

VILLAGE OF BALDWINSVILLE
PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, September 27, 2005, 7:30 P.M.
Approved 10/25/05

PRESENT: Chris Savacool, Chairman
Russ Lucy
John McFall
David Arthur
Edward Rock
Evelyn Mercer
Larry Barnett

ALSO PRESENT: Mayor Dan O'Hara
J. C. Engelbrecht, Village Attorney
Dan Faldzinski, Village Engineer
Susan LaQuay, Secretary

GUESTS: James Trasher, P.E.
Paul Curtin, Jr., Attorney
Tom Scuiga, B.S. Enterprises

Chairman Savacool welcomed the new Board Member, Larry Barnett, who was appointed on September 15, 2005.

Chairman Savacool stated the new approval documents are very helpful and he feels this will greatly improve the process for the Planning Board.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Upon motion by J. McFall and second by E. Mercer that the minutes of the August 23, 2005 Planning Board meeting be approved as submitted. Motion passed.

Chairman Savacool noted that the Board has not yet received an application for the Gentry Street subdivision and Mr. Rutherford has been informed of what is needed to start the process.

NEW BUSINESS

Sketch Plan - Golden Legacy Adult Living Facility - Meigs Road

The developer for Golden Legacy Adult Living Facility, Mr. Thomas Scuiga, and his representatives, Mr. Paul Curtin, Jr., Attorney, and Mr. James Trasher, P.E. are present.

Mr. Curtin addressed the Board. He stated the property is a 12-acre site on Meigs Road and is owned POD. The intended use is consistent with local zoning. He stated the plan submitted is a concept plan that Clough Harbour and Associates has produced that conforms wholly with village ordinances and does not at this time require any variances. The plan proposes the phase-construction of 168 units in an apartment complex. They are proposing to provide adequate parking as well as enclosed parking facilities for each building. He stated the building style is similar to facilities in Geddes, Snowbirds Landing I and II. These facilities have been very successfully marketed to seniors, defined as 55 years of age and older. This will not be an assisted living facility and there will be no direct or indirect services provided to the residents. The tenets will be self-sufficient. Recreational facilities will be provided. All the units proposed will be 2-bedroom units. The market for this has shown to be very strong for people downsizing from houses to apartment living. He noted the proposal does include garages, which are to be used for storage as well as for cars. Mr. Curtin noted the market has responded well in Geddes and this type of facility is very appealing due to the occupancy restrictions that will be in place. Covenants will be set forth that would state that

80% of the units must be headed by an individual who is 55+ years of age. Upon examining the market, they found that Van Buren and the surrounding area is undergoing similar changes that those in the Geddes community and this plan will offer options to those wishing to downsize and stay in the area. The demographic study showed this location to be ideal for this project.

Mr. Curtin stated there will be 168 units and phase 1 will involve the construction of two to three 24-unit buildings. All units are identical and the materials will be high-end quality. Primary access to the facility will be off of Meigs Road, which has 200' of frontage. This provides easy access with good sight lines.

James Trasher, P.E. addressed the Board. He noted that in 1994 Van Buren Estates was proposed for a similar location with similar type of units. He stated they, therefore, had spoken with the Village Engineer and Claude Sykes to discuss this project (sanitary sewer, water, drainage, and access to Meigs Road) as it related to facts that were discussed regarding the previous application. Mr. Trasher stated that based on the zoning and setbacks, as well as the height of the facility, no variances will be necessary. There is a 40' front yard setback, a 40' rear yard setback, and based on the height of the buildings they have the appropriate side yard setbacks. If they were to put in a public roadway, this would shift the conformance of the site and then they would potentially need a lot of variances. This is the reason they chose the access location that is shown on the plan.

Chairman Savacool stated he would like to address the issue of a collector roadway and referred to engineering comments dated September 27, 2005. D. Faldzinski reviewed these comments (page 2) as follows:

- A collector roadway with an 80' right-of-way to be dedicated to the Village should be constructed along the southern limits of the subject property consistent with prior Village master planning. A 40' of right-of-way should be reserved within the property and the remaining 40' of right-of-way should be retained from the adjacent owner to the south, Syracuse Home.
- The current Site Plan should be modified to incorporate the construction of a portion of the collector roadway and to provide access into the facility from the collector roadway. This roadway will need to be paved to a width of 30' in conformance with Village specifications, but will likely not need to have curbing or gutters.

