

VILLAGE OF BALDWINSVILLE
PLANNING BOARD SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, July 24, 2007, 7:30 P.M.
Approved 9/4/07

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

ALSO PRESENT: 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
Dan Faldzinski, Plumley Engineering, regarding Coholan property (formerly Jardine)
Julian Clark, Plumley Engineering, regarding Coholan property (formerly Jardine)
Matt Moore, regarding Village Commons
Joe Hucko, regarding Village Commons

REGULAR MEETING - 7:30 P.M.

Chairman Savacool stated that D. Arthur wanted to say a few words about former Board Member, Russ Lucy, who recently passed away.

D. Arthur stated Russ Lucy had been a member of the Planning Board for 25 years and passed away on June 30, 2007. He was a man of dedication to this community, his family, his country, and his church. He was a WWII veteran and was a member of his church for 50 years and married to his wife, Evelyn, for 60 years, with whom he had just celebrated their anniversary on June 21, 2007.

J. McFall stated he was a longtime friend of Russ Lucy and worked with him on the Board and outside of the Board. Mr. Lucy was one of the foremost model railroad aficionados in the state. He was a hardworking, good man and was a credit to the Village and to this Board.

Chairman Savacool stated Russ Lucy will be greatly missed and asked that the Board take a Moment of Silence in recognition of Mr. Lucy.

OTHER BUSINESS

Chairman Savacool stated that immediately after the deadline for this month's meeting, two issues came to his attention that need some immediate resolution or action. He informed the developers that the materials were not received in time for the meeting and, therefore, the Board would not be making any decisions this evening regarding those issues.

One issue is an amendment to the site plan for Village Commons. Mr. Hucko would like to construct an ATM kiosk located in the rear of the site. Chairman Savacool stated he had reviewed this proposal and looked to see if it would conform to the original site plan and he determined this needs to be addressed as an amendment to site plan as it will affect the traffic flow in that area. Mr. Hucko is in attendance and provided the Board with sketch plans.

The second issue is a site plan amendment to Golden Legacy Adult Living Facility to add a swimming pool in the rear of the community center. The developer, Mr. Scuiga, is looking to do this as soon as possible and he has submitted a plan for this. R. Beckhusen had indicated to him that it will require a site plan review as it may affect drainage on the site.

Chairman Savacool stated he is hoping to schedule a special meeting to specifically address these two issues on August 7, 2007.

Upon motion by L. Barnett and second by D. Arthur to schedule a Special Meeting on August 7, 2007 to discuss the Baldwinsville Village Commons Site Plan Amendment and the Golden Legacy pool application, as well as other issues that may come before the Board in a timely way. Carried.

Chairman Savacool stated he will not be present for the August 28, 2007 meeting. Dave Arthur will be the Acting Chair for that meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Upon motion by J. McFall and second by E. Rock that the minutes of the June 26, 2007 Planning Board meeting be approved as submitted. Motion passed.

OLD BUSINESS

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

Chairman Savacool stated J. Camp has submitted memos (an engineering memo dated July 20, 2007 and a memo regarding the traffic study dated July 20, 2007) to the Board. Chairman Savacool asked him to highlight some outstanding issues for this project.

J. Camp reviewed his engineering memo dated 7/20/07 as follows:

1. **Zoning/Planned Development District** – We believe that the project is best addressed under the provisions in the Village Code for a Planned Development District. The parameters of this district will need to be established.

Chairman Savacool stated that these parameters will be addressed in the site plan process. J. Camp agreed this would be one approach. He stated he and R. Carr had discussed it and the actual approval site plan document could serve as the benchmark for the district and there would not be the requirement of a lot of extra language to describe it. R. Carr stated he agrees with that and they would need just the finalized approved map to establish the regulatory parameters of layout of the site and plan. However, they will need a property description to establish what the development is and the parameters, but also will need to establish the geographical boundaries of the district. Once the plan is approved and adopted then the Planning Board can refer it to the Board of Trustees with a recommendation for approval of the PDD according to the plan. The Board of Trustees would create the PDD district and amend the zoning map to designate this. If the site needs modification in the future, the developer would need to come before the Planning Board at that time.

