

Clarence Town Environmental Quality Review
(TEQR)
Meeting Minutes
Monday, March 19, 2007

Matthew Balling, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and led the pledge to the flag.

TEQR Members Present:

Matthew Balling	Patrick Miner
Richard McNamara	John Moulin
Paul Shear	Albert Schultz
Lisa Bertino-Beaser	

Other Town Officials Present:

James Callahan, Director of Community Development
Councilman Scott Bylewski
Jeffrey Grenzebach
Town Attorney Steve Bengart

Other Interested Parties Present:

Patricia Powers	Tim Lavocat
Gerald Drinkard	Al Hopkins
Jeffrey Grenzebach	Paul Case
Bill Pfennig	Laura Pfennig
Ken Pearl	Russell Gullo
Craig Tierney	Jeff Palumbo
Jim Rumsey	

Item 1-Approval of minutes from the previous meeting.

Motion by Matthew Balling, seconded by John Moulin, to **table** the approval of the minutes for the meeting held on January 22, 2007, to allow time for the motion on Agenda Item 3h to be typed into the minutes word for word.

Matthew Balling	Aye	Patrick Miner	Aye
Richard McNamara	Aye	John Moulin	Aye
Paul Shear	Aye	Albert Schultz	Aye
Lisa Bertino-Beaser	Aye		

MOTION CARRIED.

Motion by Paul Shear, seconded by Richard McNamara, to **approve** the minutes for the meeting held on February 26, 2007, as written.

Matthew Balling	Aye	Patrick Miner	Aye
Richard McNamara	Aye	John Moulin	Aye
Paul Shear	Aye	Albert Schultz	Recuse
Lisa Bertino-Beaser	Aye		

MOTION CARRIED.

Mr. Schultz recuses himself due to his absence at the February 26, 2007 meeting.

Item 2-Communications.

Communications will be discussed under Unfinished Business.

Item 3a-Stage and Schurr Subdivision.

DISCUSSION:

Jim Callahan explains the project is located at the northeast corner of Stage Road and Schurr Road. It has been tabled awaiting a Phase II Archeological report which has not been received to date. This project may remain tabled.

Mr. Bengart advises the TEQR Committee that they do not have to re-motion the project and it can stay tabled.

Councilman Bylewski asks at what point the review becomes stale. This has been going on for a year and he wonders if there have been any environmental changes that may impact a determination.

Item 3b-Utilization of Sewer Capacity outside of Erie County Sewer District #5 for areas not included in a sewer district and proposed Harris Hill Commons Open Space Design Subdivision.

DISCUSSION:

Jim Callahan provides an update on the project. It is located on the west side of Harris Hill Road between Greiner Road and Sheridan Road. Any actions have been tabled at the request of the NYS DEC and no correspondence has been received as of March 19, 2007.

This item will remain tabled until comments have been received from DEC.

Item 3c-Kausner Open Development Area, 4180 Ransom Road.

DISCUSSION:

Jim Callahan provides an update on the project. It is located on the west side of Ransom Road, south of Tillman Road. The project has remained tabled pending receipt of additional information related to archeological and an underground gasoline tank.

Al Hopkins and Paul Case, both of Metzger Civil Engineering, are representing the applicant. Mr. Hopkins explains that the archeological study is still pending. He said that Mr. Kausner found no evidence of the underground still being there, he believes the tank has been pulled; it has not been in use for thirty years. Mr. Bengart said looking for the tank and knowing where it was are two different issues. Mr. Balling is curious to know what the Town's options are with regards to obtaining an independent verification and inspection of the tank. Mr. Bengart said the Town has the right to charge the applicant under the SEQR process if a Phase II was performed. The neighbor told the applicant specifically where the tank was, so the applicant is confident with the findings. Mr. Balling asks if there is a way the archeological investigators can conduct a concurrent inspection. After further discussion it is stated that the archeological study would not show information regarding the underground tank. Councilman Bylewski asks what method was used to locate the tank. Mr. Hopkins said the applicant probed the site. Mr. Hopkins was told it was a small, couple-hundred gallon tank.

Mr. Bengart suggests boring the area. He states that the Committee needs to know if there are any environmental issues that may result from the tank.

A metal detector would locate the tank; however, it would not find any leakage from the tank, such as gasoline or diesel fuel.

Mr. Balling asks what type of environmental firm consultant would be qualified to conduct a professional sub-surface investigation to find if the tank existed or not. Mr. Bengart said the Town has recently used Leader Services.

