values if it were developed as the same thing.

770 Ben Lockwood: I don't have a good answer for you, quite frankly. I'd have to do some math. We would also have to work with the assessor on that. And I haven't gotten to that part. It is not particularly germane to a PDD (Planned Development District) decision.

Dianne O'Donnell: On the townhomes, how many bedrooms will be in each unit?

775 Ben Lockwood: Three.

Dianne O'Donnell: Three bedrooms per unit. And what is the square footage of the unit?

780 Ben Lockwood: Between 950-1,100, I believe.

Dianne O'Donnell: Was there a determination if you're going to provide storage in the basements?

785 Ben Lockwood: We can look at the basements and then also based on some of the comments from last time, we can put on an accessory type . . . I don't want to call it a shed, but it'll be attached. Someone made the point at the last meeting—bikes and things like that—things people really don't want to look at and don't want them strewn about. We can put that on the back as well. Just incorporate it into the storage space.

790 Dianne O'Donnell: I just want to say something in closing. Housing Visions and Passero Associates have done a tasteful job with the design of their proposal. They have listened to our many concerns regarding the design and have made some changes to address our design concerns. However, they have not been hearing one of our biggest concerns, which is the location of this project with all the risks, the sewer, water, and drainage. The most logical location for senior housing is on one of the properties available off Route 20 with conveniences and amenities and true walking distance for our seniors, as well as senior neighbors in the apartments on Carriage Lane. One of the properties is within financial reach for Housing Visions, considering the multimillion dollar projects they have designed and developed in other cities. Another option could have been a revitalization project for the Emerald Court Apartments on 24 Nelson Street, which I believe is already designated for persons 62 years and older. Instead, the focus has been on this one property. And it seems the Burton Street location actually meets the needs of Housing Visions rather than meeting the needs of our seniors. Our seniors are the ones on which we should be focusing. Our seniors are the ones who need to be accommodated. It seems this affordable housing project is being pushed and forced on Burton Street so that Housing Visions can get the cheapest property deal and have time to apply for their grant in December. The zone change proposal from R-10 to PDD on Burton Street to accommodate Housing Visions is not only the wrong location for their affordable housing project, it also sets a precedent for any other available property in the small neighborhoods in our Village. Change is inevitable, but this is the type of change that can make or break a community. To the Board, before you make your official decision regarding this project on the Burton Street location, please truly hear the concerns of over 100 surrounding neighbors and those of other Cazenovia residents. Please fully examine the risks of this development on Burton Street. We are not here just because this project would be in our backyards. This affordable housing project on

815 the Burton Street location would affect the entire Cazenovia community. Please help to preserve the quiet, thriving Burton Street neighborhood. Please help to preserve the small town character that attracted and drew us all to Cazenovia.

Bruce Kaiser: Could you go back to the most recent drawing? When were those submitted? It wasn't this past Friday?

820 David Cox: I submitted additional copies this past Friday.

825 Bruce Kaiser: When I contacted the Village last Tuesday, after the last Village meeting last Monday, I was told there were no new submissions. Everything is here. That drawing wasn't in that box until Friday morning when I actually received a phone call saying: *It's here. Come on down, Bruce, you might want to take a look at it.* So I did. And there was a cover letter. So I am just concerned about the lateness of it—Friday morning for today. And I don't think the offices were open today because it's a holiday. So people really didn't have a chance to see that drawing unless they happened to go down there Friday. That being said, questions that I have relate to the impervious surface, the road location. Can you identify on that drawing where there would be storm drains to receive water as it is moving down that street? I don't see it located.

830

835 David Cox: Sure. The storm drains are located about every 250 feet. So there will be a storm drain on both sides of the curve. And then there will be additional storm drains in these parking lot areas, and in this parking lot area here for the senior building. But in the road, at about every 250 feet.

Bruce Kaiser: Will there be any at the intersection of Burton Street?

840 David Cox: Yes. We have created a low point here. Burton Street is up here. We come down the hill and . . .

Bruce Kaiser: Is it all going to fall south?

845 David Cox: Right. And then we create a little low point. And those catch basins will be in that low point. So that we're not forcing water onto Burton Street.

Bruce Kaiser: And a question was raised earlier about emergency vehicles coming around Emick Lane. There are two curves. That's the second curve. The first curve . . . go up . . . There you go. Those are appropriate size to handle a 53- to 60-foot fire engine?

850 David Cox: Yes, a fire truck can make those turns.

Bruce Kaiser: You mentioned that you had a discussion with Mr. Carr about that. When was that discussion?

855 David Cox: Last week I had a discussion with Mr. Carr. That's when he brought up the sidewalk around the building.

860 Bruce Kaiser: I had a discussion with Mr. Carr when I left this building about noon or 12:15 this past Friday. And he pointed out to me that he was getting in touch with you because the two curves that I'm addressing there were not wide enough for a fire truck to get around.

865 A. Walburger: Well, one thing we've asked for in the past, and which certainly we will be asking for when we get to the point of full site plan, is a complete diagram/turning drawing, which shows the turning radius of the appropriate size emergency vehicles. We asked for that at Aldi. We have asked for that at the brewery. We have asked for that on numerous occasions. And that will be a record drawing for review.