Chairman Savacool noted the legislative part will take place at the end of the process. R. Carr confirmed this and at that time, the Board of Trustees would formally establish the district. Chairman Savacool asked if the Planning Board would be granting approval of the site plan pending the approval of PDD designation. R. Carr stated this application should have originally come in with an application for development as a PDD district. Then certain findings would have been made and then the plan would have been developed as a site plan, but is really a district plan that this Board is approving. Having done this, the legislative act would then be necessary to formalize the plan and actually create the district as a matter of law. This Board will actually be approving the development plan. They are not actually locking in or approving a site plan.

Mr. Anderson stated his concern is that they will not be locked into the actual buildings shown any PDD. R. Carr stated they are locked in in the sense that this is the PDD they are asking for approval of. Mr. Anderson noted that the

reality of leasing is that they could get two or three tenants wanting free standing buildings and, therefore, they may want the ability to change one building shown currently on the plan into three buildings. R. Carr stated that may be permitted but they would have to come back to the Planning Board to get a modification approved. Mr. Anderson asked if the PDD designation would give them the flexibility to present additional buildings in the future. R. Carr stated they would have that flexibility as it would not be unlike any other plan in a commercial district.

Chairman Savacool asked if the Board will need to amend the application to include it as a PDD development or would this be done after the fact. R. Carr stated they could just amend the cover sheet from an Application for Site Plan Approval to an Application for Planned Development District. He stated in the future the process should begin in that way. Chairman Savacool asked if this would require a motion. R. Carr stated that is not necessary as they can still keep this application as a site plan because the process is the same. He stated it can go to SOCPA as a site plan as this is how the process was begun and it does not matter to SOCPA that it will be a PDD, as they will just be looking at the plan for development.

2. **Utilities** – The project site contains substantial existing utility infrastructure, some of which may be in need of repair. The project will need to be planned with consideration given to existing and future utilities and easements.

J. Camp stated this was discussed previously and the extent to which they will need to be aware of the utilities will be more obvious once the survey is completed. Mr. Kantak stated he had met with Claude Sykes last week and was told that the DPW will be doing some additional flow testing in that area sometime this week or early next week. He had mentioned to J. Camp that the storm water system is in disrepair in some areas, as is the sanitary sewer, but they will have a better idea once the survey is in and they have the topo completed. Mr. Anderson noted that the pink, green, and yellow lines on the plan indicate utility easements.

3. **Stormwater Management** – Stormwater management facilities will need to be designed in accordance with the latest Village of Baldwinsville and NYSDEC regulations. Also, the site drains to a watercourse that has been the subject of concern in the Village. This watercourse drains directly to the Canton Street Wellhead.

J. Camp noted this was also discussed previously. Given the sensitivity of the wellhead district, this will have an affect on the type of stormwater management facility encouraged for that area. Several types of newer DEC techniques try to promote water infiltrate into the ground and they may not be appropriate for this area given the wellhead district. Mr. Kantak stated he has already had a meeting with Ellen Hahn and discussed some of his concepts and had gotten feedback from the DEC. Her concerns were the same as J. Camp's and they are also looking at this very closely.

4. **Wellhead Watershed Protection Overlay District** – The project site is located in this district and should comply with the requirements stated in the Village Code. These requirements include, but are not limited to, documentation of various site/project properties, preparation of a full SEQRA EA form, consideration and application of practices to protect groundwater quality, minimization of impervious coverage, and the minimization of infiltration-type stormwater management practices.

J. Camp stated the project as proposed generally decreases the impervious area of the site and would generally be permitted in the code within the wellhead protection district. He noted that even though the final impervious area would not be within code, it is an improvement from the existing situation.

J. Camp stated C & S had its in-house traffic expert review the traffic study provided and reviewed the engineering memo regarding this dated 7/20/07 as follows:

1. The summarized findings of the traffic studies are as follows:
 - a. There are existing failing Level-of-Service conditions at both ends of Downer Street (intersections of Route 48 and I-690).
 - b. The project as currently proposed will reduce the areas of leasable space, thereby reducing the potential for traffic from the property.

J. Camp stated the amount of leasable square footage currently at the site is not fully utilized, but the current owner would have the permission to do so. If all that space was to be leased out, there would be more traffic coming off that site than there is right now. However, the proposed project will reduce the amount of leasable space. Assuming full build out of either scenario, the proposed conditions on site will theoretically generate less traffic than what currently has approval. L. Barnett asked what the reduction in leasable space would be. J. Camp stated it will be approximately a 15 to 20% reduction, which is just a guess as he does not have the numbers right now. L. Barnett asked if the generated traffic has more to do with the nature of the tenants rather than how much leasable space there is. J. Camp stated he discussed this with the C & S traffic expert and, generally speaking, traffic studies use leasable space as the major indicator of traffic.

