

VILLAGE OF BALDWINSVILLE
PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, January 24, 2006, 7:30 P.M.
Approved February 7, 2006

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

NOT PRESENT: Russ Lucy

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

GUESTS: Tom Scuiga, B.S. Enterprises
Robert Germain, Attorney
James Trasher, P.E.

REGULAR MEETING - 7:30 P.M.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Upon motion by J. McFall and second by D. Arthur that the minutes of the November 22, 2005 Planning Board meeting be approved as submitted. Motion passed.

CEO REPORT

Chairman Savacool stated there has been a disconnect between the Planning Board and the Codes Enforcement Office. He noted that the Codes Enforcement Officer used to attend the Planning Board meetings; however, this practice was stopped a number of years ago. This has resulted in a continuity problem with the Codes Enforcement Office and the Board. Chairman Savacool stated he had spoken with Mayor O'Hara about having the CEO present at Planning Board meetings and Mayor O'Hara agreed this would be beneficial. However, the CEO, Rolf Beckhusen, has prior commitments through April for these meeting dates and will begin attending meetings after that time. Chairman Savacool stated Mr. Beckhusen will brief him regarding updates until he is able to attend.

Chairman Savacool stated this decision will serve two purposes. First, the presence of the CEO will be helpful for suggestions and he will be aware of planning decisions and issues. Second, the CEO can give the Board updates on projects that have passed, which will allow the Board to stay informed as to the progress of projects in the Village.

Chairman Savacool stated he spoke with R. Beckhusen yesterday to get updates. They are as follows:

- 1) The fire code now requires a number of things that may change the set up of subdivisions; for example regarding ingress and egress and, in particular, cul-de-sacs are not favorably looked upon because fire trucks are very large and most cul-de-sacs have a 60' radius. Planning Boards are encouraged to try to stay away from them as they are problematic for fire protection as well as snow removal.
- 2) The Mercer Mill project is proceeding. R. Beckhusen has been there quite a bit and stated they are on schedule for an April completion.
- 3) Regarding the EDR presentation, a copy was given to Board Members regarding EDR's recommendations. Chairman Savacool stated the Board should discuss this at some point. A public meeting was scheduled for February 2, 2006, but was rescheduled for February 16, 2006 at the Village Board of Trustees Meeting at 7:30 PM.

OTHER BUSINESS

J. McFall stated he recalls permission being granted to the developer of Village Commons to keep the shed building in the back rather than demolish it as was previously agreed. Part of the deal in keeping this building intact was for it to be used partly for dumpster storage to keep them from being stored outside. J. McFall noted the dumpsters are not inside, but are fully visible. He would like this to be brought to the attention of the CEO. J. C. Engelbrecht asked if this agreement is included in the plans. E. Mercer and J. McFall stated they are not sure it is in the plans, but the issue was discussed at the meeting. J. C. Engelbrecht suggested the Planning Board secretary find the minutes pertaining to this issue. Chairman Savacool stated the Board will address this at another meeting after he and J. C. Engelbrecht have reviewed the minutes and resolution.

OLD BUSINESS

Golden Legacy Adult Living Facility Site Plan Review– Meigs Road

Robert Germain, Attorney for B. S. Enterprises, James Trasher, PE, and Tom Scuiga are present. Mr. Germain stated they had received the Village Engineer's comments dated January 20, 2006 and are prepared to address them. He stated that time is critical for this project and they are hoping to get preliminary approval subject to conditions. Chairman Savacool asked what the time issue is and Mr. Germain stated it is a contractual issue dealing with the purchase of the property. J. McFall noted that the Planning Board had previously scheduled a Special Meeting for this Applicant on January 10, 2006 and the meeting was cancelled, as they were not prepared at that time. He wanted the Applicant to understand that the Board is flexible and understanding of the issues regarding time.

Chairman Savacool asked D. Faldzinski to review his comments dated January 20, 2006. D. Faldzinski reviewed them as follows:

Existing Site Data

1. An updated boundary and topographical survey of the property has been provided. The survey acknowledges that a current abstract was not reviewed and that the survey is subject to easements and encumbrances one would discover in the review of the current abstract.

