

VILLAGE OF BALDWINSVILLE
PLANNING BOARD SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, June 26, 2007, 7:30 P.M.
Approved 7/24/07

PRESENT: Chris Savacool, Chairman
Dave Arthur
John McFall
Edward Rock
Don Cronk
Carl Pelcher
Larry Barnett

ALSO PRESENT: Mayor Joseph Saraceni
Ron Carr, Village Attorney
John Camp, Village Engineer
Susan LaQuay, Secretary

GUESTS: Paul Anderson, regarding The Shoppes at Baldwinsville
John Neumeister, regarding The Shoppes at Baldwinsville
Jason Kantak, TDK Engineers, regarding The Shoppes at Baldwinsville
Mr. Gordon Stansbury, GTS Developing, regarding The Shoppes at Baldwinsville
Larry Goldberg, owner of Tri-County Cinema, regarding The Shoppes at Baldwinsville
Please see sign in sheet as there were many members of the community present

REGULAR MEETING - 7:30 P.M.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

D. Arthur noted a correction and upon motion by J. McFall and second by D. Arthur that the minutes of the May 22, 2007 Planning Board meeting be approved as corrected. Motion passed.

NEW BUSINESS

Site Plan Review regarding The Shoppes at Baldwinsville (Tri-County Mall) – Crossroads TCM, LLC

Mr. Paul Anderson (real estate management), Mr. Jason Neumeister (architect), and Mr. Jason Kantak (engineer) are present on behalf of the Applicant. There were several members of the community present who were concerned about the proposed demolition of Tri-County Cinema. Mr. Larry Goldberg, owner of Tri-County Cinema, was present as well to address the Board.

Chairman Savacool noted that the Tri-County Theater is proposed to be demolished as part of the Applicant's plan for the site. He noted that, in addition to Mr. Goldberg and many community members being present, the Village Clerk's Office had also received close to 50 emails so far through the Village website from people in support of keeping the theater. He noted there is no public hearing scheduled for today, but he would like to give those present the opportunity to be heard. He explained to the audience that this is a Site Plan application and the process of the Site Plan Review. He stated that it is not within the purview of the Planning Board to dictate what type of business can on the site. However, he thinks it is a good idea for the public to express their views so the developer is aware of them.

Chairman Savacool noted that Mr. Goldberg (25 East Oneida Street), owner of Tri-County Theater, is present and invited him to address the Board. Mr. Goldberg stated he and his family are very happy to live in the Village and it was a great day for them when they opened up the theater a little over three years ago as a family. He noted they own and operate it together and it has been of sentimental value to the community. Mr. Goldberg stated he has spoken

with Mr. Anderson many times and feels he is a nice man. He stated that he feels what the developer wants to do with the site is a great thing for the Village as the mall is now a decrepit building and any changes to that area will be wonderful. He stated the theater is a gathering place for the Village to be proud of. He noted it is also one of less than two dozen theaters that are designated as intermediate theaters across the country and people come from all over the area to go to the theater.

Mr. Goldberg stated they understand what the developer wants to do and is pleased they will improve the area. He has expressed to them that he hopes there may be some way to incorporate the theater into the plans without having to demolish it and explained it would be a huge expense to move the theater, even if it were a short distance, and is not realistic for them. Mr. Goldberg wished to emphasize that he is not viewing this as an antagonistic situation for them as Mr. Anderson has been very honest and easy to work with and he wanted to come to this meeting to express how they feel about this as a family and to let them know they are very supportive of the developers plans to improve the area while hoping that they will not need to demolish the theater. He noted the developers are not from the area and may not have a full understanding of how important the theater is to the community.

Ms. Liz Johnson (from Syracuse) stated she wanted to attend the meeting as she knows the Goldbergs personally. She stated she grew up in Cato in the 1970s and 1980s and thinks the theater is a wonderful asset to the area. She stated she brings her children there now and feels it would be wonderful if the developer could find a way to incorporate the theater and its history into the proposed plan. She noted that it is one of the few theaters she feels completely safe bringing her children to.