Bruce Kaiser: These people need to be sure about that information.

870 A. Walburger: That is how we make sure.

R. Huftalen: There are people that make the determination as to whether the site plan is accurate or not.

875 David Cox: This internal radius that has a 25-foot radius. Almost all these other roads are closer to a 10-foot radius. So this is actually a greater radius than the majority of roads they would have to turn onto to actually get to this property.

880 Mr. Stokes: Just for the Board, I communicated directly with Mr. Carr and asked specifically for fire department comments. The only comment that I received was about the 20-foot emergency access behind the building.

885 Frank Snider: Anybody working on the electrical going in now for that operation? This is the Indy 500 going up there. It is way out of control. I would hope you would put in some kind of stop or slow blinking lights coming into Emick.

David Cox: That would be up to the Village if they wanted to do that. It is the Village right-of-way if they wanted to install something on Emick Lane. You could approach them about that.

890 Frank Snider: You've got a lot of children walking across that street now and there are more as time goes on. Give it some thought and make sure it's in there somewhere.

895 Suzanne Munger: This might be the last chance we get to speak. This is to the Board. You have heard a lot of comments. We have had lots of questions. I give Housing Visions and Mr. Cox credit for addressing many of those questions. But some of them simply cannot be ameliorated. The storm sewers—the amount of water that comes out into the air—is going to remain the same. It all has to be dealt with. It's all going to be directed under Burton Street into our backyard and into this barely adequate pipe, which is going to have 49 households added to it. So that's going to increase the amount by 50% of the households that are on Emick, Burton and Evergreen. They are smaller in square footage, but in terms of the number of people in them. Everybody takes showers. Everybody does laundry. Everybody maybe waters their lawn. So the amount of sanitary sewer water, in addition to storm sewer water, is going to be increased. Am I reasonable to say almost 50%?

905 David Cox: For the whole area it is not 50%.

Suzanne Munger: We have 100 households and now you are adding 49 households.

David Cox: For one, the school is in the . . .

910 Suzanne Munger: I'm talking about houses. The number of houses on Emick, Evergreen, and Burton are 100 right now—individual households. I'm not talking about the school. You are proposing to add 49, which is 49% more than we have. That's going to be 49% more sanitary sewer capacity—not capacity—load is likely to increase by 49%. Am I way out of line here?

915 David Cox: I'm saying, all of the flow that is going to those sanitary pipes is not just single family homes. There's Continental Cordage. There's a school. There are other users.

Suzanne Munger: That's true. Okay, you're right, thank you for pointing that out. But, as Mr. Cunningham said when he was here, the treatment plant is at or near capacity. The
920 plant is going to have to be upgraded. Is this the time to consider adding a development like this that may not only push us over the top, but create some kind of a crisis, that nobody wants to think about? You're not going to answer that, okay. But I would ask the Board to remember what I believe your function is and that is to pay attention to the Comprehensive Plan which addresses situations like this. Pay attention to the current zoning, which certainly has something to say about
925 things like this. And please pay attention to the people of the community who have spoken out. We are the ones who have to live there. We all live in the community, but this is really a big impact on our neighborhood and I would just ask you to consider that. Thank you.

930 R. Huftalen: Are there any other comments? I don't want to close the public hearing if people still have items left to say.

Helen Byrnes: Will we ever be able to speak again? You're not going to vote on the PDD now. But then, if you do, and I don't know which way you're going to go with this, will the public be able to speak to this development if you do vote to change it, again, like about the roads, the concerns.
935

R. Huftalen: We'll accept written comments for sure. And if there's a substantial change to the site plan, there's a potential for us opening up a public hearing again. It may happen. Probably not likely.

940 Mr. Stokes: But you have to remember too, the next step in the process that I referred to earlier. Even if we get through this phase, this comes back to the Planning Board for final site plan approval where those kinds of issues can be addressed again. *How close is this? How tall are the trees?* That type of thing.

945 Helen Byrnes: And people can talk? We can talk?

Mr. Stokes: It is up to the Chair.

950 R. Huftalen: There are cases that we accept public comment on site plan review without necessarily opening a formal public hearing. It is not necessarily required by the Code, but we are your community servants up here.

955 Helen Byrnes: Talking about all of this and it has not even been rezoned. The first issue should have been the zoning. We are talking about the development. We first started like that and we think there could be a better place in a different area of our community. It is kind of mixed up the way we have been doing this.

960 R. Huftalen: A little bit of a chicken and egg situation when we make a recommendation on a zone change to the Village Board—all the while with a specific site plan in mind, concurrent review—then the site plan actually gets reviewed by the Planning Board.

Mr. Stokes: Jim, do you have anything to amplify that? (Mr. Stokes gestured no.)

965 Bob Butterworth: How would we get a copy of the flows and loads that were done for this project?

Mr. Stokes: Anything that gets filed is a public record. Once we have it, it goes into the clerk's office.

970 R. Huftalen: There's a box here.

Dianne O'Donnell: At the Village Board meeting last week, Mayor Wheeler said we were able to comment through October 28.

