

Town of Clarence
Planning Board Minutes
Wednesday August 6, 2008

Work Session 6:30 pm

Roll Call
Update on Pending Items
Zoning Reports
Committee Reports
Miscellaneous

Agenda Items 7:30 pm

Approval of Minutes

Item 1

Master Plan Amendments
Transit Road Corridor

Recommendation on Master Plan 2015
Amendments.

Item 2

Chalets at Red Rock
Traditional Neighborhood District

Requests Concept Approval for six (6) additional
units at 8880 Main Street.

Item 3

Waterford Village
PURD

Requests a Site Plan Approval for Waterford
Landings, Campus and Greens.

Item 4

Stone Ridge Estates/Joe Frey
Agricultural Rural Residential

Requests Preliminary Concept Plan Review for a
major subdivision at Stage and Ransom.

Chairman Gerald Drinkard called the meeting to order at 7:35 p.m. Councilman Peter DiCostanzo led the pledge to the flag.

Planning Board Members Present:

Chairman Gerald Drinkard
2nd Vice Chairman Timothy Pazda
Richard Bigler

1st Vice Chairperson Wendy Salvati
Jeffrey Grenzebach
Gregory Todaro

Planning Board Members Absent:

George Van Nest

Albert Schultz

Other Town Officials Present:

Director of Community Development James Callahan
 Planner Brad Packard
 Councilman Peter DiCostanzo
 Deputy Town Attorney David Donohue
 Supervisor Scott Bylewski

Other Interested Parties Present:

M. Williams	Scott Snyder
Carol Minnick	Tony Russo
Janice Armitage	Robert Sackett
Carol Russell	Dolores Liebner
Joe Meyers	Scott Glassman
Fred Ehlert	Ron Norton
Douglas Klotzbach	Paul Stevens
Michael Metzger	

Chairman Drinkard explains that with the absence of two (2) Planning Board members the alternate member, Gregory Todaro, will be participating in all discussions and voting on all agenda items this evening.

Motion by Timothy Pazda, seconded by Richard Bigler, to **approve** the minutes of the meeting held on July 2, 2008, as written with the following corrections:

- Page 93, third paragraph from the bottom shall read, "...if the road ran through the subdivision the number of lots would **decrease**."
- Page 94, second paragraph, fourth line shall read, "Mr. Hopkins said the only **way** to do this is to switch back to an Open Space Design."
- Page 94, second last paragraph, third sentence shall read, "...that was built across **from** Gott Creek..."
- Page 95, third paragraph from the bottom shall read, "Mr. Schultz refers to the two (2) **lots** at the south portion of the project..."

Gregory Todaro	Aye	Richard Bigler	Aye
Jeffrey Grenzebach	Abstain	Timothy Pazda	Aye
Wendy Salvati	Abstain	Gerald Drinkard	Aye

MOTION CARRIED.

Chairman Drinkard explains that the Planning Board is a recommending body that may vote to refer agenda items to other committees such as the TEQR Committee, Fire Advisory and Traffic Safety for their study and comment. The Planning Board may vote to recommend an action to the Town Board with conditions. The Town Board is the governing body and as such will have the final vote on all items. The procedure for agenda items starts with Jim Callahan introducing and providing a brief history of the item. The applicant will then have the opportunity to speak on the project. The Planning Board members will then have an opportunity to ask questions. The public will be offered the opportunity to speak on the subject; all commentary will be addressed to the Planning Board and will

be limited to three (3) minutes. The applicant will then have the opportunity to respond to the public comment. A motion will be called for with a roll call vote.

Item 1

Master Plan Amendments
Transit Road Corridor

Recommendation on Master Plan 2015
Amendments.