Ms. Wendy Christopher (of Comstock Road) stated she has seen a lot of business come and go and has seen Tri-County Mall rejuvenate itself more than once. She stated it would be a shame if this Board cannot do more to keep the theater. She feels the Board should recommend that they do so.

Mr. Ron Harrington (of Gunbarrel Road) stated he does not feel it has been explained to them why it is necessary to tear the theater down. He stated his family is probably like many and they come into town early to shop at the local stores or eat before going to the movie. He feels the theater is one of the few key points in the Village now. He noted that another key point was Vicki's Cozy Corner, which was in Tri-County Mall and has been pushed out by the developer. He stated the Tri-County Theater was recently the first movie experience for his granddaughters. He feels malls come and go, but this theater has been around for a long time and he feels it should be kept in place.

Ms. Peg Rona stated she and her husband, Dick, live in McHarrie Town. She stated they walk everywhere, including to the theater. She stated it is affordable and clean and within walking distance of a lot of new developments in the area. They would like it to stay.

Ms. Sue Longo (Warners Road) stated she has a lot of family memories of the theater and would love to have it stay. She thinks the Village needs to recognize that some change is progress and some change is just change and she hopes the theater can remain.

Mr. Jason Murphy (Gunbarrel Road) stated he and his friends and classmates get out on half-days from school and there is nothing to do in the Village except go out to eat. He stated they have pay \$9 for a movie at any other area mall and they love to go to the Tri-County Theater. He feels that the Village needs to keep these businesses to keep its personality. He noted the theater is doing well at its present location and does not see a reason to tear it down.

Mr. David Hill (Sunset Terrace) stated he has worked at the theater for two years. He stated he gets comments from patrons all the time about how clean the theater is now. He stated the Goldbergs have done so much to improve the theater and still have more they want to do. He hopes the theater will not be demolished.

J. McFall stated he had received a flyer in his mailbox. He stated it bothers him that there is no identification on the flyer so he does not know who it came from. He suggested if flyers are sent out on behalf of the theater again, they should be sure to put a name on them.

Chairman Savacool noted that a few comments had been made about the board allowing certain businesses to come in and the types of businesses in the Village. He stated those are not decisions to be made by the Board and explained that if a developer chooses bring in a certain business, the Board cannot tell them no as this is a free market and the

market drives what businesses are here. He explained that it is actually illegal for a Board to put quotas on the number of businesses located within the Village of any particular type.

J. McFall noted that someone had mentioned Walgreen's and stated that Walgreen's and Rite-Aid are in the town of Van Buren and were never before this Board.

Chairman Savacool asked Mr. Anderson if he would like to respond. Mr. Anderson stated that the developer did not push Vicki's out of the mall. He stated that she took her restaurant over to the Fireside Inn when Don Cole wanted to make changes. He stated they were sorry to see her go as her business really gave life to the mall. He stated that they are also very interested in having a theater in the complex. He noted that Mr. Goldberg is in a tough situation in that the mall is a decrepit building. He stated their plan is creative and there is room for a theater, but the issue is whether they maintain the building as a theater or move the theater elsewhere. He noted there is a substantial cost to moving a theater and some would be borne by the developer and some would have to be the responsibility of the theater owner. He stated at no time have they suggested that Mr. Goldberg leave. They are redeveloping this site as a community center that would have mostly local tenants. He noted they would like to get some national tenants as anchors, but their plan is to fill this complex with local tenants.

Mr. Anderson noted they had discussed some changes to the plans at the last meeting. He stated they are looking at the northeast corner for snow disposition. He stated they are still at a loss to determine the nature of the driveway from the senior apartments, but will keep working to locate that information. He stated they are working to improve pedestrian access and Mayor Saraceni had made it clear that the rebuilding of the sidewalks is of great importance to him and he told Mayor Saraceni that they will, to the west of the existing building along Meigs Road, install a sidewalk. He noted the property along the hotel is in question, but they would continue the sidewalk down closer to Downer Street. He stated that after many revisions of the plan, they are close to what they want as a final plan. They had discussed using the back parcel that is currently wooded and have staggered it with 31,000 square feet of buildings, a two-story building in the middle and then a series of smaller buildings. This will allow them to develop incrementally and also gives them the goal of drawing the line of sight back to that area. This has also allowed them to operate within the constraints of the many easements on the property.