Mr. Germain stated it is common for a surveyor to not have the abstract in front of him and the surveyor would note that. They have taken steps to obtain an updated abstract and will get this to the Board when they have it. Mr. Trasher noted their plans are based off an old abstract and the new one is typically requested at closing. Mr. Germain feels this could be made a contingent item for preliminary approval. D. Faldzinski noted that the owner would likely be forthright in trying to make sure everything is in place for the sale. Mr. Trasher stated no utilities run through the site and most are along Meigs or on the property of Syracuse Homes. He does not believe easements will be an issue.

2. The applicant should provide documentation of ownership or authorization to pursue the proposed action.

D. Faldzinski stated this has been addressed and the applicant provided a letter of authorization from the landowner at the start of the meeting.

Site Plan

1. The floor area value shown within the apartment building envelope on the Site Plan is 9,500 square feet. The floor area value identified with the summary table is 9,850 square feet. This discrepancy should be addressed.

Mr. Trasher indicated this was a typo and the correct value is 9,850. This will be corrected on the revised plan.

2. The applicant shall provide a long EAF for the proposed action.

Mr. Germain handed out a copy of this. Mr. Trasher stated they have completed Part I to the best of their ability. They had previously submitted a short form with the application. Chairman Savacool stated this will be reviewed later.

3. The proposed action will occur in an area currently designated as sensitive for archaeological sites on the NY Site Inventory according to the NY State Historical Preservation Office. The applicant should demonstrate that the proposed action will not have a significant impact on historic and archaeological resources.

D. Faldzinski stated on Part II of the long EAF there is section on page 16, Item 12 where the Board will address the potential for impact. He noted the current inventory identifies this as a sensitive site and this is based on locations where it is likely that Indians settled. Mr. Trasher stated he checked the website that shows these areas and their property is located at the edge of the sensitive area and crosses into an area that is non-sensitive. He gave the Board a copy of the website page he was referencing. He stated this issue tends to be dealt with when applying for wetland permits and during the SEQR process. Mr. Germain felt it could be a Board determination. He noted that this is a farm field that has been cultivated over a long time. It is likely those disturbances would have brought to light any significant findings. SHPO would create another long delay and incur greater expense. He noted the Board is more familiar with this land than is SHPO. Chairman Savacool asked if anyone on the Board is familiar with the history of the property. E. Mercer stated that she is aware of archeological finds on farm properties bordering the river (the Crego farm), but is not aware of anything being found as far inland as this site. D. Faldzinski stated he concurs with Mr. Trasher that if the action requires federal or state permit requiring review, it would be incumbent on that agency to determine if consultation with SHPO is necessary regarding this issue. Mr. Germain noted there is currently no other authority involved in this process. They are asking the Board to make an informed determination on this issue.

D. Arthur noted that much of Baldwinsville is designated “sensitive” and, as such, any new development would be difficult. D. Faldzinski noted that much of the time nothing is found on these sites. J. McFall stated he feels comfortable moving forward on this property and D. Arthur agreed. Chairman Savacool asked what would happen if they started work and then found something significant. J.C. Engelbrecht stated that could be addressed at that time and development would halt immediately. He stated he can relate to the Applicant’s sensitivity to time and money and feels their point is very valid. He noted this area, notwithstanding the map, is not recognized to be an archeologically sensitive area. Chairman Savacool noted the history of the property being cultivated. D. Faldzinski stated that SHPO does not consider cultivation to be soil disturbance. L. Barnett noted that crops are not permanent and buildings are; however, he does not feel that this issue should hold up the project. Mr. Scuiga noted there are no large trees to indicate that the land has been undisturbed for any real length of time.

Chairman Savacool stated when addressing SEQR regarding this issue, it will be noted that the development will occur in an area that is sensitive with small to moderate impact, which is the least degree of impact. He noted that it will be important to fill out the comment section to show that this issue has been considered and reviewed by the Board and to demonstrate the Board’s knowledge of the area.