DISCUSSION:

Jim Callahan provides history on agenda item #1. The annual Public Hearing on the Master Plan 2015 was held on February 27, 2008. Several requests were made to consider amendments to the Master Plan including two (2) requests along the Transit Road Corridor to extend Commercial Zones deeper to allow potential projects. The Town Board referred the request to the Planning Board for consideration per the Master Plan 2015 requirements. The Planning Board analyzed the entire Transit Road Corridor as part of their task and identified a recommendation to down zone from Major Arterial to Commercial and Restricted Business the areas north of Roll Road per the developed study. A Negative Declaration under SEQRA was issued by the Town Board upon recommendation from the Town Environmental Quality Review (TEQR) Committee on the recommended plan from the Planning Board. The proposed Master Plan 2015 amendments are up for final recommendation to the Town Board.

ACTION:

Motion by Gerald Drinkard, seconded by Jeffrey Grenzebach, to correct the April 16, 2008 Planning Board minutes as follows:

-Page 47, last paragraph shall read...(the parcel just north of the NOCO station and car wash at **Clarence Center Road.**)

Gregory Todaro	Aye	Richard Bigler	Aye
Jeffrey Grenzebach	Aye	Timothy Pazda	Aye
Wendy Salvati	Aye	Gerald Drinkard	Aye

MOTION CARRIED.

Chairman Drinkard explains that the annual review of the Master Plan historically is held in February, this year it was held on February 27, 2008. Individuals are given the opportunity to make requests to change the Master Plan. The guidelines are spelled out in the Master Plan on page 39; the town is currently going through the procedure. The changes that were discussed extended from Wehrle Drive to County Road; the Planning Board reviewed this entire corridor when it reviewed specific projects rather than focusing on a single project. It was determined that the corridor from Wehrle Drive to Greiner Road, which is currently zoned Major Arterial, should remain Major Arterial. The section of Transit Road going from Greiner Road to Roll Road is currently zoned Major Arterial and the proposal is to keep it Major Arterial as many of the current uses are appropriately zoned. There are three (3) segments within the stretch of Transit Road from Roll Road to County Road. The first segment is from Roll Road to Clarence Center Road; it was recommended that this corridor be down zoned from Major Arterial to Commercial. The second segment runs from Clarence Center Road to Miles Road; since much of the use in this corridor is Restricted Business, the proposal is to down zone to Restricted Business. The segment from Miles Road to County Road has been reviewed

and the proposal is to recommend this segment be zoned Commercial. These three (3) corridors are what the Planning Board is addressing this evening. Chairman Drinkard said the presentation for the request was held on February 27, 2008, the Planning Board deliberated on March 5, 2008, April 2, 2008 and April 16, 2008. The issue has also been studied at Executive Session.

ACTION:

Motion by Gerald Drinkard, seconded by Jeffrey Grenzebach, to **recommend** the following:

- Down zone from Major Arterial to Commercial the current Major Arterial zone along Transit Road between Roll Road and Clarence Center Road commercial zoning and maintain the current depth of all parcels.
- Down zone from Major Arterial to Restricted Business the current Major Arterial zone along Transit Road between the parcel beginning with #43.17-5-1.1 and extending north to Miles Road. The current depth of the Major Arterial zone could be maintained after the down zone to what it is currently with the exception being parcel #43.17-5-1.1 where the depth would be extended to 1,130’.
- Down zone from Major Arterial to Commercial the current Major Arterial zone along Transit Road between Miles Road and extending north to County Road. The current depth of all parcels in this corridor will be maintained after down zoning to Commercial with the exception being parcel #43.05-2-1.1 which would be extended to a depth of 1,050’.

ON THE QUESTION:

Chairman Drinkard clarifies that any future projects will need to go through the SEQRA process to be reviewed under the SEQRA regulations and details.

Jim Callahan refers to the map that reflects the stretch between Miles Road and County Road, Transit Road Corridor Section D, and clarifies that it is reflected that the zoning would extend back on parcel #43.05-2-1.1, but it is not the entire depth that is aligned matching the current Major Arterial line.

Gregory Todaro	Aye	Richard Bigler	Aye
Jeffrey Grenzebach	Aye	Timothy Pazda	Aye
Wendy Salvati	Aye	Gerald Drinkard	Aye

MOTION CARRIED.