Mr. Anderson stated they also made some other changes. They left more green space up against the houses with the exception of behind the corner house going in on the east side. They feel this is a prime spot that they need to utilize. He stated they will buffer it properly. He stated they also will move the access from the senior apartments over onto their property and connected it to walkways that will get them safely across the front of the buildings. He stated they have also done the traffic study.

J. McFall asked what is between buildings B1 and B2. Mr. Anderson noted this was previously shown as a store, but will now be a walkway.

Mr. Anderson stated this is not the typical mall. He noted that this version of their plans works the best. The buildings at the back will make the plan pretty exciting. He feels this plan overall is sensitive to the needs of the Village and they are ready to proceed.

Mr. Harrington noted that Chairman Savacool had stated that the Board cannot change buildings or tell a developer what stores they can have. He stated he feels the developer is being disingenuous in that he stated they had not forced Vicki's out because they are tearing down the building and also because he stated they are willing to move the theater, which is clearly not feasible due to cost.

Chairman Savacool asked Mr. Anderson why the theater structure needs to be torn down. Mr. Anderson stated the theater sits right in the middle of the avenue that opens up to the back of the property. It has been their goal to open the lot up to the back as it is currently undeveloped and underutilized and is primarily a hang out. This will also open up where Vicki's kitchen was located and this provided them with a number of storefronts.

D. Arthur asked if there is an elevation change in the back of the property where Building C is located. Mr. Anderson noted their survey is late in coming and Mr. Kantak had had a level of discomfort with the survey they initially had so they have hired Romans and Romans to survey the property. Mr. Kantak stated the back of the property does rise through there and the area where building C will be located will be elevated.

Chairman Savacool asked Mr. Anderson to indicate where on the drawings the theater is presently located. Mr. Anderson showed this on the plan and indicated where it blocks the path of the avenue they are proposing.

D. Cronk noted the plans show that they have doubled up on trees on the northern side of Build D next to the residential section and asked if this is truly what would happen. Mr. Anderson stated he thought this would be a sore point. He stated that if approval necessitates getting rid of the trash in this location they would understand that. He stated they want to ensure that it is properly screened. This will be dependant on the type of tenant they will have for Building D. He noted they are hoping for a bank or something similar where trash will not present such an issue since it is so close to residential.

D. Cronk asked how many retail locations they expect to have in Building A. Mr. Anderson stated they may have three large tenants or eight or nine smaller ones. They are hoping for a 20,000 square foot store. He noted they are deed restricted from having business that carry items commonly carried by a drug store due to the Eckerd's sale to Rite-Aid, so they are looking for clothing, applicances, etc. He noted there had been discussion about using this area for a theater. He noted there is a market for this type of tenant, but there is not really a place for them on Route 31 as they cannot afford that location.

D. Arthur asked if buildings A and B would have interior access. Mr. Anderson stated access would be all exterior. He noted that one of their earlier plans had been for a strip mall and stores behind Eckerd's, but they decided against that plan as it would block the visibility to the rest of the property. He feels this current plan is the correct use for the property.

Chairman Savacool asked, in response to the concerns regarding the theater, that if they were to keep the theater in its present location, would they be keeping a strip mall type of development? Mr. Anderson confirmed this would be the case and noted that, since the theater would be blocking the back area of the property, they might as well keep a strip mall there. He stated they don't want to do this. This would throw off their entire plan and they feel that the current plan is the best use for the property and is of the most benefit to the community. He noted they have never said they don't want a theater and haven't even negotiated this yet. It is a money issue for the developer and the theater owner. He noted that the developers are good and honest men who want to do the right thing, but they need to be able to find businesses that will support the cost of the design and construction.