Parking and Site Access

1. Both one-way entry and one-way exit driveways for the eastern parking area have been provided. Angular parking at the entrance has been provided to discourage cars from driving in the wrong direction. The issue of safety for vehicles backing out of the garage spaces should be addressed.

Mr. Trasher stated that there was initially ingress and egress at both driveways and D. Faldzinski’s comments in December requested one point of each. The difficulty accommodating this was based on the inclusion of garages in the facility. Mr. Trasher noted there is now one-way circulation around the site. Driveways were taken from 24’ wide to 16’ wide and at areas where there are garage doors on either side, there is a 5’ width of pavement striping, as well as curbing. D. Faldzinski stated he realizes there is not much more they can do but wanted this addressed at the meeting.

Mr. Scuiga noted that he had sent Chairman Savacool a letter from the CEO and the fire department and they have no issues with the plan other than wanting some hydrants moved. D. Faldzinski noted this hydrant issue is not addressed in the memo. Mr. Trasher stated that they had been referring to an old set of plans and the hydrants have been relocated on the revised plan. D. Faldzinski stated the Board needs to understand that the CEO may have seen something new after the hydrants were relocated. Mr. Trasher showed the new locations on the revised plans. Chairman Savacool looked at the new location and felt this hydrant issue had been addressed by the revised plan.

D. Arthur asked if the width of the driveway ingress and egress are suitable to the fire dept. D. Faldzinski stated they meet codes and the width is suitable for a one-way driveway. His concern is the cars pulling out of garages. Mr. Trasher stated they can put up caution signs. He stated the curbing at 5' will keep cars far enough from the buildings. Chairman Savacool noted that cars will likely be moving slowly anyway. D. Faldzinski noted it is also helpful that the parking is angled to get cars traveling in the right direction.

Wellhead Protection

1. An infiltration system within the stormwater managements area is proposed to recharge the pre-development stormwater volume from the 100 year, 24 hour storm event in to the ground, similar to pre-development site conditions. The proposed infiltration system design is based on the use of an infiltration rate of 5 inches per hour. Based on the Onondaga Count Soil Survey the infiltration system will be located in an area where Arkport very fine sandy loam soil exists. The soils survey indicates that the permeability of this soil can range between 0.6 to 6.0 inches per hour from 10 to 60 inches below the surface. We recommend that the design be based on a more conservative infiltration rate or that the applicant perform field-testing to support the use of the higher rate.

Mr. Trasher stated a test pit is being dug down 5' for a perk test tomorrow and the DEC has set up mandates for perk tests for stormwater facilities that are almost identical to perk tests for septic systems. He noted there is sandy loam in this area and they feel that 5" per hour should be accurate. They will modify this according to the perk test. D. Faldzinski asked that they do three tests in the stormwater management area as this will be a Village owned and operated system so they will want the information up front. Mr. Trasher stated they will dig three holes. D. Faldzinski stated this will satisfy the comment.

Chairman Savacool stated that, given the site and the history of wellhead protection issues, he contacted Steven Winkley of the NYS Water Authority regarding what should be done to allow for recharge of the well. One concern is allowing a minimal amount of water into the soil, as this is a recharge area. D. Faldzinski stated this is not to say that discharge offsite will not absorb offsite, but they would prefer it to be absorbed onsite as to not make it someone else's responsibility to manage the water offsite.

Collector Roadway and Traffic

1. Site and stopping site distance calculations for the proposed access on to Meigs Road shall be provided.

Mr. Trasher gave the Board the site distance test, which was done according to AASHTO standards. He explained how the test was conducted. D. Faldzinski stated this is appropriate and sufficient based on the road.

2. Initial feedback from the County DOT suggests that the impacts from the proposed action are negligible and based on the number of trip generated suggests a traffic study will not be required. The applicant should provide documentation from the County DOT supporting these understandings.

The Board was provided with a letter from Jim Stelter at the DOT documenting this.

3. Warning sign and barricade details preferred by the Village are attached to this memorandum for the applicant' use. The Applicant should incorporate these details into the plans.