Item 2

Chalets at Red Rock
Traditional Neighborhood District

Requests Concept Approval for six (6) additional units at 8880 Main Street.

DISCUSSION:

Jim Callahan provides the background on the project. It is located on the north side of Main Street, west of Shimerville Road. The project is located in the Traditional Neighborhood District (TND) and extends into the Residential Single-Family Zone. A variance was granted by the Zoning Board of Appeals to allow for additional units to extend into the Residential Single-Family Zone. The

application was tabled at a previous meeting pending a review by the Fire Advisory Board. The applicant is present seeking Concept Approval.

Douglas Klotzbach, of K2 Architecture, is representing the applicant. Paul Stevens is the owner of the project and is present as well. The only item left to be addressed is the hydrant request. Mr. Klotzbach has a response from Scott Switzer, chief of the Harris Hill Fire Co. The response is on file. It was estimated at \$40,000 to supply a six inch (6") line for an Erie County water connection across the road; this would have prevented the project from going forward. With regards to the 400' and 600' requirement and after reviewing Section 508.11, Required Water Supply, of the NYS Fire Code, Mr. Klotzbach said there is an exception to the code which pertains to detached one (1) and (2) family dwellings constructed in accordance to residential code. He has discussed this with David Metzger and Tim Lavocat in making sure the requirements were satisfied. Mr. Klotzbach said if there was a fire at the site Main Street would have to be shut down.

Wendy Salvati requests as much vegetation as possible be preserved, the applicant agrees.

Mr. Stevens agrees to stripe the bottleneck area so it won't be filled with parking.

The footprint for the first floor of the additional units shows 600 square feet, as previously requested.

ACTION:

Motion by Wendy Salvati, seconded by Timothy Pazda, to **recommend** Concept Approval for six (6) additional units as proposed at the property located at 8880 Main Street with the following conditions:

- Payment of proper fees.
- The building will be sized to comply with the Traditional Neighborhood District Code and will be a minimum of 600 square feet on the first floor.
- The woodland on the east side of the property will remain in tact and undisturbed, it will be yellow taped during construction.

ON THE QUESTION:

Wendy Salvati suggests adding the condition that fire access be delineated in the bottleneck area as discussed. Timothy Pazda agrees to include this in his motion.

Gregory Todaro	Aye	Richard Bigler	Aye
Jeffrey Grenzebach	Aye	Timothy Pazda	Aye
Wendy Salvati	Aye	Gerald Drinkard	Aye

MOTION CARRIED.

Item 3

Waterford Village
PURD

Requests a Site Plan Approval for Waterford
Landings, Campus and Greens.

DISCUSSION:

Jim Callahan provides the history on the project. It is located on the north side of Roll Road between Shimerville Road and Thompson Road. Development Plan Approval for the Waterford Greens, Landings and Campus was amended on August 13, 2003. Under PURD, Final Site Plan approval is the final step in the review process. As established in the Development Plan approval the number of units, the design layout, access roads and building setbacks have been established. The applicant is seeking site plan approval for the Greens, Landings and Campus which will include public road dedication of approximately 2,000 linear feet of Dana Marie Parkway with the remainder roads being private with a Home Owners Association.

Michael Metzger, of Metzger Civil Engineering, is representing the applicant. Mr. Metzger explains that the plan that is presented matches the plan that was approved at Concept. He has met with involved agencies and the plan has been approved by all of them.

Chairman Drinkard explains that the file has been reviewed and the Executive board has drawn up a document in order to guide and organize questions and answers regarding the project, the document is dated August 6, 2008. He also refers to a document dated December 10, 2003 entitled Waterford PURD Zoning Standards, this will also aide in the review process of the proposal. Both documents are on file. The December 10, 2003 document is what was agreed to at the Town Board meeting and includes specifications for lots, side setbacks, footprints of homes on lots and landscaping just to name a few. Wendy Salvati said the original PURD zoning will also be referenced when reviewing this project.