Ms. Judy Plouffe asked if the developer can afford to build this entire plan, why can't they afford to build the theater in a new location since there is so much opposition to getting rid of it? Chairman Savacool stated that the Planning Board is really in a tough place with this as, personally, he would prefer for the theater to stay. However, he noted that when realistically looking at the plan and the present location of the theater, keeping it would present huge obstacles for the developer and would not allow them to maximize the use of the property effectively. The back of the property is the focal point and is what makes it worth the developers' time and investment to develop it. He noted they could have gotten a developer who just wanted to come in and put on a new façade, which would clearly not be advisable given the deteriorating condition of the mall.

D. Arthur stated that visualizing the buildings in the back, being elevated and set off by the avenue through the center with green space, reminds him of town centers one would see in the South. Mr. Anderson agreed and stated that tress lining the avenue will bring balance to the site visually. He feels the scale is great for the site. He noted he has a fiduciary responsibility to his investors to develop this property correctly as it has to make a decent return for them. He noted that he has lived in this area himself for years and he is committed to doing this properly and he feels this is the proper approach.

Mr. Anderson stated they will have to fence the back section of the property as there are problems with this area, which can be confirmed by the police department. This is shown on the plan.

J. Camp stated that the zoning of this property still needs to be addressed as there will be multiple buildings and uses and the property is only zoned for one building. They may need to obtain variances or may have to consider making it a PDD. He stated this is the first time he has seen this version of the plan and has not had time to review it. He noted the issues he brought up at the past meeting were not addressed. Chairman Savacool stated he does not think solving the zoning issues will take a tremendous amount of extra work. R. Carr stated that, regarding a PDD district,

the developer has already gone through the majority of what is necessary. He noted the acreage far exceeds the minimum for a PDD and a PDD envisions a grouping of buildings, which is what this plan is for. He stated the process of getting a PDD designation is much like the site plan review process and establishes the actual zoning regulations such as parking requirements and setbacks, etc. Once approved, they would then present the basic plan with all the design elements to the Board of Trustees for a zoning amendment, which would designate this ground as a zoning district in and of itself and the zoning map would be amended. The end result is that this would be its own zoning district and everything in this plan, by virtue of its design detail, would be its zoning regulations. Chairman Savacool stated that this process could go hand-in-hand with the Site Plan Application process and may be the best route for them. Otherwise, they will have to seek multiple variances. He noted that the PDD route will also survive the structures and the land will always have that designation. R. Carr noted that future changes will require amendments to the code, but variances before the ZBA would be difficult to address as they would not get the point of approving a multiple-structure development.

Mr. Anderson agreed that a PDD is the answer for them long-term, although it may delay them in the short-term.

Chairman Savacool asked if this would need to be done prior to referral to SOCPA. J. Camp stated it seems to be done both ways. Chairman Savacool stated he would prefer to wait to refer it so SOCPA and D. Arthur agreed, noting that SOCPA has looked at zoning in the past and he would prefer they can see it as a PDD.

R. Carr noted that an application for PDD would be presented to the Planning Board in any event and he suspects that this plan originally came before this Board as a Site Plan Review. He does not feel it would be much of a deviation to transform the application that was presented as a Site Plan Review to one for the consideration of a PDD and incorporate everything up to this point rather than starting over. They would just be recognizing that the application as it was applied for was in error and should have been for PDD consideration instead of for Site Plan Approval. He noted the elements of the both applications are the same, as are the considerations. The Planning Board would need to refer this to the Board of Trustees to undergo the legislative process of creating the PDD district.

Mr. Anderson asked if they should continue with the Planning Board at this time. R. Carr and J. Camp agreed that he should. Mr. Anderson stated this will give them time to complete the engineering and the topo and noted that the PDD district will address both the parking and the zoning issues.

R. Carr stated that the whole review process should go to completion so the plan, when presented to the Trustees, will be complete. He noted that the Trustees do not do the review, but address the legislative process and they will need the property description and final approved plan.