Chairman Savacool noted that D. Faldzinski had had a meeting regarding this and Claude Sykes had given his input. He asked D. Faldzinski to discuss the master plan idea and why the Village is looking for a public roadway in that location. D. Faldzinski stated that prior to this application, he had had multiple discussions with the Village and Department of Public Works. Previously, when looking at the Sorrell Hill development access onto Meigs Road, they were provided with a traffic study of Downer Street, which specifically looked at the intersections of Sorrell Hill Road and Downer Street and Meigs Road and Downer Street. This study showed that at peak hours during the day, traffic was either at or near failure for available capacity. This was recognized as a problem. In addition, the Village inherited Meigs Road, which was previously a County road, and they understood at the time that it was substandard and would require improvements regarding drainage modifications, ditching and piping, and potentially an overlay to the roadway. The application for Van Buren Estates did show Peach Tree Lane, located on the southern limits of this parcel of land, and from a master planning perspectives, some of the Board Members looked at the Village street system and thought a collector roadway from Meigs Road over to Syracuse Street through Canton Street would be beneficial to the Village. As a result, when this application was received, one of the first things they told the Applicant was that there were some problems with Meigs Road from a functionality standpoint and, additionally from a master planning perspective, it would make sense to try to mitigate some of the existing traffic problems along Downer Street and provide an alternative route to the Village or 690 by way of this collector road. E. Mercer and J. McFall stated they remember this being discussed with the previous application.

James Trasher stated he would like to address the constraints that this long and narrow parcel has when requesting a 40' right-of-way. He noted that 40' would also be needed from Syracuse Home and this would have to be discussed between the Village, Mr. Scuga, and Syracuse Home prior to a roadway being constructed. He noted the market for these units relies on interest rates and these units are needed now. The Applicant would like to move on this plan as soon as possible. If Syracuse Home is not ready, then this creates problems for this Applicant. He noted another problem would be that setbacks would start from the edge of the right-of-way, which would affect their layout. This roadway would also make this southern property line essentially a front yard, which would require a 40' setback. He

noted the units could be modified, but the layout works well as it is proposed with a common area within the center of each building and green space. D. Faldzinski stated he appreciates this and noted that a PDD district has flexibility regarding setbacks without requiring variances. He noted the density requirements are similar to R2 zoning, which limits the number of potential units. Mr. Trasher stated they had done their density layout based on R2. D. Faldzinski stated it is his interpretation of the code that, regarding setbacks, it is up to the Planning Board to decide how to best locate and require setbacks.

Mr. Trasher asked what the floor area ratio would be. D. Faldzinski stated his interpretation is the total floor area considering multiple floors. D. Faldzinski stated his initial calculations put them at approximately 46%, which is over the 0.4 to 1.

D. Faldzinski stated the Village had recognized the need for this roadway in the past and they are trying to work with the developer to get this built. It would be beneficial to the Village to have the developer help out with the development of this road because there will be problems with traffic congestion in the future that would be alleviated by this collector road. Chairman Savacool noted it would also be beneficial to the developer as the maintenance of that road will be the responsibility of the Village in the long term. D. Faldzinski agreed and noted that maintenance of utilities would be the responsibility of the Village as well so there are some offsetting advantages to the developer.

Mr. Curtin stated he has looked at tax maps of this parcel and surrounding parcels and there are 2 stub roads on Meigs Road, one to the north of this site and one to the south. He felt this showed that the Board at one time viewed the potential for continuation of these roads to Canton, which did not happen. He then noted that looking at the surrounding property, everything to the south of their property for almost 370' and back is owned by Syracuse Home, (which is a total of 75 acres) that has similar zoning classification. With Syracuse Home not at the table and not knowing if, how, and when they are going to develop their property, to plan for this road even on a reduced basis will not necessarily lead to the relief being sought. He stated they are willing to consider and take it under advisement, but the imposition of 30' of paving within this 80' right-of-way adversely impacts their site, which is long and proportionally narrow, and he would like to know what Syracuse Home's position would be. D. Faldzinski stated that based on the conversation they had initially with them on Friday, Syracuse Home was aware that they would be responsible to help with the creation and extension of this roadway. Other applicants have been told this as well. Mr. Curtin stated he would like to make certain that the end result is actually going to be achieved. He noted that, looking at the tax map that shows those 2 stub roads, this logic was employed in the past and those roads were never extended beyond that point. He asked what would be the catalyst to get this road to connect. D. Faldzinski stated the catalyst will be time and development. Development is happening in this area and the payoff may be 10 to 15 years down the road, but the Village does not want to miss the opportunity to get all parties involved now. The Village is just trying to settle on a plan that will provide access into their site and serve the purpose of a connector road as well.