Chairman Drinkard asked if the Greens, which are patio homes, the Landings, which are town homes and the Campus, community services will all be done at once. Mr. Metzger said yes. The buildings may not be done all at once but on a "when they are rented" basis. Chairman Drinkard asked the applicant to provide an end date; when will the project be fully built-out. Jim Callahan will research an appropriate end date.

Mr. Metzger clarifies that the Landings and Green will be built first and the Campus will be built as needed to support the infrastructure of the Landings and the Greens. There are no strict plans for any users of the Campus at this point; however Mr. Metzger refers to a list of commercial uses listed on the site plan: 4 to 6 buildings, 57,000 gross square feet maximum, including community support buildings (Greens village house and school house community center), private roads and utilities, area 7.33 acres, business and community support uses such as but not limited to daycare, physical therapy, doctor office, dentist office, law office, barber shop, beauty salon, ice cream parlor, pizza shop, travel agent, dry cleaner, community centers, etc. Mr. Metzger said this information is not conclusive but provides a "flavor" for what can be done in the Campus. The Planning Board does not have a copy of the print Mr. Metzger read from; Chairman Drinkard said a full size copy of the current print will need to be submitted. Mr. Metzger agrees to submit one.

Jim Callahan clarifies that engineering approval identifies specifically that the 52,000 square foot figure is what is approved for that campus.

Chairman Drinkard said each business as it is proposed for the site will have to obtain Town Board Approval. Wendy Salvati explains that the PURD is somewhat specific in indicating that commercial uses that are included as part of the PURD have to service that PURD. She voices her concern and said more information is needed for what will go in the community service area so the Town can make sure it is in keeping with the PURD. She is concerned with how this will be managed in the future; this is why Town Board approval is required for each business.

Chairman Drinkard said a drive-through business would be prohibited. Building and home elevations are required for site plan approval, they need to be submitted. The print needs to show the location of the dumpster. Jeffrey Grenzebach said a complete lighting plan needs to be submitted. Chairman Drinkard asked how the applicant plans to phase the project.

The Town Engineer will review the issue of sewers and taps.

Areas of discussion that also need to be addressed include roads with respect to public verses private, connectivity, street lighting plan and pond maintenance/ownership. Timothy Pazda points out that the project is now under the direction of Patrick Homes, Mr. Metzger concurs. Chairman Drinkard said the Planning Board is very concerned with walkability within the development; there must be sidewalks on every street. Timothy Pazda clarifies that a sidewalk should not be on the main drag. Mr. Metzger will look into the sidewalk issue.

Wendy Salvati said it appears that the number of parking spaces is maxed out at the site. She suggests looking at the possibility of eliminating one (1) row of parking on one of the outer most sides of the project in order to buffer the town houses. Timothy Pazda said the possibility of banking both sides of the outer most parking all the way down was also discussed; this would allow an opportunity for an alley way to feed the town houses on the right side of the site. Chairman Drinkard voices his concern with the driveways dumping out into a parking lot. Wendy Salvati would like to see parking on both sides eliminated to create a greater buffer.

Deputy Town Attorney David Donohue asked if the applicant planned a buffer between the parking lot and the town houses. Mr. Metzger said there is nothing built into the plan. Chairman Drinkard said the Landscape Committee will look for landscaping to buffer this area.

Chairman Drinkard said the yield of the full subdivision is 379 plus/minus 10%. SEQRA was done on 500 units.

Timothy Pazda said the print identifies two (2) areas that will connect into the Land Conservancy area. The Planning Board discussed the possibility of some walking trails if the Conservancy will allow them; this needs to be further researched. Timothy Pazda asked if a resident of another part of the Town can drive on the private drive and take a walk on the Land Conservancy area. The representatives that previously met with the Executive Committee would like to restrict out the public. Chairman Drinkard said the intent of a conservation easement is to provide green space to the public. Deputy Town Attorney David Donohue said there could be other access points such as on Roll Road. There are areas around the PURD that are town owned parcels.