Mr. Anderson stated that the sale to Eckerd's by Don Cole carried with it a restriction on the remainder of the site against the sale of anything that is carried by a pharmacy. Because of these restrictions, there will be smaller stores on the site.

- c. If leased to capacity, the project will result in an increase in traffic compared to the currently leased space. This increase should not result in a symmetry substantial impact to traffic operations in the vicinity of the site.

2. The traffic study appears to be in order and its conclusions seem reasonable.

Chairman Savacool asked Mr. Anderson if he has any other concerns. Mr. Anderson stated that timing is an issue for them and they would appreciate this being sent on to SOCPA. Chairman Savacool asked if they have the completed survey yet. Mr. Kantak stated that trying to get a surveyor at this time of year is difficult and they are waiting patiently for the survey and it was confirmed this morning that it is coming soon. Chairman Savacool asked what they will be able to have completed for the next meeting. Mr. Kantak stated they will be 60% complete with their storm water plan and the engineering specs and detail sheets will be complete. They will have a full engineering design complete and will submit the water, sewer, and drainage to John Camp within two weeks of the meeting.

Mr. Anderson asked what would happen after the SOCPA recommendation is received. Chairman Savacool stated if they have engineering and final plans submitted, the engineer will review them and be able to give his comments, at which time they can make revisions even prior to the meeting if necessary. This would expedite things. Mr. Anderson stated he is certain the architect will have all his work done and hopes the surveyor will have come through by then.

J. Camp spoke with SOCPA regarding the timing of submissions and tried to get some definitive information out of them. He stated they do not have a set of regulations for what they want submitted and their official stance is that is up to the Board. They encouraged him to submit a set of plans that are as close to an approvable set of drawings as possible, their concern being that if there is a revision made based on Planning Board comment, that revision may require that the plan be sent to SOCPA again. Chairman Savacool asked J. Camp what point these plans are at right now in his opinion. J. Camp stated he feels they are at more of a sketch plan phase now. R. Carr stated they will need the stormwater plan completed for SOCPA as well.

Chairman Savacool asked when they want to start construction. Mr. Anderson stated they want to begin as soon as possible. They had not anticipated the surveyor's delay. They do not want to lose another month and asked if there is a way to get SOCPA referral with the stormwater management plan to follow. R. Carr stated he thinks if it was sent to SOCPA without the stormwater management plan, SOCPA would just send it back with the comment that it needs to be completed. Chairman Savacool stated he is hesitant to do this as they have made referrals to SOCPA that have been disapproved for a number of reasons. The Planning Board was advised at that time that they need to be further along in the process before they send a plan to SOCPA and does not want to send in a plan that is not farther along than this.

Mr. Anderson asked if they can be included on the agenda for the special meeting on August 7, 2007 to discuss SOCPA referral again and they will try to get all their information together as soon as possible. Chairman Savacool stated he will put them on the agenda and if the Board feels they have sufficient information they will address this at that time.

NEW BUSINESS

Informal discussion regarding the former Jardine/now Coholan property (near Agway) – Dan Coholan

Mr. Dan Faldzinski and Mr. Julian Clark from Plumley Engineering are present on behalf of the Applicant. He stated the property is located between Route 31 and Route 370. The plan for the site is to create two separate lots. One lot will have a self-storage facility with entry onto Route 370. The plan for the second lot is still to be determined and they will hopefully have more details regarding this for the next meeting.

D. Arthur asked if this area is still an Empire zone. Mr. Faldzinski stated he will have to check.

Mr. Faldzinski indicated on the map where the site is located. He stated that Mr. Coholan initially planned to develop this as a residential area, but determined it was not cost effective and the site is better suited for industrial/commercial use as it does about the Village's commercial and somewhat industrial area. It is not a very intensive commercial use and the site does run adjacent to the residences along Curtis Avenue. They feel this may be a good transition use from the Village's industrial district towards the residential district. They are here tonight to get the Board informed of the project early on and to see if the Board would be in favor of approving a project with this type of use.