975 R. Huftalen: Yes, for sure. We will accept written comments on this and the ongoing site plan review.

Dianne O'Donnell: So if comments are still available through October 28, will your decision be made before that?

980 R. Huftalen: Quite unlikely.

Mr. Stokes: Why don't we get the public hearing closed?

985 R. Huftalen: Are there any other comments for the public hearing? Then we can talk about procedure. I'll make a motion to close the public hearing.

A. McDowell: I second.

990 R. Huftalen: All in favor?

D. Raleigh: Aye.

A. Walburger: Aye.

995 A. McDowell: Aye.

R. Huftalen: Aye.

1000 S. McEntee: Aye. (The motion carried with 5 in favor, 0 opposed.)

R. Huftalen: From a procedural point of view, after speaking with the mayor and the applicant, the Village Board meets again on November 4, and they asked if we would consider holding a meeting sometime after October 28 to review SEQR and potentially make a recommendation for them to consider at their next Village Board meeting.

- 1005 Bob Butterworth: Rich, can you speak up just a little bit? We can't hear.
- R. Huftalen: As I was saying to the members of the Board, the applicant and the Village Board have asked if we would hold a special meeting to make our SEQR determination and to make a
1010 recommendation to the Village Board for them to consider at their next meeting, which is November 4.
- S. McEntee: That recommendation being on the change in zoning?
- 1015 R. Huftalen: Yes. On the change in zoning. Beginning October 28, I was going to ask the members here to consider their schedules and see if Monday, Tuesday, or Wednesday of that week might be available. I don't know, I thought maybe Jim didn't have availability.
- Mr. Stokes: If you are going to take comments through October 28, you really should not meet that
1020 night.
- S. McEntee: Do we have assurance that we will hear everything back that we need to have from John Dunkle?
- 1025 Mr. Stokes: It really depends on the applicant. I think the applicant has an interest in submitting the information. And if they get it in in a timely fashion, John Dunkle will review it. If he doesn't, that is the applicant's fault.
- R. Huftalen: So, again, I've been in touch with John Dunkle and told him there are specific areas of
1030 great concern that we want to make sure he has given full attention to and getting the required information from the applicant. And he said he thought it would be reasonable to be able to get that done and have a couple weeks to get information back to us. And if there wasn't, as Jim said, I think that would . . . I wouldn't want to schedule the next meeting if I didn't think we would have that information available.
- 1035 A. McDowell: John hasn't gotten all the information?
- R. Huftalen: Well, I think that the applicant has made modifications to the application and the site
1040 plan. So John, instead of using his resources to review every stage, has asked that once we get to a point where the applicant says this is the proposal we want you to consider, then he will do his work. That being said, he has looked at various aspects of the project and is quite familiar with the general scope. He needs and wants input from us as to what areas and specific concerns we have and want him to drill down further on and part of the reason for us having this discussion here tonight.
- 1045 A. McDowell: So we are already saying that the stormwater and drainage and sanitary drainage and the traffic are big areas.
- S. McEntee: I would also be interested in his assessment of the perc tests. We got the data. We got
1050 the analysis. I don't know if that's acceptable or not.
- Mr. Stokes: John is already addressing all of those issues, I can assure you. He had identified those even before the public hearing.

1055 R. Huftalen: So I propose reconvening on the 29th or the 30th.

A. Walburger: I'm going to put my hat in for the 30th.

S. McEntee: The 30th works for me.

1060 Ms. Westcott: I can come on the 30th.

1065 R. Huftalen: I will schedule our next meeting for October 30 at 7:00 p.m. It will be open to the public. I just want to make sure we get those areas of focus to John tomorrow and invite any members of the Board to reach out to John directly and engage him in discussion on any areas of concern you have.

1070 Mr. Stokes: It would probably be easier for John if the members relayed their comments through you. That way, he's not getting as many phone calls. As I said, I know he is on top of all of those issues that you identified.

1075 R. Huftalen: Good. Again, at our next meeting, we will be using the SEQR Part 2 form and review those questions together as a Board. I suspect if there are areas we don't have consensus on an answer, we will record the various opinions on the answer form. We will ask Jim to help us with how best to proceed in making a recommendation to the Village Board. Is that fair enough, Jim, to get your help on that? Are there any other questions or suggestions from members of the Board?

D. Raleigh: Did you say the SEQR information was on the DEC website?

1080 R. Huftalen: I think I forwarded you an email at our last meeting. It has the 10-page long form. That is Part 2. The applicant filled out Part 1. We would review their responses. I don't know if you [Mr. Cox] need to review that and make sure it conforms to the revised project. You will want to make certain we have the latest version.

1085 David Cox: Yes, I will go through that.

R. Huftalen: We will review their answers and go through SEQR Part 2 together, make a SEQR determination, and then discuss and proceed from there.

* * * * *

1090 R. Huftalen asked for 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 5 in favor, 0 opposed. The meeting was adjourned at 8:32 p.m.

1095 Respectfully submitted,

1100 Marlene A. Westcott
Recording Secretary