Chairman Drinkard said elevations are needed. Wendy Salvati voices her concern regarding the minimum setback of 10' between buildings, houses could be located 5' off each property line; how would accessory structures be handled as they need to meet certain setback guidelines as well. Chairman Drinkard said it may be very hard to get a variance.

Mr. Metzger does not know if the applicant plans condo status.

Chairman Drinkard refers to the landscaping of the site, specifically the berm. Mr. Metzger said the berm runs across the full frontage of Roll Road and will be a 1' to 4' rolling landscape berm. There is another berm shown on the plan behind Hank Stockwell property per Town Board resolution made in 2003. The current Landscape law requires 8% landscaping within the parking area. The PURD is silent to landscaping requirements thus the current Town Code is used. Chairman Drinkard refers to the PURD Law in the Town Code, section 30-28.11 Site Plan Approval, page 3024.5; this is the section the Planning Board is following in reviewing the proposal. Wendy Salvati reads (A) (1) (d): Location, proposed use, type, floor area and height of all buildings; location of all parking and service areas with access drives thereto; location, uses and proposed improvements to all open space.

Chairman Drinkard explains there was a precedent set early on that stated no Recreation Fees will be assessed because the developer is putting in the bike path; the pavement portion only. The Town requests the bike path be put in ASAP, before any development starts. Mr. Pazda wants to see the bike path go to Roll Road and parking at the end of the trail. Wendy Salvati reads from the Waterford PURD Zoning Standards dated December 10, 2003: Because the Project Sponsor is donating parkland to the Town and donating approximately 35 acres to the Western New York Land Conservancy (WNYLC)-no recreation fees will be imposed on any portions of the project. (Established by Town Board on May 14, 2003-Note: Findings Statement requires donation of 35 acres to WNYLC). Gregory Todaro refers to paragraph six (6) of the same document which reads: Blacktop material for the Town's Bike Path on entire project site (including Wexford Manor) is to be donated to the Town by the Project Sponsor (established by Town Board on May 14, 2003). Mr. Metzger thinks the agreement at the time was for the developer to provide the materials and the Town to provide the labor for the bike path. Mr. Pazda said this will have to be researched.

Chairman Drinkard said the conservation easement for open space needs to be discussed. The discussion should include such items as the need for the easement to be built into the Homeowners Agreement, access points to the easement and who can use it. Wendy Salvati said the Homeowners Agreement will address other areas as well such as the ponds, community centers and the berms. Chairman Drinkard said before this project is put back on a Planning Board agenda the Board a prospectus indicating the Homeowners Agreement is in process. Jim Callahan will research the WNYLC agreement.

Chairman Drinkard said the post office delivery of mail needs to be clarified. Updated engineering letters on file. He reads from the PURD Law page 3024.11, Signs: Freestanding signs in any PURD District shall be limited to traffic and pedestrian directional and control signs, signs identifying uses as permitted on the site plan and street signs. Traffic signs and devices shall meet state requirements. Other signs shall be in conformance with the Town of Clarence Sign Law. Chairman Drinkard goes on to say that, since the current Sign Law does not speak to PURD and the PURD is for people who live in the area, there will be no monument or pole signs on Roll Road. There will be no identification of businesses on Roll Road. Signs will be restricted to the front of the building only.

Wendy Salvati refers to the PURD Law, item (E) page 3024.7: Conformity to development plan. It is expected that the site plan will be in substantial conformance with the objectives of the development plan. However, if in the preparation of the site plan it becomes apparent that certain elements of the development plan, as it was approved by the Town Board, were in need of

modification, the applicant may incorporate the necessary development plan modifications in the site plan.

With regards to monumenting the back ends of the properties with a conservation easement Chairman Drinkard said should there be a monumentation on every single lot indicating that the homeowner have restrictions; the Homeowners Agreement must speak to the can do's and can't do's. The Planning Board will be looking for a prospectus for review on the entire Site Plan Approval.

Wendy Salvati refers to the Waterford PURD Zoning Standards document and reads: A street tree planting plan is required. Two (2) trees per home are required to be planted within the single-family residential portions of the project which includes Waterford Green. Four (4) trees will be required per corner residential lot. Ms. Salvati thinks it is important to reread the SEQR findings statement.