J. Camp asked what the current zoning designation is. Mr. Faldzinski stated most of it is zoned industrial. Mr. Coholan did pick up some residential properties as well that will be included. There will need to be a zone change to combine several lots and ultimately do a subdivision to form two distinct separate lots.

Chairman Savacool asked if there will be access from East Genesee Street to the second lot. D. Faldzinski stated there would be and it would somewhat line up with Spruce Street. Access onto Salina Street is somewhat more difficult given the sight distances. He stated they are in contact with the DOT and have provided them with the same plan that is before the Board tonight. Mr. Clark stated that access on to 370 would be next to the redemption center.

D. Cronk noted that lighting for storage facilities tends to be a significant issue near residences. Mr. Faldzinski stated this can be scaled back and they have the ability to utilize wall pack lighting with timers. Storage facilities do not do much business after dark so the need for lighting will be flexible. Mr. Faldzinski also noted there are trees that will provide a buffer between the facility and residences. They will submit a photometric plan to the Village for approval.

Mr. Faldzinski stated they are proposing 76,000 square feet to be developed in 3 phases for the self-storage site. Phase 1 would be almost half of the facility, which would likely be constructed within the first year. He stated he is very aware of the stormwater management issues in the area. Ultimately, the existing discharge is to a swale that runs along the eastern side of the railroad tracks and they will keep that intact. They will have to collect and discharge into a stormwater management area and this is still a conceptual plan so the size of the detention area may grow.

Mr. Faldzinski stated that Phase 1 will include the three 3 buildings to the lower half of the project and one will be climate controlled. They will submit more detailed plans at the next meeting and move towards approval.

J. McFall noted there is no problem with snow removal for Phase 1, but noted this might be an issue when the second section is developed. Mr. Faldzinski stated they will be sure to leave an area for this.

D. Arthur asked if the second parcel would include the Agway building. Mr. Faldzinski stated it will. Mr. Clark noted they will have to combine a few properties to create this second parcel. Mr. Faldzinski noted that the Village code does not have a reverse subdivision process, but ultimately they will combine several lots and then divide them into two.

J. Camp noted that the topography is fairly dynamic in the area. Mr. Faldzinski stated that as you look at the rear side of the homes on Curtis Avenue, there are 2 large pockets of wetlands that were identified by the DEC. These will be preserved. Beyond that, there is some slope, but nothing significant. Mr. Faldzinski stated that there is an approximately 5 to 6 foot drop across the 800 feet of lot width. J. Camp noted that building 1 is 5 to 6 feet higher than the rear yards. Mr. Faldzinski stated he is sure if their plan is to try to lower the grade in that area to balance it out. J. Camp noted it would be more difficult to screen the facility from the surrounding properties if it is higher than the residences. Mr. Faldzinski noted they plan to maintain the vegetation on that property line and possibly lower the site. Mr. Clark noted that the structures will not be very high, only 12' tall with gabled roofs.

D. Arthur asked if the climate controlled building will have HVAC on top. Mr. Faldzinski state that will depend on which method of climate control they utilize.

Mr. Faldzinski asked if the ARB will want to review the plan. J. McFall stated it is likely that they will.

J. Camp asked if the 75' drainage easement shown on the plan is existing. Mr. Clark stated it is a proposed easement and there is no easement at all right now. Mr. Faldzinski stated it is located where the existing water course is. Mr. Clark noted they will be taking on water from other properties so they may need to convey it to the Village.

E. Rock asked if this is the right use for the site as there is a new self-storage facility on Van Buren Road and a new one going up on Route 48. Mr. Clark stated this location will rely heavily on the Store America name. Mr. Faldzinski noted that the developer must have determined this to be a good investment. D. Cronk noted that the storage facility on Van Buren Road was a phased development and they have already completed all the phases even though it has only been two years.

L. Barnett asked what the nature of the truck rental facility is. Mr. Clark stated they would be U-Haul rental.

C. Pelcher asked how the residential property that Mr. Coholan owns on Curtis Avenue will tie into the project. Mr. Clark state they are not sure yet. However, there is no plan to have the road go through to Curtis Avenue and he noted this residential lot is very small.