Mr. Balling said the next step would be to complete a Part II, which identifies impacts as being small to moderate or potentially large. Given the facts that have been presented it would have to be a potentially large impact.

Mr. Bengart suggests he talk to the applicant and have the Town's consultants visit the site. The consultant would look at an area that was agreed on with the applicant and provide a report. He asks if this would please the TEQR Committee. The Town would not have to do the testing, but the applicant should pay for Town's consultant to be present at the site to make sure the testing is done correctly. The Town's consultant would be involved in the process to make sure it is done to the Town's satisfaction. Mr. Balling would be satisfied with this procedure. Mr. Bengart will talk with Mr. Hopkins to work out details.

Mr. Schultz points out the major concerns as being storm water run off, drainage, flooding specifically to the neighbors to the south. The flooding will be listed as a potentially major impact requiring some project action to preclude it and that action will be monitored and supervised by the Town Engineer. The applicant is aware of these concerns and advises they will be addressed appropriately.

The project remains tabled from the February 26, 2007 meeting pending the findings of the Archeological Report. Let the record show that the Town will work with the applicant to further investigate the proposed underground tank.

Laura Pfennig, owner of the property to the south of the proposed project. She spoke with the owners of the properties to the north and northwest and they are all very concerned with the water. For the record, Laura Pfennig states that Mr. Kausner is not the owner of the property. She strongly

objects to the aerial shot on file because it is from April 2002 which is prior to the two storms that damaged hundreds of trees.

Item 3d-9435 Main Street Office Park, 9435 Main Street.

DISCUSSION:

Jim Callahan provides an update on the project. It is located on the south side of Main Street west of Goodrich Road. It is a proposed office park. The project was previously tabled pending receipt of comments related to storm water and traffic. Comments have been received from NYS DOT as well as supporting documentation related to storm water. Comments were received today from NYS DOT related to the traffic analysis.

Jeffrey Palumbo, with the Law Firm of Renaldo and Palumbo, is representing the applicant. Mr. Palumbo has also received the letter from Mr. Rutkowski of the DOT and refers to the first bullet point in the letter which suggests the proposed secondary access should be eliminated; the applicant has no problem complying with this suggestion. They will align the main driveway as suggested by the DOT with the proposed Dunkin' Donuts in the manner in which they have suggested.

With respect to the second bullet point in the DOT letter, which indicates the DOT conducted a level of service analysis with corrected inputs, the DOT states that the additional traffic generated by this development should not have a significant impact on the State Highway System.

Mr. Balling explains that the TEQR Committee discussed the Town's obligations are for a project review, it was decided that the TEQR Committee's review of water quality and water quantity issues is within the Committee's domain. There is a need to prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan and an Erosion Control Plan for this project, because the site is over 1 acre. These plans will be reviewed by the Town's Engineering department. It seems to the Committee that there will be a potentially large impact, but it can be mitigated by a project change. As far as the impacts of storm water, this would be part of the recommendation to the Town Board.

With regards to traffic, the TEQR Committee does not have the full report they requested. This report was to include all traffic volumes, the analysis of the traffic problems and what remedies would come about. The DOT has now indicated that they do not feel this project will have an impact on the State Highway System.

Mr. Shear said it is probably appropriate for the TEQR Committee to accept the DOT's recommendations, he believes the DOT has provided the Committee with what they required. There is a concern with the timing of the various lights through the corridor.

Mr. Schultz concurs with Mr. Shear.

Ms. Bertino-Beaser is comfortable with the information that is before the Committee. The remaining Committee members agree.

Mr. Balling explains the next step is to prepare a Part II which will identify small to moderate and potentially large impacts. A Part III, if appropriate, should then be drafted as well. This would go on to the Town Board as a recommendation.

Mr. Balling refers to question 1 of the Part II that has been prepared. This question indicates that the proposed action will result in a physical change to the project site. It identifies a potentially large impact with regards to the construction continuing for more than one (1) year or involving more than one phase or stage. This was indicated because this project has an additional build-out concept that would result in a major physical change over many years.

Question number 2 of the Part II was answered “no.”

Question number 3 of the Part II indicates that the proposed action will affect a body of water designated a protected (under articles 15, 24, 25 of the Environmental Conservation Law ECL). Under “Other impacts” it is stated as a potentially large impact and that a large portion of the site is State and Federally protected wetland; while construction activity will be outside of the wetland, storm water management is essential. It is identified on the form that this impact can be mitigated by a project change.