Mr. Trasher asked if the Village is attempting to get the right-of-way from Syracuse Home now so they would have the ability to construct the road using tax dollars if no one came through and did this in the future. D. Faldzinski stated they are trying to get the 40' adjacent to their property, but also are trying to get the additional 40' all the way to Canton Street. Mr. Curtin asked what Syracuse Home's reaction was to this request. D. Faldzinski stated they needed to talk to their board of trustees, but he felt their reaction was positive.

Mr. Curtin noted that this issue will impact the layout for the property, but they will take it under advisement. He noted that the developer has been a good neighbor in all municipalities he has worked in, but he wants to be certain they do not create a disproportionate burden to him, as he will be incurring significant costs to develop this property. this is a project he will build, own, and maintain for a long time.

Chairman Savacool asked if the representative from Syracuse Home indicated when they will bring this issue to their board of trustees. D. Faldzinski stated he believes it is something they will address now. Mr. Scuga stated he will contact them directly to ask that they go to their board sooner rather than later.

Mr. Trasher wanted to clarify what would be required for this Applicant. He would need to provide the 40' for right-of-way and then construct the road only to the portion that will serve his property.

Mr. Curtin asked why a total of 80' of right-of-way is necessary. D. Faldzinski stated this is standard for a collector road. Mr. Trasher asked why this is defined as a collector road. D. Faldzinski stated this is based on anticipated capacity, which is not actually calculated. This was arbitrarily looked at as a bypass. This is predicated on taking it all the way to Route 48. Mr. Curtin noted this far exceeds where the Applicant's property is. Mr. Trasher noted this seems similar to the Liverpool bypass, which was stopped due to land acquisition issues, etc. J. McFall stated he feels that things are different in Baldwinsville in that the Village has more control over the land in question.

D. Faldzinski reviewed comments regarding "Site Access and Traffic" as follows:

- Meigs Roadway has been identified by the Village of Baldwinsville Public Works Department to be a sub-standard roadway in need of some drainage improvements (ditching and piping) and eventually an overlay. Increased traffic onto the road from future developments will likely worsen these existing conditions. As a result, the mitigation of these issues should be performed by current and future developers residing along Meigs Road.
- Site and stopping site distance calculations for the proposed access onto Meigs Road shall be provided.
- The traffic flow capacity at peak periods of the day along Downer Street near the intersections of Sorrell Hill and Meigs Roads has been identified by recent traffic studies as being at a point near or at failure. As a result, the Applicant should provide a traffic study identifying the impacts to traffic along Downer Street as a result of the proposed development. Coordination with the State and County Departments of Transportation shall be required by the Applicant to mitigate any immediate impacts from increased traffic. The eventual construction of the Village collector roadway should help alleviate impacts from current and future developments.

D. Faldzinski noted he met with Claude Sykes in the field last week and they walked the entire length of the road. They feel that the minimum required improvements consist of reditching of some existing ditches to bring up the depth. Some ditches are 3' and 4' deep, which would be unsafe, and they will need to be raised and redefined. Some other areas need piping and culverts replaced. There is some cracking occurring right now and there will need to be an overlay placed 5 to 7 years down the road. Meigs Road was never intended to be a collector roadway or handle a high volume of traffic that will come with development of the properties adjacent to it. He wanted to be sure that before the Village starts approving these developments that these existing problems be corrected by the developers. D. Faldzinski stated he will provide the Applicant with a detailed assessment of the limits of the required improvements. D. Faldzinski is aware that Mr. Scuga has spoken with Pooler Realty and discussed potentially working together. Pooler Realty has been before the Planning Board previously seeking access, which was denied without these improvements.

Mr. Scuga felt that these improvements to Meigs Road will be accomplished by a collection of parties including himself, Pooler Enterprise, the Town, the Village, and Syracuse Homes. D. Faldzinski stated they need to discuss this with the Village and Syracuse Homes. Mr. Scuga noted that Syracuse Homes owns the majority of the property along Meigs Road and he only owns 12 acres. D. Faldzinski stated he can appreciate this point, but the change in traffic is happening and they need to get the road up to standard. He stated they are willing to work with him to get as many parties involved as possible to accomplish this. Mr. Curtin stated he feels that the type of housing they will provide will not create a heavy level of traffic as most of their residents at their other facilities have only one car and, given the age restrictions, they are not dealing with the normal use of their cars. The fact that they are seniors may in itself mitigate traffic concerns.