Chairman Savacool asked R. Carr how they would approach the rezoning issue and, as the plan is to combine several lots that have different zoning designations, ranging from industrial to B1, would the new zoning be the more restrictive or less restrictive. Chairman Savacool noted that some of the parcels are zoned residential. R. Carr noted they would be creating a lot where a district line will sever the lot. He is not sure the Village code defines or addresses this situation. Some codes expand out the most restrictive zone and the lot would be considered the most restrictive of the zoning designations. He is not sure what this code does, but he will look into it. D. Arthur stated he believes it goes to the most restrictive. Mr. Faldzinski stated they would propose a zone change for the applicable lots. Chairman Savacool noted they would have to go to the Village Board. The Village Board will look to the Planning Board for a recommendation.

D. Arthur asked if they would want to change the zoning to Industrial or Commercial and asked if it is zoned B1 or B2 if they would have the ability to have multiple buildings on one lot.

Chairman Savacool asked why there are residential parcels involved along East Genesee Street. Mr. Clark stated this is to open up development opportunities and to provide better access to the site. Chairman Savacool noted that this Board has been concerned about this area for some time and does not want to see the commercial zone spread. Mr. Faldzinski stated they will discuss this in more detail with Mr. Coholan. D. Arthur stated he feels they may meet with some resistance to changing a B1 or residentially zoned area to Industrial. D. Arthur noted that the Village may be moving towards getting rid of the Industrial zoning designation. Mr. Faldzinski stated they may ask to change the zoning to Commercial.

Informal discussion regarding Village Commons Revision to Site Plan/ATM kiosk – Washington Street Partners (Joe Hucko)

Mr. Joe Hucko and Mr. Matt Moore are present to address the Board.

Chairman Savacool stated that there was originally a plan to have an ATM Kiosk at the end of long building where stair tower is located on the original site plan. Mr. Hucko confirmed this. He stated they now have a prospective tenant for the space where Johnny Angel's was previously located and that tenant would require there to be an ATM on site.

The original site plan approved in 2003 involved two drive-thrus, one at Kinney's and one at the end of building A. Drawings were provided and Mr. Hucko stated they would like to relocate the approved drive thru at the end of building A and place an ATM in the open parking area. He feels this location would have minimal impact on the site. Any parking they lose they would just restripe parking at the end of the building.

Chairman Savacool stated the reason he wanted the Board to review this proposal is the location of the proposed kiosk, the proposed traffic flow, and the potential for a change in the parking. Mr. Hucko stated that the sketch provided is mainly for illustrative purposes. The ATM kiosk itself is only the size of a parking space itself.

J. McFall stated he feels there is too much parking around this area and there are spots that are too close to the driveway. He stated he would like to see an exit by the liquor store to have the cars leaving the ATM to exit here rather than at the main entrance. J. McFall noted that this parking lot is already very busy and is concerned that the cars going back to the kiosk may speed to get to the back of the lot. Chairman Savacool stated he agrees that it seems that there are a lot of cars going in a lot of different directions. He would like to see better traffic flow on the site. C. Pelcher noted that he has seen two accidents in the parking lot in front of the gym and he is also concerned about the traffic flow on the site.

D. Arthur asked if they could place the ATM where it was originally proposed at the end of the building. Mr. Hucko stated the potential tenant has requested that the ATM kiosk be at the location being proposed. He stated he feels this is the most convenient place with the least impact. L. Barnett also suggested they should try to direct the traffic exiting the ATM to exit by the liquor store. Mr. Hucko thinks that is a good suggestion and stated they can put up bollards to accomplish this.

Chairman Savacool stated the parking lot is laid out in such a way that cars can go anywhere and they in fact do. The Board wanted to discuss these issues with Mr. Hucko so he will be sure to consider how to improve the flow of traffic.

E. Rock suggested utilizing angled parking to direct traffic better. Mr. Hucko stated they had considered this, but they already did not have enough parking on site and this would limit parking. He stated he would be better able to address some of these issues if he was allowed more latitude with parking. He feels they have adequate parking from a practical standpoint. Chairman Savacool stated the Board would be willing to consider this if it would improve traffic flow.

C. Pelcher noted that last winter snow took up 3 or 4 spaces near the gym. Mr. Hucko stated that was an error on their snow plower's part and they hope to avoid that in the future. He stated they will bring back a more detailed plan with some better parking arrangements to the next meeting.

Chairman Savacool stated the next meeting will be to address:

- 1 - Village Commons site plan amendment
- 2 - Golden Legacy pool
- 3 - SOCPA referral for The Shoppes at Baldwinsville.

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

Chairman Savacool stated that a number of people did not get their disks until today.