Mike Williams, of 4385 Ransom Road, asked how many families are going to live within this development. Chairman Drinkard said the original proposal was for 379 homes. The current proposal is for 34 townhouses and 100 single-family homes. Mr. Williams asked how this will impact the school system. Ms. Salvati explains that this project was part of an Environmental Impact Statement, part of this review looked at impacts to the schools, the determination was a negative impact; the school district could handle the number of estimated students. There was mitigation; this report was prior to the Clarence School District re-districting some of its elementary schools. Mr. Williams asked how many of the proposed homes will receive special assessment. Jim Callahan said the houses will be assessed at 100%.

Joe Meyers, of 8120 Roll Road, said there have been some changes to the plan since its original proposal. He voices his concern with the traffic impact on Roll Road. He is also concerned with the commercial development and suggests there be specific guidelines for what type of businesses are allowed. Mr. Meyers said the berm needs to be clarified and requirements set; a 4' berm is not a big berm.

Timothy Pazda reads from the Waterford PURD Zoning Standards, page 2, paragraph 3: the Project sponsor will be required to contribute towards mitigation that may be required as a result of significant traffic impacts.

Mr. Pazda questions why the businesses are in the development in the first place, it's restrictive if they can only service that community; how will they survive? A business man is going to want to bring in people from all over. Gregory Todaro said if the businesses become successful there will be the traffic issue to deal with.

Gerald Drinkard said a work session will be held to discuss this project. It will be held in the evening and will be open to the public.

ACTION:

Motion by Gerald Drinkard, seconded by Wendy Salvati, to **table** Waterford Village PURD.

Gregory Todaro	Aye	Richard Bigler	Aye
Jeffrey Grenzebach	Aye	Timothy Pazda	Aye
Wendy Salvati	Aye	Gerald Drinkard	Aye

MOTION CARRIED.

Item 4

Stone Ridge Estates/Joe Frey
Agricultural Rural Residential

Requests Preliminary Concept Plan Review for a
major subdivision at Stage and Ransom.

DISCUSSION:

Jim Callahan provides the history on the project. It is located on the north side of Stage Road, east of Ransom Road and consists of approximately 127.5 acres. The applicant is proposing a major subdivision and was tabled at a previous meeting pending input from the Traffic Safety Board, Fire Advisory, the Town Highway and Engineering Departments.

Michael Metzger, of Metzger Civil Engineering, is representing the applicant.

Chairman Drinkard refers to the Planning Board minutes of January 24, 2007 where much discussion was held on items such as ponds and requirements for topsoil. One item referred to a conversation that took place at an Executive Planning Board meeting with regards to changing the road to continue through the lots; from Stage Road back on to Stage Road, as opposed to what is recently presented. Chairman Drinkard asked if the road was to be public or private.

Jim Callahan said, through informal discussions with the various departments and boards, the recommendation was to either have all public roads or all private roads, do not mix them.

Wendy Salvati said the original plan included lots that have been removed from the most recent plan; the applicant is planning to have those lots treated under a separate action. The Planning Board would like to see all lots brought back to be treated as one action.

Chairman Drinkard refers to the action taken at the Planning Board meeting of January 24, 2007, which tabled the project to allow the applicant time to address the issues discussed that evening. The Planning Board has not yet received a revised plan with the issues discussed at that meeting. Mr. Metzger clarifies that the proposal is not to segment the project from a SEQRA standpoint.

Mr. Metzger explains the reason for two (2) applications is so they would work in conjunction with each other through the planning process. Once the proposals reached a comfort point in the concept the two applications would be reviewed by engineering as a whole. Wendy Salvati is not comfortable with the proposal and is not in favor of the two separate actions.

Mr. Pazda said the convoluted lines on the proposal must be eliminated. Mr. Metzger asked why and goes on to explain that the plan reflects the best location for the houses as the land has a unique topography. Mr. Pazda said future property owners will not know where their lot lines are.