Mr. Trasher noted that D. Faldzinski had mentioned culverts when discussing required improvements and these are closer to the intersection of Meigs and Downer. He noted there often are transportation improvement districts that put in place. There is a shopping center in this area with access onto Meigs, an existing apartment complex that puts a lot of traffic onto Meigs, Pooler Enterprise is looking to put traffic onto Meigs, Mr. Scuga is looking to put traffic onto Meigs, and when there is a situation where there is an existing substandard road, typically municipalities do not put the burden all onto one developer who has just a small part of the development. Often municipalities will start a transportation improvement district and would assess a fee to all the properties in that district and the Village would come in and make the improvements. Mr. Trasher then asked why the Village has known that Meigs is substandard and has not yet done anything about it. D. Faldzinski stated these are issues that are being discussed, but the Village

has not yet come to a resolution on what direction to take. These other options are still being discussed. Mr. Curtin asked if the Village would be inclined to consider a transportation improvement district, as this plan for a collector road all the way to Syracuse Street is very comprehensive. Chairman Savacool noted that is something that the Village is in the process of looking at.

Chairman Savacool asked D. Faldzinski to review his other comments from the memo dated September 27, 2005 and they were reviewed as follows:

Existing Site Data:

- An updated boundary and topographical survey of the site should be provided to the Planning Board which identifies the following:
 1. The meets and bounds of the property, defining the site limits.
 2. Off-site topography such as portions of Meigs Road and downstream drainage ways.
 3. The Applicant should provide documentation of authorization for the Site Plan action if the applicant is not the current landowner.
 4. All easements and encumbrances.

D. Faldzinski asked if the Applicant is the current owner of the property. Mr. Scuiga stated he is currently under contract. D. Faldzinski stated he will need the authorization for the Site Plan action and the survey should show all easement and encumbrances. Mr. Trasher stated they will take care of this. D. Faldzinski noted that some of these comments may be premature, but he wanted to provide them with some direction.

Site Plan:

- The site is currently zoned PDD (Planned Development District). The following requirements are outlined within this district:
 1. Site area of 10 acres minimum. A site area of 12 acres is proposed.
 2. Maximum density based on R2 zoning criteria. For the 168 units, a minimum site area is 11.81 acres is required.
 3. Floor area ratio of 0.4 to 1 is required. The applicant will need to provide a breakdown of the floor areas for the proposed buildings.

D. Faldzinski noted they would need a breakdown by level. Mr. Trasher asked if this should include the garages or only the living area. D. Faldzinski stated this is vague and he will look into this further. Mr. Trasher stated they can do two different calculations, one including the garages and one without it. Mr. Curtin noted that common areas and hallways may not need to be included either.

4. A maximum lot coverage of 30% is required. The plans identify that the lot coverage will be apparently 17.8%.
5. Setbacks shall be as determined by the Planning Board. We recommend using the R2 district setback requirements as an initial guide to determine the appropriate location of the buildings. In R2 zoning, there is a 40' front yard, a 40' rear yard, and side yard setbacks are to exceed 1' of horizontal to each 1' of vertical building elevation.

Mr. Trasher noted this will be affected if there is to be an access road on the south side. D. Faldzinski stated he interprets the code to state that the setbacks in a PDD district are up to the Planning Board's discretion. Chairman Savacool stated the Board will consider the issues and will look at what is reasonable. He stated it is his understanding as well that the setbacks are to be determined by the Planning Board. J. C. Engelbrecht confirmed this. Mr. Trasher stated their layout will be dependent on what the setbacks are. D. Faldzinski noted that some of the open spaces, possibly the interconnected roadway between buildings, could be eliminated to make the layout work.

- The Applicant shall provide a long EAF for the proposed action.
- This Site Plan application will require review by SOCPA as the project is within 500' of the Village limits.

- The Applicant should indicate the size and location of lease/maintenance offices, community centers, associated parking areas, and all other site amenities.
- The plans shall indicate the limits of construction phasing.
- The site is located within the Canton Street Wellhead Protection Area. As a result, the project will be subject to the regulations as part of Article XIX Wellhead-Watershed Protection Overlay District within the Village Code.