D. Faldzinski noted these details came directly from Claude Sykes, the Superintendent of Public Works. He is looking for a full barricade at the end of that road. Mr. Scuiga suggested they could purchase the materials and maybe the Village DPW could do the installation so they can make certain it will be done to Village standards. They will show the details. D. Faldzinski stated he could discuss this with Mr. Sykes.

4. Meigs Road 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 conditions and increase the potential for safety related issues. As a result, we recommend that current and future developers work with the village to mitigate these issues.

Mr. Germain stated they will be meeting with the Mayor O'Hara and with Plumley Engineering and are committed to working on this issue.

Stormwater

1. A field walk was performed to review the site watershed areas and the direction of existing stormwater run-off. A field inspection report was completed and is attached for the applicant's use. The proposed basin outlet and emergency spillway are positioned to direct stormwater discharge to a low area (low area no.1) northeast of the project. However, the majority of current stormwater run-off is directed toward a separate low area (low area no. 2) to the northwest of the property's northeast property corner. In addition, a portion of land in the southeast corner of the property, as part of basin E02, discharges to the east and toward low area no. 1 and not into low area no. 2 as the majority of the watershed from E02 does. We recommend that the proposed outlets be relocated along the north property, approximately 100 to 200 feet west of the northeast property corner and that the watershed basin areas be revised accordingly.
2. The revised location of the stormwater management system outfall will likely be located such that the stormwater discharge will be directed toward the north and in to low are no.2. Due to the fact that stormwater run-off in the form of shallow concentrated flow is currently experienced along the north property line, a level spreader devise(s) positioned at the basin discharge points should be provided.

Mr. Trasher stated they have changed the location of the outlets to address these 2 comments. This is shown on the revised plans. Mr. Trasher stated there is a weir on the north line. D. Faldzinski stated this is likely a self-regulating area due to the soil at that location.

Utilities

1. The applicant shall obtain authorization for the sanitary sewer line connection from the County and obtain off-site easements for the proposed connection.
2. The sanitary sewer system should remain private, as there will be a single owner of the property.

Mr. Trasher showed the easement along the sanitary sewer that will allow the Village to own and maintain the system. He noted there will be an easement from Syracuse Homes to connect to sanitary sewer manhole #1 and continue the easement over to the right of way to allow for Syracuse Homes to connect without having to tap into the manhole again. An easement along their property line will be required. Mr. Germain stated they have discussed this with Syracuse Homes and have drafted an easement agreement. Mr. Trasher stated the Village would have access, as this will eventually be a public easement. They are requesting to do this now to avoid the necessity of future negotiations with other property owners. D. Faldzinski stated that they will need Claude Sykes' input and Mr. Germain stated he would be able to inspect it prior to dedication. D. Faldzinski stated they will need to go before the Village Board of Trustees and ask the Village make a resolution of intent. J. C. Engelbrecht stated they will need to get plans more complete and finalized prior to this. Chairman Savacool noted the comment states the system should be a private system. Mr. Scuiga stated they will obtain the easements from Syracuse Homes regardless of whether or not the Village would like it to be public and they will initially be private. Mr. Germain stated this will be temporary in nature and will terminate upon dedication to the Village.

3. Information regarding facility water demands should be provided to the Village.

Mr. Trasher stated this is part of the SEQR documentation and it is 32,400 gallons per day. Per apartment it is between 150 and 300 gallons per person per day and there are 144 units. Chairman Savacool asked if this needs further review. D. Faldzinski stated he will review this. It has likely already been incorporated into the Master Plan and this is good information to have for inventory purposes. He stated he will pass this information on to Claude Sykes and get his impressions on it.

4. The water main extension from Meigs Road within the Oakcrest Road right-of-way should be between 10 and 12 inches in diameter. The Village is currently involved in performing a hydraulic analysis of the water system in the area of the project to determine the required pipe sizing.