Question number 4 of the Part II was answered “no.”

Question number 5 indicates that the proposed action will affect surface or groundwater quality or quantity and the proposed action will require a discharge permit. This is a potentially large impact. The form indicates that this impact can be mitigated by a project change, however, Mr. Balling suggests deleting this answer; he does not think it has to be checked off.

Question number 6 indicates that the proposed action will alter drainage flow or patterns, or surface water runoff. It will have a potentially large impact as it will require storm water management plan and facilities for each phase of construction as well as final facility.

Questions 7 & 8 are answered “no.”

Question 9 indicated that the proposed action will substantially affect non-threatened or non-endangered species. It was indicated as a small to moderate impact with the destruction of habitat for native fauna. Mr. Schultz suggests revising this answer to “no” because of the word “substantial”; it would not have a substantial affect. The form will be revised to reflect this change.

Questions 10 through 12 are answered “no.”

Mr. Balling suggests question 13 be checked “yes”. He states that the current property is entirely wooded and Open Space has been identified in the Town’s comprehensive plan as a significant resource for the community that has a positive benefit for the development of the quality of life. He suggests that a major reduction of an open space important to the community be identified as a potentially large impact that can be mitigated by a project change. The project change will be to minimize any disturbance of non-developed acreage on the property; this would include maintaining existing tree canopies in areas that can be undisturbed.

Question 14 is answered “no.”

Question 15 indicates there will be an effect to existing transportations systems; it is noted to be a small to moderate impact. The comments from the DOT should be noted in this question and Mr. Balling suggests the form be changed to reflect a potentially large impact that can be mitigated by a

project change. There will be a major impact on transportation on a congested road per the comments of NYS DOT.

Questions 16 through 20 are answered “no.”

A Part III has also been completed.

Jim Callahan points out that the property was not identified on the original open space inventory of the Town.

ACTION:

Motion by Albert Schultz, seconded by John Moulin, to **accept** the Part II with the revisions discussed and forward the project to the Town Board with a **recommendation** for a Negative Declaration.

Matthew Balling	Aye	Patrick Miner	Aye
Richard McNamara	Aye	John Moulin	Aye
Paul Shear	Aye	Albert Schultz	Aye
Lisa Bertino-Beaser	Aye		

MOTION CARRIED.

Item 3e-Russell Gullo Retail Landscape Shop, 6825, 6835 and 6843 Transit Road.

DISCUSSION:

Jim Callahan provides an update on the project. It is located on the east side of Transit Road, north of County Road in the Swormville Traditional Neighborhood District. The project was previously tabled pending receipt of comments from the NYS DOT and regarding archeological impacts. Comments from NYS DEC and NYS DOT have been received as well as an archeological analysis.

Al Hopkins and Paul Case, both of Metzger Civil Engineering, are representing the applicant. The applicant has no problem complying with the comments from DOT. Mr. Hopkins is confident that the Town Preservation representative(s) will come to the same conclusion as what the archeological study revealed, which is the buildings have been altered to a point where they are no longer significant. Mr. Hopkins said he has confirmation from the Erie County Sewer Authority that there is no sewer extension required as there is sewer available on the site; they have given approval to change the use from residential discharge to commercial discharge.

Mr. Schultz reminds the applicant that one of the potential major impacts that the TEQR Committee is concerned with is stormwater and run-off. The problem is exacerbated in that half of the site is in a floodway. This needs to be worked out with the Town Engineer. Mr. Schultz believes the pole barn is in violation of the Town’s Zoning Code. Mr. Hopkins has recently been informed that there are wetlands at the site. Mr. Hopkins will address all these issues.

The site plan shows a proposed barn, it was proposed prior to the applicant receiving a wetlands delineation which shows the proposed barn in a wetland. Mr. Balling said it is not a good idea for the TEQR Committee to an action on a site plan with a proposed barn in a wetland. Mr.

Hopkins said if the applicant had the proper setbacks he could mitigate the wetlands. Mr. Balling said this merits a potentially large impact that can be mitigated by a project change, which is removing the barn.

Mr. Schultz voices his concern with the impact on the neighbors.

Mr. Balling explains that in 2004 the Towns of Clarence and Amherst drafted a corridor management study. This study included a number of concept street connections throughout this hamlet; the study identifies them as necessary for not just improving traffic flow but also as a character issue. This site is located where one of the connections is supposed to be. Thus, the project would have a potentially large impact because it would not be harmony with the future street connections identified in the Town's management plan. He does not know if this can be mitigated by a project change. Mr. Hopkins explains that the site plan shows connectivity for future access to the side of the site. Councilman Bylewski explains the study that Mr. Balling is referring to is the Land Use Access Management Plan.