D. Faldzinski noted this was one of the obstacles of the prior application for this property. He said he anticipates that the stormwater drainage will have to be collected in pipes and discharged to a lined detention basin system and then piped from there outside the limits of the wellhead protection area. Mr. Trasher stated they plan to collect the stormwater within the parking areas and take it down the main storm system. They could line the swales with clay and then outlet it back in the same direction. Chairman Savacool stated he thinks the issue is water treatment. Mr. Trasher stated that piping the water to outside of the wellhead protection area is a long way to pipe. D. Faldzinski stated he is concerned that there are no areas of channelized flow and they would need to meet the same discharge characteristics that are there. Mr. Trasher noted that the town of Cortland has one of the most stringent wellhead protection plans and he is aware of the standard regulations. He stated he could design their drainage plan in accordance with those regulations. D. Faldzinski stated they can address this issue more as it develops. Chairman Savacool stated that timing was an issue in terms of money for the prior project and when that applicant became aware of the wellhead protection issue, they were not prepared. Therefore, he wanted to be certain this current Applicant was aware of this now. Mr. Trasher stated they are aware that certain things need to be done within a wellhead protection district, but he noted there are different layers of a wellhead protection district and they are closer to the recharge district. He noted that the developer has a caring concern for this issue, but piping their stormwater outside of the district is problematic.

- The location of trash/recycling collection structures shall be indicated on the plan.

Parking:

- The proposed plans indicate that 266 parking spaces will be provided for the facility and its 168 units. According to Village Code, approximately 252 parking spaces are required. This is based on 1 and ½ parking spaces per dwelling unit.

Mr. Trasher asked if they could eliminate some of the parking space initially and use that space for green space and add in parking later if needed. The reasoning for this is that this is a senior living facility and a number of parking spaces sit vacant at the facilities in Geddes. Chairman Savacool asked J. C. Engelbrecht if any covenant that would be provided regarding use would survive if ownership were to change. J. C. Engelbrecht stated that covenants are binding with the property if they are filed with the County and will transfer with the sale of the property. Chairman Savacool stated he, therefore, would prefer to see more green space over empty parking areas. Mr. Curtin stated they would reserve space for parking if it is necessary later on and will landscape this. They could show this on the plan as “reserved,” which would conform with the Village ordinance. The developer would have the ability to put this parking in later if required. J. C. Engelbrecht stated he feels a parking covenant may be desirable in this situation. Mr. Curtin stated he has done this in the town of Camillus and the Board there grants approval, but requires the Applicant to revisit the plan and how it functions incrementally so the Board has the ability to review it in the future. This way, the Board maintains some degree of jurisdiction and keeps the developer accountable to the Planning Board. Chairman Savacool asked what the mechanism for this would be. Mr. Curtin stated it is part of the resolution to require that the Applicant maintain contact regarding certain issues. J. C. Engelbrecht stated the problem with this is that it could become a “paper tiger” and he feels it would be preferable to have the issue resolved up front.

Mr. Trasher noted that adequate parking is desirable for the developer as well and based on their experience, the full number of parking spaces required is not needed at this time. E. Rock asked how much of a reduction in parking the Applicant was asking for. Mr. Trasher stated they are considering taking the parking off the ends of each unit, a total of 40 stalls. Chairman Savacool noted this would be a total of 26 fewer spaces than required. J. McFall stated he feels that he has no problem with this parking plan.

D. Faldzinski stated that his opinion is that basing parking requirements on 1 and ½ spaces per unit is not unreasonable given that there are potentially two people per unit and they will also have visitors. Mr. Trasher stated it has been their experience with the facilities in Geddes that the lots look pretty much empty much of the time even though the facilities are fully occupied.

J. C. Engelbrecht asked if there will be assigned parking. Mr. Curtin stated that only the garages are assigned. He noted there are not enough garages for all the units and about 2/3 of the occupants pay extra for them. He noted that not all occupants will have a car.

D. Faldzinski asked what the occupancy for the Geddes facility is. Mr. Scuiga stated there are 101 people in 72 units and of those only 2 people had more than 1 car. The ratio used for that parking was the same, 1 and ½ per unit, and the lots are often mostly empty.

