

**VILLAGE OF BALDWINSVILLE  
PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES**

**Tuesday, November 27, 2007, 7:30 P.M.**

These minutes are not yet approved.

---

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

**ALSO PRESENT:** Dave Jones, 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, PE, regarding The Shoppes at Baldwinsville  
Julian Clark, PE, regarding 80 East Genesee Street (Coholan property)  
Ms. Judy Plouffe, resident, regarding 80 East Genesee Street

**REGULAR MEETING - 7:30 P.M.**

Chairman Savacool stated that this will be the last meeting for Susan LaQuay, the Planning Board Secretary. He also noted that he has a meeting with Paul Fritz from EDR on Monday at 4 pm at their offices. The proposal that EDR had provided was approved by the Village Board. He stated that Board Members are welcome to attend as long as they will not have a quorum.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Approval for the minutes of the October 23, 2007 Planning Board is postponed until the next meeting.

**OLD BUSINESS**

**Site Plan Review regarding The Shoppes at Baldwinsville – Crossroads TCM, LLC**

Mr. Paul Anderson, Mr. John Neumeister, and Mr. Jason Kantak are present to address the Board. Chairman Savacool stated the Board has received new materials regarding this project.

Mr. Anderson stated there have been a number of changes since they were last here. These changes are tied to the investigation that showed the existing sports facility has deteriorated beyond repair and will have to be demolished. They have also concluded that the furniture store is in too good a condition to tear down and with that in mind they have opened up the entire center and are now showing a freestanding site on Meigs Road. They have also expanded the building that is on the east side and brought it closer to the houses. The building at the entrance has been pulled away from the houses and loading has been removed from that area, which was one of the Board's requests. The architects and engineers have made it clear that the easterly-most entrance should be straightened out to avoid any potential traffic hazards. Currently the Applicant is proposing 199,000 square feet, which is a slight increase in the net rentable square footage. There will still be an office building at the rear of the site. Building G could become office space and Mr. Anderson noted they will be meeting with a client tomorrow to make a presentation for a 25,000 square foot facility. He noted that once they get approval on the footage, they may have to take footage from other spots to accommodate this. He stated they will be taking the area where the furniture store is and the space behind it and proposing that they add 16,000 feet. They have gone back to using the existing entrance on Meigs, which was previously brought down, but then determined it could not be integrated properly. He noted the engineering has been a lot more involved than anticipated because the site is an old site and because of the wellhead district. He noted that

the design has been split between two architects. Lake Architects will be doing the main building and the outlying buildings will be done by Stuart Alderman.

Mr. Anderson stated they would like to be able to get referred to the County in time for the January meeting. He apologized that many of the delays have been on their part, but would like to see this move forward in time for that meeting. He noted they are also concerned how the PDD will be written as they are continually coming up with adjustments. Future adjustments are likely and he is concerned that if the zoning is specific to this site plan, it may cause problems down the road. Chairman Savacool noted that they had talked about trying to give them some latitude by perhaps identifying a building square footage area or a lot percentage and then work on tweaking the site as long as there are setback requirements in place. The Board would like to try to avoid limiting the Applicant by setting the plan in stone as this is certainly a unique situation. However, at the same time the Board wants to make sure that there are some limits to avoid changing the site to a degree that it would not adhere to the vision that has been planned. Mr. Anderson agreed and stated that any changes will be just tweaking and they will certainly come back to the Board with any changes. He noted that Building E has great marketability due to its size. The smaller buildings will be less than 5000 square feet.

Mr. Katak noted it has been quite a while since they have been before the Board. During the interim time, they have been working to develop PDD zoning criteria to complement the Village's zoning requirements and this is demonstrated in the new drawings and the handout provided. Mr. Anderson has been focused on the future tenants and Mr. Katak has been looking more at the engineering aspects. He noted that since August he has been working primarily on Buildings A and B and also the addition of B2. They have gone through all the buildings extensively, including the sanitary water supply, gas and electric services, etc. They have also developed a full demolition plan. They have just finished up an asbestos survey. A Phase I ESA has been done. They are in the process of doing a geotechnical evaluation to make sure the soils are consistent. Extensive research inside the building to identify foundations and such has been done and this was geared mainly towards the demolition and renovations of Buildings A and B. He stated those building will remain as shown on the new plan. Regarding the outlying buildings, they are interested in getting feedback from the Board so he can finalize services for them. He stated he has the grading laid out for about 90% of the site, but until he has further comments from the Board, he cannot move forward. He stated there is a tremendous amount of area that drains through this property. One of his biggest concerns is that there are currently no drainage easements through here. He has met with Chuck McAuliffe to go over this and the drainage is substandard by far. One of his objectives is to identify and work with John Camp to figure out how they will route a majority of the water through the property so they do not end up over-sizing the stormwater management areas to account for all the additional runoff from offsite and try to separate it into easements for future maintenance.