Mr. Balling said the TEQR Committee was awaiting information from the Town's Historic Preservation Board. He asks the Committee if they are comfortable with the information received on this project or should it be tabled again.

Councilman Bylewski points out that, if the Committee is comfortable with the historical piece that has been presented, the Town Board does not meet until next week Wednesday and hopefully the historical piece from the Historical Society will have been received and can be reviewed.

Mr. Balling asks if the TEQR Committee must recommend a positive or negative declaration or can a project be forwarded to the Town Board without making a hard recommendation. Mr. Bengart said the Committee can forward a project without recommending a positive or negative declaration, however, the Town Board prefers the recommendation. Councilman Bylewski confirms the Town Board's preference and said the Committee can forward the project with stipulations.

Mr. Schultz has prepared a Part II. It is confirmed that the barn is in the Floodplain not the Floodway. Question 1 indicates that the proposed action will result in a physical change to the project site by converting a residential area into a medium sized business; this is a small to moderate impact.

Question 2 is answered "no."

Question 3 is answered "yes" and indicates that the developable area of the site contains a protected water body and the construction is in a designated freshwater or tidal wetland; both have a potentially large impact that can be mitigated by a project change.

Question 4 is answered "no."

Question 5 is answered "yes" and states that proposed action will require a discharge permit; the impact can be mitigated by a project change.

Question 6 is answered "yes" in that there would be a potentially large impact and the proposed action would significantly alter drainage and run-off patterns around Ransom Creek, a protected stream. The impact can be mitigated by a project change by preparing a stormwater pollution and prevention plan.

Questions 7 through 11 are answered “no.”

Question 12 is changed from “yes” to “no” because there were no significant archeological artifacts found on the property per the study, however it is still maintained that it would be a potentially large impact with the demolition of two homes greater than 50 years old. The impact can be mitigated by a project change.

Questions 13 and 14 are answered “no.”

Question 15 is answered “yes” and is identified as a potentially large impact. The project site is identified as a future street connection in the Town’s 2004 Land Use Access Management Plan.

Questions 16 through 18 are answered “no.”

Question 19 is answered “yes” indicating the proposed action will replace or eliminate existing facilities, structures or areas of historic importance to the community. It is a potentially large impact and can be mitigated by a project change.

Question 20 is answered “no.”

ACTION:

Motion by Matthew Balling, seconded by Albert Schultz, to **accept** the Part II with the changes discussed and direct the Planning and Zoning Department to draft a Part III reflecting the comments on each one of the impacts stated this evening. The TEQR Committee **recommends** the Town Board issue a Negative Declaration subject to information received from the Historical Society.

ON THE QUESTION:

Councilman Bylewski asks if the applicant is willing to put up a marker at the site indicating the history of the site. Mr. Hopkins said it has not been determined if this is the site of the Sworm House. If it is an historic site, the applicant is willing to erect a marker as requested. The applicant has offered to put in a “Welcome To Swormville” sign.

Matthew Balling	Aye	Patrick Miner	Aye
Richard McNamara	Aye	John Moulin	Aye
Paul Shear	Aye	Albert Schultz	Aye
Lisa Bertino-Beaser	Aye		

MOTION CARRIED.

Item 3f-Dan D’Andrea, 5445 Salt Road.

DISCUSSION:

Jim Callahan provides the history on the project. It is located on the east side of Salt Road, north of Greiner Road. It consists of existing residential and agricultural structures proposed for demolition. It is a Type I action under SEQR, it was referred to the Historical Society for comment and comments have been received from them related to the history of that particular structure. The

historic resources survey has identified the home as being non-contributory to the historic fabric of the community.

Craig Tierney is representing the applicant.

Mr. Balling explains that given the magnitude of the project and the impacts that have been identified the TEQR Committee is comfortable with making a recommendation.

In response to Mr. Moulin's question regarding the demolition of all the structures at the site, Mr. Tierney said they have received quotes for the demolition of all the buildings, however, a decision has not been made yet as to whether the applicant wants to demolish all the buildings or not.

Mr. Balling refers to the Part II and states item 1 is answered "yes" and under Other Impacts it is to be stated that there will be a visual change to the site. The remaining items on the Part II are answered "no."