Mr. Trasher stated they are willing to comply with the 1 and ½ spaces per unit, but would like to have more green space. Chairman Savacool stated the Board just wants to make sure the parking issue is covered and to be sure the Village would be able to protect itself in the future. J. C. Engelbrecht stated he will look into the parking issue further.

Stormwater:

- A NYSDEC Stated Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (SPDES) stormwater discharge permit will be required for the proposed action. A drainage report will be required to demonstrate the proposed discharge is in conformance with NYSDEC regulations.
- If channelized flow directed off-site from the stormwater management area is proposed, then an off-site easement for stormwater conveyance will be required to a point where the water intercepts an open body of water or a closed drainage system.

Utilities:

- The applicant is proposing connection to the County sanitary sewer trunk line to the east of their site. Based on an April 2001 Facilities Plan report produced for the Onondaga County Department of Drainage & Sanitation by Barton & Loguidice, P.C. the trunk line appears to have been sized with sufficient capacity to accept wastewater flow this development and others along Meigs Road. The applicant shall obtain authorization for this connection from the County and obtain off-site easements for the proposed connection as necessary.
- The Village would likely accept the dedication of and maintenance responsibilities for the proposed sanitary sewer main serving the project if it were to be located within the future collector road right-of-way.

Chairman Savacool noted this would be an advantage to the developer.

- The potable water main connection within the Meigs Road right-of-way and extension to the east shall be accomplished within the proposed collector road right-of-way for future access and extension.

D. Faldzinski noted this is an opportune time for the Village to loop the water system from Meigs Road further to the east for the main to exist along Canton Street and eventually connect to the main in town and keep up the pressure and circulation as a result. He noted this would be an advantage to the developer as well, as they could take services for their facility off of that main. Mr. Scuiga stated he had spoken with Claude Sykes about the water line and noted that Mr. Sykes was not looking for him to do the loop, but just to provide the right of way so the Village could do the loop. D. Faldzinski noted they would just need the Applicant to extend this just adjacent to his property, not all the way down Canton Street.

- The new water service(s) will need to provide adequate water capacity and fire protection. Coordination with the Baldwinsville Fire Department in regard to the location of on-site fire protection facilities will be required. Terminal ends of water mains will require hydrants for flushing.

- The location of other utility service extensions such as gas, electric, telephone should be shown on the plans.
- The applicant shall coordinate with and obtain approvals for all utility connections and extensions with the Village of Baldwinsville Superintendent of Public Works, Claude Sykes.

Miscellaneous:

- The engineering fee for the review of this application will be initially set at \$7500.00. Payment of these monies should be arranged with the Village Clerk.

Chairman Savacool stated he would like to visit the site as a Board for a walkthrough with D. Faldzinski to get a feel for the land to better address drainage issues, setbacks, etc. This will take place on Saturday, October 15, 2005 at 9 AM and will be posted to meet the open meeting requirement. Mr. Scuiga gave his permission for this.

Mr. Trasher stated they will submit a revised plan in time for the walkthrough and they will want to be on the next month's agenda. Mr. Curtin stated he will contact Syracuse Home. D. Faldzinski stated he will meet with the DPW to discuss Meigs Road and other roadways. Mr. Trasher stated he was given the impression by the County that the intersection of Meigs and Downer is under the control of the Village. D. Faldzinski stated that this is not accurate, that it is a County road in this location. He will meet with Mr. Trasher and the County on Thursday.

OTHER BUSINESS

J. McFall stated that early in 2003 the Assembly of God came before the Planning Board for their new facility. One of the Board's requirements for approval was that trees and shrubs be planted along the Oneida Street boundary. This has not been done. Reverend Czyz had agreed to this and had also met with several homeowners and told them that this would be done. Chairman Savacool asked if this was on the drawings. J. McFall and E. Mercer stated they remember the discussion regarding this, but were not sure if it was actually on the drawings. J. C. Engelbrecht asked if the text was made part of the resolution. J. McFall was not sure and stated they had discussed putting in cedars. D. Arthur asked if the Assembly of God had been approached. Chairman Savacool disclosed to the Board that he is a member of that church. He stated he will contact them regarding this issue and report back to the Board. D. Faldzinski stated he will look at the plans and see what was indicated regarding the trees/shrubbery.

Upon motion by J. McFall and second by E. Mercer, the meeting was adjourned at 9:05 p.m. The next Planning Board meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, November 22, 2005.

Respectfully Submitted,

Susan A. LaQuay
Planning Board Secretary