D. Faldzinski stated that, referring back to the Master Plan, he thinks the water line that was envisioned connecting from Meigs to Canton was 12" diameter pipe. However, McHarrie Town needed an 8" water line and the Village got involved in paying for the increase from 8" to 12" and he is not sure if 12" is needed for this project to connect. He and Claude Sykes are trying to find out what is needed. William Rowell confirmed the need for the 12" line. Chairman Savacool noted that 12" may in fact be bigger than what is needed as it may restrict flow further down. D. Faldzinski stated Mr. Rowell may have been looking at it from a water pressure standpoint. He stated he will address this further with Claude Sykes.

Mr. Scuiga asked if it was determined that 8" would fulfill their needs but the Village wanted 12", would the Village pay for the difference? D. Faldzinski stated he does not want to say that the Village would, but this has been done in the past. Chairman Savacool noted this issue will still need to be resolved and asked what the impact would be on the plan. Mr. Trasher stated it would just involve changing the number on the plan. D. Faldzinski stated he is still trying to retrieve the old master water system report and will get that information to the applicant as soon as possible.

5. All proposed easements and right-of-ways to be conveyed to the Village of Baldwinsville will require the Village Board of Trustees review and approval prior to acceptance.

D. Faldzinski noted this will be going before the Village Board of Trustees.

Miscellaneous

1. The Village has expressed interest in a sidewalk or other path between this property and the senior center located on Canton Street.

Mr. Trasher noted they have a roadway with roadside swales and this impacts what can be done in terms of sidewalks. He noted there are a lot of sidewalks around the facility. He does not think that people would actually walk along that road. D. Faldzinski stated this does not necessarily mean roadside sidewalks but more of a path between their facility and Canton Street.

Chairman Savacool noted the Village wants to consider pedestrian access when considering future development. This does not have to include actual sidewalks, but can consist of pathways. The Board would like to keep this in mind whenever considering new development. Mr. Trasher stated that internal sidewalks have been provided around the site and he does not feel with the slopes and water detention areas that paths would be safe. Mr. Scuiga also noted they had planned to keep the wooded area between the properties intact for screening purposes.

J. McFall stated that suggesting a path from this property to the senior center on Canton Street is unreasonable. He feels that if residents of Golden Legacy want to get to the senior center, they will get there without this path. Mr. Scuiga noted that he does not own the property all the way to Canton Street. D. Faldzinski stated he would only be providing this pathway on his own property towards Canton Street. Mr. Trasher noted that if the pathway were along the road in the right-of-way, the Village would be able to control the connections between developments. This control would be problematic if the path was going through private properties. He also noted that if they put in the path

towards Canton Street, residents would have to walk uphill to get back from the senior center on Canton Street. Mr. Germain stated he feels pathways would also provide nonresidents with access to the property and this may present security issues.

L. Barnett stated he understands the Village is expressing a wish but feels they cannot hold an applicant responsible for tying into someone else's property. Chairman Savacool stated the Board wants to consider the potential for tie-ins and connections to future developments and noted this is a difficult issue to address after a development is already built and this is why this issue is being addressed up front. Mr. Scuiga suggested this path could be situated to go through the area that will potentially be dedicated to the Village. This way the Village would have control of future connection.

Chairman Savacool asked if the sidewalks between phases 1 and 2 will be connected. Mr. Trasher stated they will not be connected because of the slope of the site. He noted ADA compliance is difficult regarding sidewalks due to slopes. He stated if there is demand for connection from the residents they may address this at that time.

D. Faldzinski noted the issue of sidewalks was in his comments to invite discussion, as this is something the Village is working towards. D. Arthur noted the intent of the Village is to get sidewalks into new developments and to connect sidewalks from sites being developed now to sidewalks in future developments. He stated his understanding was that the Village was intending to get sidewalks along roadways.

Chairman Savacool asked what was being discussed regarding payment in lieu of parks. D. Faldzinski noted some of this fee could be appropriated for sidewalks and the Applicant should discuss this with Mayor O'Hara and Claude Sykes. Mr. Scuiga stated he thought payment in lieu of park fees was for subdivisions. D. Faldzinski stated the Village Board had passed a per unit fee for a PDD site. Mr. Germain stated they will discuss this with Mayor O'Hara at their meeting.