D. Arthur noted that he feels a PDD district is the best option as he would not have felt comfortable approving a plan with so many zoning issues.

Mr. Anderson asked if Village Commons, which also has multiple structures, is a PDD. J. McFall stated it is not because Kinney's is on a separate parcel and two of the structures are original buildings.

Mr. Gordon Stansbury authored the traffic study and reviewed it for the Board. They were asked to look at Downer Street from the 690 off ramps all the way to Route 48. He noted they had collected traffic counts during evening and Saturday peaks and today everything east of the interchange is working pretty well. He noted the interchange has some failing delays getting off of the ramps during peak hours. However, this is an existing condition that will continue to grow with any development and is independent of this project. He recommends that at some point the DOT should review this area for consideration of signalization. They did all the standard trip generation estimates and included Walgreen's in their study as well as the signal at Crego. With the development under full build out based on existing traffic patterns, they did note the end of Meigs Road at Downer Street may potentially have failing delays during evening peak hour with the assumption that roughly 60 to 70 cars from the mall will use the Meigs Road entrance. They could easily shift over to use the traffic signalized entrance. Also noted that given the layout of the site any traffic using Meigs Road today could easily use the middle entrance and go to the signal where they expect to have levels of service A or B with full buildout. He stated the level of Meigs Road traffic would not warrant signalization as traffic will naturally redistribute to utilize traffic signal already there. It is also too close to the existing signal. He stated they found no capacity concerns with driveways. He noted the intersection of 48 and Downer showed potential failing delays with full buildout as there are no turning lanes at the traffic signal. Although

analysis shows it is operating fairly well under the existing condition, he looked at the volume-to-capacity ratio and it is currently operating at 90% of its capacity. The intersection capacity utilization is currently at 102%. Although the levels of service seem to be working well, they are borderline with having issues in this location. Turning lanes would be recommended, but they are not sure of what issues there will be with right of way conditions, etc. They questioned what the responsibility would be for an area that is this far away from the mall. Mr. Stansbury noted the roadway in front of the mall works well there no concerns in close proximity to the mall. They really just found issues at the intersection of Route 48 and Downer and at the end of the off-ramps from 690. D. Arthur asked if the intersection of Route 48 and Downer is currently at 90%, what would it be with full build-out? Mr. Stansbury stated it would add roughly 200 cars to the intersection. The mall is expected to generate total trips over what is current of 300 to 350 during peaks. Mr. Gordon stated this traffic study did consider the additional development on the site. There is currently 70,000 square feet occupied on the site.

J. Camp stated he has not fully reviewed the traffic study, but noted that from the figures on the sheet that there is currently 205,000 square feet on the site which could be occupied without any approval right now. The proposed full build out is 183,000 square feet, which would be a reduction in 10% of the square footage.

L. Barnett noted that the capacity numbers are based on this development and asked if future development in the area will cause issues. Mr. Stansbury stated it would cause issues and this intersection at Downer and Route 48 really should have turning lanes now, as left turns really block the intersection. Future development would require something to be done at this intersection.

D. Arthur asked if the traffic analysis took into consideration the other new developments in the area. Mr. Stansbury stated he did include Walgreen's, but did not account for the new housing development. However, he did use a 2% blanket growth number. D. Arthur stated he feels this traffic study is a very responsible analysis of the area.

J. Camp stated he will look more closely at the traffic in this area.

D. Arthur asked if they had discussed further the road between Conifer Village and their property yet. Mr. Anderson stated they still have not found out who owns this land yet, but they will track down the information on it. He noted they are appalled at the poor condition of the road and that people still walk and ride in motorized wheelchairs on it. They are proposing a pedestrian walkway to get people off the street altogether. They also plan to have benches along the walkway, but they will have to find the owner of the land first to resolve this legally. D. Arthur stated if there will be vehicular access at that location, it should be included on the plan. Mr. Anderson agreed and stated they are working on this issue.