D. Cronk noted the topic of conversation up to this point has been to establish a build to line. He stated he did some research on central business districts, which would have certain objectives and create a cohesive village center with similar building lines, landscaping requirements, signage, etc. He asked if the goal is to get a district created or establish a build to line as soon as possible in case a new developer comes in with plans for one of the vacant properties. D. Arthur stated the goal is to do both and the idea is to look at distinctly different properties and consider how to get them to what the EDR study envisions. This Board is trying to take these areas and come up with overlay districts to provide additional zoning to those areas to get them in line with the EDR plan.

D. Cronk stated he would like to see these overlay districts specifically address signage. L. Barnett agreed and stated he has been accumulating photos of signs that he feels would be desirable in these districts, as well as photos of signs that are not desirable.

Chairman Savacool stated at the last meeting the Board had determined 5 items that need to be addressed as follows:

1. Build to line on East Genesee Street.
2. Build to line on the river.
3. Reduction of curb cuts and the potential access road.
4. Rear parking.
5. Pedestrian flow/streetscape.

Chairman Savacool stated that signage is a large issue and will be dealt with separately. D. Cronk suggested that the ARB could make recommendations to the Planning Board and noted there are two architects on that Board. D. Arthur stated he feels signage is an important issue as well, but feels the Board has a lot of work to do before they get to address that.

J. McFall noted that the Board always seems to begin discussing this issue after 9-o'clock. He feels they should have a meeting just to address this or start a regularly scheduled meeting early and discuss this first. Chairman Savacool agreed and felt that both suggestions were good. R. Carr noted they can have a workshop meeting, but any meeting with a quorum would have to be an open meeting. D. Arthur suggested starting a meeting at 6 pm and having EDR present.

L. Barnett stated he likes the build to line at the library. Chairman Savacool noted that that is on the opposite side of East Genesee Street and they need to figure out what would be acceptable on this side. R. Carr stated they will need to consider setbacks and sidewalks for streetscape purposes. J. McFall noted that the library is right up to the sidewalk if you consider the front stairs.

R. Carr stated he feels it would be helpful to have photos of the area to refer to for visualization purposes. Chairman Savacool suggested they need to walk the area together and take photos and talk as they walk. He feels they can still do this as an open meeting. This could be done on a weekend and then finish with a workshop. The Board agrees this would be helpful. Chairman Savacool stated he will talk to Mayor Saraceni and get this set up.

J. McFall asked what it would take to establish the build to line at 1' off the sidewalk. R. Carr stated they would have to address this by considering the existing setback requirement and amending it to make an exception for "except for the setback along East Genesee Street between _____ and _____ where the setback line is 1' off the curb line" and make that amendment to the zoning code to pass that wording. D. Cronk stated if the Village was to do this now it would eliminate the concern about someone coming in soon and not having a new build to line established.

J. McFall noted this is the only stretch in the downtown corridors that does not have the build to line at the sidewalk. This would bring this area in line with the other streets in the downtown area.

D. Arthur noted the scope of this first overlay district is to reduce curb cuts and get a road in back of the properties. R. Carr stated it may be difficult to do this. Some lots extend from East Genesee Street all the way to the river. The Village could say there is to be no construction within a certain distance from the river and set up setback requirements from the road. D. Arthur stated he is concerned about how they will dissuade construction of buildings in the middle of the properties in order to leave room for the road. R. Carr stated it is difficult to understand how this road will be accomplished as there would have to be easements across many properties. They will have to have public easements and everyone will have to come in line all at one time.

C. Pelcher noted the Village right now could go all the way to Eckerd's with an access road with no problem. However, the rest of the properties are a concern.

Chairman Savacool stated this issue all boils down to EDR as they generated this plan and have some expertise in implementing it. They should be asking these questions of EDR and he feels they should set up meeting with them first. D. Arthur noted that Mayor Saraceni was head of the master plan committee and had discussed codifying the plan. That burden has come to the Planning Board. He noted that EDR could do this, but it was not part of their contract. C. Pelcher stated EDR is very good at taking a lot of information and putting it together and presenting it back in an organized fashion. Therefore, it would be very helpful to get them involved.

Chairman Savacool stated he will try to set up a meeting with EDR in the near future, maybe in mid-August.

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 a special meeting scheduled for Tuesday, August 7, 2007.

Respectfully Submitted,

Susan A. LaQuay
Planning Board Secretary