ACTION:

Motion by Matthew Balling, seconded by Albert Schultz, to direct the Planning and Zoning Department to draft a Part II as discussed and **recommend** the Town Board issue a Negative Declaration on agenda item #3f.

ON THE QUESTION:

Mr. Schultz said the summary needs to list the letter from the Historical Society as being received and on file.

Mr. Bengart makes it clear that if different information were to be received, the Town Board, even though the 30 day comment period has not yet expired, has the opportunity to not move on the project since this is just the recommendation. The 30 day comment period will have expired by the time this item is before the Town Board.

Matthew Balling	Aye	Patrick Miner	Aye
Richard McNamara	Aye	John Moulin	Aye
Paul Shear	Aye	Albert Schultz	Aye
Lisa Bertino-Beaser	Aye		

MOTION CARRIED.

Item 3g-Donald Steinwachs, County/Heise, 4-lot Open Development Area.

DISCUSSION:

Jim Callahan provides the background on the project. It is located on the northwest corner of County Road and Heise Road. It consists of approximately 28 acres and is zoned Agricultural Rural Residential. The applicant is proposing to develop a 4-lot Open Development Area on a portion of the property. To avoid the issue of segmentation the applicant has provided a full build-out proposal and the accompanying EAF for the Board's consideration.

Paul Case and Al Hopkins, both of Metzger Engineering, are representing the applicant. Mr. Case explains the project was tabled pending requested information. One piece of information the TEQR Committee requested was a potential full build-out plan, the applicant has submitted a revised plan that shows a potential 6-lot Open Development Area for the full build-out with access off Heise Road. The proposed project, at this point, remains the 4-lot Open Development Area as presented.

Another piece of information that needed to be addressed was the National Fuel easement. The applicant has provided Mr. Bengart and Mr. Callahan with a copy of general conditions; however, the applicant is awaiting legal documents. The applicant was advised the documents have been mailed and will arrive via U.S. Mail. Mr. Bengart said he requested the easement, what he received was the general conditions that National Fuel sends to all appropriate land owners. Mr. Metzger and Mr. Bengart discussed the situation and the applicant is in the process of obtaining this information.

Mr. Case said he is proposing to minimize any construction within the easement; the only construction being proposed is the driveway. He requests the Town solicit Lead Agency Status and begin the SEQR process.

Mr. Balling asks if this configuration under the existing Subdivision Regulations and Zoning Law is permitted. Mr. Callahan said it could be permitted; it meets the minimum requirements of the Open Development Area in terms of driveway separation and lot size. Mr. Bengart said the only issue would be if the easement would change any information.

Mr. Balling asks what the difference is, on the site plan, between the ends of both of the proposed private driveways. The applicant said it is approximately 700 feet. Mr. Balling asks if it is possible to link the two driveways with some form of a seasonal path or walkway. Mr. Case said that would require a Home Owners Association agreement, at this point, he does not see that as an option because it is not part of the current plan. Mr. Case points out that there are private driveways in the area.

Jim Callahan indicates the EAF, in general, seems to be acceptable.

ACTION:

Motion by Matthew Balling, seconded by John Moulin, to **recommend** the Town Board solicit Lead Agency Status and commence the 30 day comment period for all involved agencies for agenda item #3g.

Matthew Balling	Aye	Patrick Miner	Aye
Richard McNamara	Aye	John Moulin	Aye
Paul Shear	Aye	Albert Schultz	Aye
Lisa Bertino-Beaser	Aye		

MOTION CARRIED.

Item 3h-Proposed Sign Law.

Item to remain tabled.

Item 3i-Proposed APFO Law.

Item to remain tabled.

Item 3j-Proposed Zoning Map Amendments.

Item to remain tabled.

Item 4a-St. Mary's Church, 6925 Transit Road.**DISCUSSION:**

Jim Callahan provides a history on the project. It is located on the southeast corner of Transit Road and Stahley Road in the Traditional Neighborhood District. There is an existing church/school; the proposal is for development of a new worship hall. The applicant was referred from the Planning Board on March 7, 2007.

Ken Pearl, a member of the Parish Building Committee, is filling in for Fr. Yetter. Bill Schutt, engineer, is present as well. Mr. Pearl explains that the parish itself is a Civil War era church. The school has grown over the years warranting building additions that have been built. There is a convent on the site. There is a building further back on Stahley Road that is the current residence of the pastor. With the growth in the surrounding Towns, the church has long been faced with accommodating this growth. The growth has leveled out, but the parish consists of approximately 2600 families and the current church seats 450 people. The concept is to build a parish that is facing the old church. The plan is to have all the parking on site.