E. Rock asked if the theater were to be included in the plan, would the excessive cost be in the move or in the rental for the space. Mr. Goldberg stated the relocation costs would be excessive and also noted that the building being offered would not be sufficient and there is no slope to the floor. The theater screen would need a 15' 7" clearance. Mr. Anderson noted that they have a responsibility to rent the space at a market rate, but does not feel this type of discussion should be before the Planning Board.

Ms. Rona asked what the time-table for the back development would be (building C). Mr. Anderson stated they would like to beat this winter. Their goal is to have the demolition well under way by the end of the year. He stated Buildings D and E will be built as they get tenants, but C will be done fairly quickly.

Ms. Longo stated that when thinking of Baldwinville as it is now, she knows there are empty stores in town currently and is concerned that even though what they are seeing looks like a great project, they will be tearing down a much-wanted theater and they are not even sure what will be there. Mr. Anderson stated they have tenant possibilities and are in talks with some potential tenants now, but they are not willing to reveal that information as of yet. He noted they have close to \$1 million invested and of course it is their intention to keep it rented and properly financed. He noted they don't have leases in hand, but that is not necessary.

D. Arthur noted his family will be very disappointed to not have the theater in the Village anymore. However, he feels this developer has been very responsible and creative with this site. They have been asked to look into issues and they have done so responsibly. The Board cannot dictate what will be on the property as long as it falls within the regulations of the Village, but they are investing in this community and he believes they are trying to do this right. He

feels they have been responsible to the Village. He stated he understands everyone's desire to keep the theater, but unless it falls outside the realm of what they are allowed to do, this cannot be dictated by the Planning Board.

Chairman Savacool stated he agrees that this is a difficult issue. He noted he is hesitant to a project that will eliminate what has become an institution in the Village, but is convinced that this developer is working responsibly in this project. He thinks it would be a terrible wrong if the people in the meeting were to leave thinking this project is just another strip mall. He stated it is a community center and a space that is well-utilized. He feels this is an exciting project. He also feels it would be wrong for people to walk away with the idea that they are planning to demolish the cinema for parking space. This is not accurate and he stated that they need to consider what this location means visually to the entire project. He noted the developer cannot accomplish the development of the back of the property without opening this area up. If this isn't done, then it will end up just being another strip mall. The theater, unfortunately, is in the worst possible place on the site. He noted that as a Board they are unable to do anything other than make suggestions. However, in considering the developer's reasoning, they cannot see how the developer is doing anything irresponsible. He would like to see the community come together to make a location for the theater work.

J. McFall encouraged Mr. Goldberg to get together with Mr. Anderson and work on a solution. Chairman Savacool stated that the Goldbergs have a lot of support and he is sure the developer recognizes that the community values the theater.

OTHER BUSINESS

Additional discussion/recommendations regarding East Genesee Street between Conroy's and Cole Muffler

Chairman Savacool stated he did not bring the materials he intended to bring regarding this issue but would like to discuss it anyway.

J. Camp stated that C & S has had experience with this type of planning and stated it took a long time from conception to adoption, maybe five years, even with a clear direction. Much of the time was spent getting everyone involved to agree. He stated he feels the best approach is a piece-meal approach to set general guidelines that will be refined along the way. He noted the process is a long one, even under good circumstances.

Chairman Savacool stated he feels it may be beneficial to invite business owners to a meeting and perhaps this could be the first step. They could use the July meeting to prepare for this. J. Camp suggested having someone from EDR to present the strategic development plans so they would have an idea of the vision.

Chairman Savacool noted that at the last meeting, they had discussed where the boundary would be. C. Pelcher stated he feels they should go all the way to Agway, but not including Lock Street. The Board agreed. D. Arthur stated he feels they should have a list of specific tax parcels to consider.