2. Roadway lighting a minimum level of 1-foot candle should be provided immediately above the pavement surface to illuminate the proposed access points along Oakcrest Road, including the intersection with Meigs Road and driveway connections.

Mr. Trasher asked if the Village has a lighting district for streetlights and from his experience streetlights in the right-of-way are handled between the municipality and National Grid. Chairman Savacool asked what lighting is currently provided and Mr. Trasher stated just the building lights. There is no lighting at the access points. D. Faldzinski noted it has been his experience with the Village that lighting is provided by the developer. The lighting bill itself is paid by the Village, but the lighting fixtures are paid for by the developer. Mr. Trasher noted that the Village took care of the lighting for Baldwin Hill. Chairman Savacool noted that this was done as a concession for the pump station that developer built. D. Faldzinski noted that for the second phase of Baldwin Hill, the developer was required to pay for the lighting, as was the developer for Festa Fairway. Mr. Trasher asked what the Village would require. D. Faldzinski stated he will check the Village detail for standard lighting and get back to him regarding this. Mr. Scuiga stated he will discuss this with Claude Sykes.

D. Faldzinski stated that his final comment is in regard to the erosion sediment control plan, which Mr. Trasher has prepared and will send to him.

D. Arthur asked if the applicant had provided the meets and bounds of the easement with Syracuse Homes. Mr. Germain stated they have a legal description of the easement and will do a temporary agreement with Syracuse Homes, which will terminate upon dedication to the Village.

J. C. Engelbrecht stated that payment in lieu of parks for this site is addressed in Code section 72-28C, which states that this applies to site plans as well as subdivisions. The amount per unit is not set in the local law, but is set by the Board of Trustees from time to time. D. Faldzinski thought it would be between \$350. to \$400. per unit. Mr. Germain stated they will address this at their meeting with Mayor O'Hara.

Chairman Savacool asked what was determined regarding the financing and subdividing of the property between the two phases. He noted subdivision was not an option as PDD requires consideration of the site as a whole and it needs to be developed as a whole. Mr. Trasher stated it is his experience that phase development is common for PDD sites due to the size of the projects and upfront costs involved with developing all at once. D. Faldzinski stated he agrees with this with the understanding that all the infrastructure will be in place in Phase 1. J. C. Engelbrecht noted, however, that separate financing for each phase may require a legal description that may require subdivision of a property that cannot be subdivided and still maintain its PDD zoning. Subdivision may be triggered automatically upon filing. This is something the Applicant may need to discuss further. J. C. Engelbrecht noted this is the Applicant's issue to deal with, not the Village's issue. Mr. Germain stated he will work on this.

Chairman Savacool asked J. C. Engelbrecht how they could formalize the infrastructure going in in a phase development. J. C. Engelbrecht stated this development, even done in phases, is all one PDD for the Village. The infrastructure will need to be done to obtain permits. He noted the only issue with this is they will need to come back in later to pull permits as they need to be pulled within a certain time frame.

Chairman Savacool outlined the outstanding issues that will need to be resolved/addressed prior to preliminary approval. They are as follows:

1. An updated abstract is needed from the Applicant to check for easements, etc. Mr. Germain stated this will be provided within a few days. He noted they do not expect any surprises. J. C. Engelbrecht stated this could be considered a contingency issue.
2. Regarding water demand and sewer flows - Information should be provided to the DPW for review and assessment to determine potential need for upgrades and to verify capacity. Mr. Trasher stated they do not anticipate any problems with this. He had spoken with Claude Sykes and Mr. Sykes had stated there was sufficient water. D. Faldzinski stated this could be considered a contingency issue.
3. The perk test will be done tomorrow. This will address the design of the detention basin, which will be designed according to the results of the test. D. Faldzinski stated this will potentially be a change just in the stormwater management report. Chairman Savacool asked how long the design would take. Mr. Trasher stated it will take a few days. D. Faldzinski stated this is an issue that would need to be resolved prior to any approval.
4. The plans will need to show details regarding barricade and warning signs. Mr. Trasher stated this will be shown on the revised plan.
5. Comment 4 under Collector Roadway on D. Faldzinski comments dated 1/20/06 is still an open item. Chairman Savacool noted this is not a requirement and, therefore, should not hold up the site plan. D. Faldzinski stated there are potential traffic and safety concerns regarding this road. J. C. Engelbrecht noted the DOT is not saying that increased traffic from this project will have a significant impact on traffic and the physical impact on Meigs road is negligible. D. Faldzinski stated the Village's concern is that the road is adequate from a structural and safety standpoint. Mr. Germain stated they are committed to working with the Village on this issue. Mr. Trasher stated it is his impression that the Village is looking more for ditch improvements, etc. and not actually the reconstruction of Meigs Road. Mr. Germain noted that the comment is a recommendation, not a requirement, that they work with the Village and this is what they will do. Mr. Trasher noted that showing Oakcrest Road on their plans shows their willingness to work with the Village regarding this issue. D. Arthur stated the Village Board of Trustees will have the opportunity to emphasize or de-emphasize what they will want from this Applicant regarding this issue. Mr. Germain stated that based on his discussion with Mayor O'Hara, this issue was not intended to hold up the site plan. D. Arthur stated he feels that their upcoming meeting with Mayor O'Hara regarding this should satisfy the comment.

J. C. Engelbrecht stated that based on the outstanding issues, the Board can give the Applicant a degree of comfort regarding this plan, but they will have to complete SEQR for formal contingency approval. Chairman Savacool asked if the outstanding issues can all be addressed within two weeks. Mr. Germain stated they can be addressed in that timeframe. Chairman Savacool stated the Board could hold a Special Meeting in two weeks as the long EAF form is required and cannot be completed tonight. Mr. Trasher asked if D. Faldzinski would recommend answers for part II in their review and noted they would like to see this in advance. J. C. Engelbrecht stated this is fine. D. Faldzinski stated he will contact Mr. Trasher with this information.

Chairman Savacool noted there are remaining outstanding issues as follows:

6. Water main size. D. Faldzinski stated he will get this information to the Applicant within a few days.
7. Easement issues regarding the sewer - private vs. public. They will start out as private easements and potentially be dedicated at a later time.
8. Sidewalk issues and payment in lieu of park fees. The Applicant has already scheduled a meeting with Mayor O'Hara.
9. Lighting issues. D. Faldzinski will get the standard from Claude Sykes to give to the Applicant.
10. Erosion control and sediment. This will be provided to D. Faldzinski.
11. D. Faldzinski stated the agreement with Syracuse Homes regarding the dedication of 40' may play into approval regarding Oakcrest Road. This can be a contingent issue.
12. J. C. Engelbrecht stated that landscaping needs to be included in the drawings, as the Board has had problems with this in the past. Mr. Trasher noted this is included in the revised plan and is extremely detailed. J. C. Engelbrecht stated he was glad to see this detail.
13. D. Faldzinski noted that the Village has been requiring Applicants to pay engineering and legal fees prior to approval.

Chairman Savacool asked if the sign has already been addressed. Mr. Scuiga stated this has already been reviewed and approved by the Architectural Review Board.

Upon motion by E. Mercer and second by J. McFall, a Special Meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, February 7, 2006 at 7:30 PM to discuss Site Plan review for Golden Legacy Adult Living Facility and any other matters that may come before the Planning Board. **Carried**

This Special Meeting will be posted by the Village Clerk.

Chairman Savacool stated the Board will take care of the acceptance of the SOCPA resolution and SEQR determination at the Special Meeting and he anticipates a vote at that time.

Upon motion by L. Barnett and second by E. Rock, the meeting was adjourned at 9:53 p.m. The next Planning Board meeting is a Special Meeting scheduled for Tuesday, February 7, 2006.

Respectfully Submitted,

Susan A. LaQuay
Planning Board Secretary