Gregory Todaro voices his concern regarding the placement of accessory structures. Mr. Metzger said a large amount of land will not be taken up with placing an accessory structure on the property and when the need arises for knowledge on the property lines there will be a survey for each lot. Ms. Salvati suggests all the frontage be off the cul-de-sac and the cut off the back of the lots to make it a common area. Mr. Metzger asked if the Town would entertain a plan for 15 lots with many of them fronting on the new road. Chairman Drinkard said there are two alternatives, one is to put in a public loop road, which was discussed two years ago, with appropriate frontage and number of lots. The second alternative is to put in an Open Development with a private road and the lots off of it; a Home Owners agreement and a conservation easement is suggested as well.

Jim Callahan said there may be a mechanism to do an Open Development, this law requires a minimum lot size and amount of frontage but it does not necessarily say that the frontage has to be on a private drive. The frontage that was calculated would allow that number of lots, plus the four (4) allowed in an Open Development. The entire frontage can be deed restricted so there can never be another curb cut along the frontage.

Deputy Town Attorney David Donohue suggests an Executive Planning Board meeting to discuss these options with the applicant.

Wendy Salvati would like to see the plan as a whole on one map. She wants to see it as a 19-unit subdivision.

Mr. Metzger said the applicant's preference is for a public road. Chairman Drinkard said then a loop road is required.

Chairman Drinkard asked Deputy Town Attorney David Donohue if the Planning Board can look at the 14 or 15 lot subdivision, without the geometry, and take the frontage and make it a conservation easement and not have to worry about the frontage literally being as shown. Deputy Town Attorney David Donohue will research the legal answer.

Mike Williams, of 4385 Ransom Road, said the project site is like Lake Erie. How do you fill in Lake Erie? Once it is filled in the water has to go someplace, surrounding neighbors will have water problems. He voices his concern with the project being on a septic system as he thought the Town was doing away with subdivisions on septic systems; this doesn't even comply with the Master Plan.

Fred Ehlert, of 10805 Stage Road, asked Mr. Metzger to get his lot correct on the map. He voices his concern with how much water accumulates during the spring on the site. He does not want to pay for a special drainage system.

Scott Glassman, of 10725 Stage Road, asked for mitigation for privacy during the construction period to help with things such as noise and dust. He suggests a treed berm for privacy. He also asked the Board to consider a separate ingress and egress for construction vehicles and equipment. The winds are strong coming off the quarry and will blow the dust and dirt from the construction vehicles. Mr. Glassman is not sure what the difference is between a looped road and a private cul-de-sac, but he thinks a looped road might increase the number of houses, thus increasing the traffic.

Mr. Metzger will take a closer look at ground water levels. He apologizes to Mr. Ehlert and promises to get the correct lot size of Mr. Ehlert's property on the plan and submit it to the Planning and Zoning Office. Mr. Metzger said his client is willing to discuss provisions for a buffer for Mr. Glassman's property, not only long term, but during construction as well.

Wendy Salvati asked Mr. Metzger if he anticipates bringing in a lot of fill for the site. Mr. Metzger said there will not be a lot of fill, but may be the need for topsoil for lawns.

Chairman Drinkard said when this project gets to the point of TEQR referral; the TEQR Committee should pay special attention to water, storm water, ponds, etc.

Mike Williams, of Ransom Road, said he takes exception to the fact that the applicant is saying he is going to bring in topsoil only. This insults his intelligence. He invites the Planning Board members to look at the site.

ACTION:

Motion by Timothy Pazda, seconded by Jeffrey Grenzebach, to **table** the request for Preliminary Concept Plan Review for a major subdivision at Stage and Ransom Roads.

Gregory Todaro	Aye	Richard Bigler	Aye
Jeffrey Grenzebach	Aye	Timothy Pazda	Aye
Wendy Salvati	Aye	Gerald Drinkard	Aye

MOTION CARRIED.

Meeting adjourned at 10:08 p.m.

Carolyn Delgato
Senior Clerk Typist