Mr. Schutt points out that a church is a permitted use in the Traditional Neighborhood District. A full EAF has been submitted and he understands a coordinated review is in order.

There is a detached garage shown on the site plan that is proposed to be removed.

Mr. Balling indicated the EAF Part I needs no adjustments.

Mr. Schultz asks the applicant if the new worship hall will increase the number of people attending or will it just move them from one building to another? There is a cry from the public regarding traffic; will this plan result in a traffic change? Mr. Pearl said the plan is being driven by the overall diocese plan. In the future, they don't see so much growth in the parish, but a diminishing ability to deliver services; there may not be enough priests to have 6 or 7 masses on a weekend. The overall attendance will not change, but the peak may.

ACTION:

Motion by Matthew Balling, seconded by Lisa Bertino-Beaser, to **recommend** the Town Board solicit Lead Agency Status and commence the 30 day comment period for all involved agencies for agenda item #4a.

Matthew Balling	Aye	Patrick Miner	Aye
Richard McNamara	Aye	John Moulin	Aye
Paul Shear	Aye	Albert Schultz	Aye
Lisa Bertino-Beaser	Aye		

MOTION CARRIED.

Item 4b-Benderson Development, 5965 Transit Road.

DISCUSSION:

Jim Callahan provides the history of the project. It is located on the east side of Transit Road south of Clarence Center Road. It is an existing vacant parcel consisting of approximately 3.08 acres, it is zoned Major Arterial. The applicant is proposing a mixed-use commercial building and was referred from the Planning Board on March 7, 2007.

Jeff Palumbo, of Renaldo and Palumbo is present as well as Jim Rumsey of Benderson Development Company. Mr. Palumbo explains that the total area to be developed on the site is approximately 2.04 acres. The proposal is to construct a building just over 15,000 square feet in size, and will consist of three different uses; approximately 4,000 square feet of office space, approximately 6,200 square feet of retail and approximately 5,000 square feet of restaurant. There are no tenants to date. The site is approximately 54% greenspace.

Mr. Grenzebach, member of the Town of Clarence Planning Board, explains that one of the Planning Board's concerns was the proposal being for three different uses. Mr. Palumbo said there was no traffic study done; the EAF indicated a maximum of approximately 57 vehicular trips per hour.

Mr. Shear asks if one of the tenants were to be a medical office use would the parking, in the present design, be sufficient to accommodate this type of use. Mr. Callahan does not believe so; the medical office use puts the parking at a different ratio. The applicant is not anticipating a medical office use.

Mr. Balling asks if the use will have to be proposed when the applicant applies for the Certificate of Occupancy with the Town. It is confirmed that the applicant will have to propose the use when applying for the Certificate of Occupancy. At that point, the applicant would have to come back to the Town if the use is medical office, because that puts the project in a different building permit classification. The Certificate of Occupancy is filed at the Building Department and they review every certificate.

Mr. Balling said the project is subject to coordinated review, the EAF Part I is complete. He questions the height of the building and learns that it conforms to the Town's code.

ACTION:

Motion by Matthew Balling, seconded by Richard McNamara, to **recommend** the Town Board solicit Lead Agency Status and commence the 30 day comment period for all involved agencies for agenda item #4b. A confirmation from Erie County Sewer District #5 indicating that capacity is available for this project is requested by the TEQR Committee. Objections and/or opinions are to be

requested from the DEC with regards to ways to connect the street that currently dead-ends at the property line with the existing parking area.

ON THE QUESTION:

Councilman Bylewski asks if the TEQR Committee prefers a more accurate description of the proposed height of the building. Mr. Callahan said the proposed building is identified as a one-story with a gable roof. Mr. Balling said the project is not in an architecturally area sensitive for heights, it can be left as is.

Matthew Balling	Aye	Patrick Miner	Aye
Richard McNamara	Aye	John Moulin	Aye
Paul Shear	Aye	Albert Schultz	Aye
Lisa Bertino-Beaser	Aye		

MOTION CARRIED.

Item 5-Miscellaneous

A local government conference is being held at Houghton College on May 2, 2007. If any member is interested in attending he/she is encouraged to contact Carolyn Delgato in the Planning and Zoning Office.

The next meeting date is April 16, 2007. A professor from the University of Buffalo will be in attendance, he will present information on the process of reviewing an archeological study.

Meeting adjourned at 8:43 p.m.

Matthew Balling, Chairman