R. Carr stated he is concerned about the idea of bringing the business owners into the process at this time as he feels it may hinder the process if they are to go into the meeting without a definitive idea of what the Board wants. Chairman Savacool stated they will have EDR there to explain the vision for the corridor and will be able to get feedback from them. The Board can refine what it is looking for at the July meeting. They cannot necessarily come up with a comprehensive list, but will be able to come up with some things. L. Barnett stated that R. Carr's point is well taken and agrees they will need to have some concrete things to say to them, such as build-to lines, access, reduction in curb cuts, signage, etc., but no more than four or five items. Chairman Savacool stated they need to convey the message that the Village is not looking to shut anything down now, but will want to get the property owners thinking in the right direction.

Chairman Savacool stated they should come up with some issues they will want to discuss specifically. They are as follows:

1. Build-to lines up to East Genesee Street.
2. Build-to lines up to the river. Chairman Savacool noted there are really 2 fronts for a lot of these properties and this will need to be addressed. This will be a good opportunity to utilize some of these parcels differently.

3. Reducing the number of curb cuts. J. Camp noted this may be a very sensitive issue for business owners.
4. Potential access road. Chairman Savacool noted this ties into the curb cut issue and will improve traffic flow and parking for the area.
5. Rear parking (behind building) rather than in side lots or in front lots.
6. Pedestrian flow, which will be improved in front of the businesses that have these improvements.
7. Streetscape.

J. McFall stated the reality of the situation is quite different than what is being discussed. He feels the post office and Rite-Aid will be resistant to moving to the front of the lot and getting them to do this will be nearly impossible. They may have to consider that this will be the build-to line for new construction. D. Arthur stated he understands this will not happen in the next 5 years, but they need to set up what will happen within the next 25 years.

R. Carr noted that the City of Syracuse has a streetscape provision in their code. This is futuristic in the sense of considering redevelopment and new development and is something that will be put in place now in contemplation for years down the road. Chairman Savacool stated that considering these issues now will enable the Village to stop just reacting to things and be more proactive and have a plan in place so when an issue comes up they are already prepared.

L. Barnett stated he feels it is important to do this now to plant the seeds for an eventual transition. However he is concerned about a presentation to the business owners and feels they will possibly be suspicious of it. He feels maybe having some kind of booklet available to provide to developers with the application would be appropriate. D. Arthur agreed that this will need to be presented well to the developers and businesses owners to get them excited about it. He noted that the ARB has a set of guidelines that they give to applicants, so this is something the Village has already done. L. Barnett stated he has a collection of photos of signs he will bring to the next meeting. He feels having a concrete standard to present to business owners and developers is a good idea. D. Cronk agreed and stated they will have to package EDRs ideas properly. C. Pelcher stated he feels EDR would be the ones to really sell it and agreed they should be at the next meeting. Mayor Saraceni stated he will call them and request their presence.

Mayor Saraceni stated he had talked to Jim Nobles about his plans to rebuild Nobles garage. When speaking to him, Mayor Saraceni asked him what he would think about being required to build it up to the sidewalk and Mr. Nobles told him he wouldn't have a problem with that. Mayor Saraceni stated he feels if property owners just are made aware of what is required, they are often very willing to work with the Village. However, he noted there will be some people who will resist it. Mayor Saraceni noted that he feels it would be advisable for every Board Member to have a copy of the EDR plan on disk. He feels this is beneficial because you can zoom in on areas and manipulate them. He stated he will get copies to each Board Member prior to the next meeting.

Chairman Savacool stated that for the next meeting, they will want to have the following:

1. EDRs plan on disk. Mayor Saraceni will provide that.
2. Tax maps of the corridor. John Camp stated he will get that through C & S.
3. GIS. John Camp stated this is coming from Plumley and Mayor Saraceni has been in touch with them.
4. EDR representative for the meeting. Mayor Saraceni stated he will contact them.

J. Camp stated he believes that from the time they have a set list of what they want included in the overlay district, they can go through the approval process for creating it in 3 to 4 months. R. Carr noted it will be an amendment to the zoning law and they would have to have public hearing.

Upon motion by J. McFall and second by D. Arthur, the meeting was adjourned at 9:50 p.m. The next Planning Board meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, July 24, 2007.

Respectfully Submitted,

Susan A. LaQuay
Planning Board Secretary