Mr. Anderson stated that they hope to pull a demolition permit this week. The construction management company will start fencing the perimeter of the existing buildings around December 3. Mr. Katak has prepared extensive demolition drawings. He also noted that they have contacted Centro about rerouting the buses. Their goal is to have a 6-month buildup period for this potential 25,000 square foot tenant and would like to have other tenants by the beginning of summer. Mr. Katak stated they expect to have the asbestos survey back by the end of this week, but right now nothing has turned up. Once they have a negative asbestos survey, they can move forward within a week to begin the demolition. He noted they need to move quickly to secure the site as well as it has been vandalized every day. Mr. Anderson noted it has been a challenge to keep people out of the building.

Chairman Savacool asked if the theater is still in the building. Mr. Anderson stated he had put them on notice to be out at the end of November but, knowing there would be delays, he allowed them to stay and has given him until December 9<sup>th</sup>. He noted they are a month-to-month tenant and it costs the Applicant money to allow him to stay. Mr. Katak noted that to even keep this one tenant means they have to heat the entire building because of the way the sprinkler system is set up. Mr. Anderson stated they have looked at retaining the theater and keeping a portion of the mall to accommodate it. However, this threw off the design. He stated they told the theater owner that they wanted to keep him as a tenant as the site will appeal to local and regional tenants. However, the theater owner simply will not pay the market price. The owners have provided him with the opportunity and even though he is a wonderful tenant, they cannot offer him more than they have and he feels they have been fair.

John Camp reviewed the engineering memo dated November 27, 2007 as follows:

We have reviewed sheet S1 dated November 13, 2007 and PDD description dated November 13, 2007 for the above-referenced project and have the following comments:

1. The plan has been modified since the previous submittal. Some of the changes include:
  - a. The characteristics of the parking area between proposed buildings A and B have changed. The previous version of the plan contained more substantial plantings and grassed islands.

J. Camp stated he brought this to the attention of the Board because this area has been discussed before as a possible site for fair-type activities. Mr. Anderson noted the parking layout was not appropriate for the store layouts. The parking was perpendicular to the buildings, which made it unsafe. They have charged EDR with reworking this and they would like to break up the paving. They are still waiting for EDR to get back to them and will be deferring to them regarding this issue.

D. Arthur asked if there are raised islands or painted areas at the ends of the parking lanes. Mr. Kantak stated they are raised islands and even though the configuration has changed there will still be planting beds. Mr. Anderson noted this is a safer configuration. They have asked EDR to repeat what they did at the outlet center in Seneca Falls, which is a beautiful site. D. Arthur stated their layout reminded him of that shopping center and agreed it is a very nice site. J. Camp asked if they will lose spots with the EDR plan. Mr. Anderson stated they may lose 10 or 15, but can pick those up elsewhere.

Mr. Anderson noted they would still like to find out about the “mystery property.” He has written letters with no response. He would like Mayor Saraceni to write a letter as perhaps a letter from him will carry more weight and open the lines of communication. Mr. Kantak noted they have expended every effort to find out who owns it as this will be beneficial to everyone. J. McFall suggested they contact the Herman brothers, whose family once owned all the property in that area.

- b. Proposed building “F” appears to block the “visual corridor” that was previously discussed by the applicant.

Mr. Anderson stated they feel that if it is kept at 5000 square feet or below, the building will not block the visual corridor to the point where it would be detrimental to the plan. He stated they changed this because they are so constrained by easements. Mr. Kantak noted that the drainage and sanitary service drains right through the original location. Mr. Anderson feels the plan is still open and they will not do anything that would impact the leasing of the freestanding buildings.

L. Barnett suggested turning the building. Mr. Anderson stated this is a possibility, but he suspects Building F will be smaller than the 5000 square feet shown. Mr. Neumeister stated that the plan shows the building in the worst-case scenario and he has shown it as big as it could be and in its worst possible orientation. D. Arthur asked where trash, storage, and receiving will be located for the outlying buildings. Mr. Anderson noted it is not shown on the plans, but it will be along the side. They will be sure to address this. D. Arthur stated they should be particularly aware of Building F as it will be in the visual lane and may be difficult to hide. Chairman Savacool agreed and noted that Building F needs to be visually attractive from every angle. Mr. Anderson stated they will come back with elevations and the change on the site plan showing the trash, storage, and receiving.

- c. Proposed building “D” is closer to the existing adjacent residential lots.

Chairman Savacool asked how much closer Building D will be to the houses. J. Camp stated it will be 20’ to 25’ closer than what was shown on the June 20 version of the plan. Mr. Anderson stated they will move this building south. Chairman Savacool stated he likes the screening in that area and would like to see the building moved to the south. Mr. Anderson stated they will do this and noted this would actually increase its visibility from Downer Street. He stated they will be sure to design the receiving properly on the east side. D. Arthur asked what will be considered the back of the building for Buildings D and F. Mr. Anderson stated it will likely be the east side of the buildings as they do not want a back side facing Downer Street. He stated they have given instructions to the architect that those buildings are 4-sided.

Chairman Savacool asked if they have an idea as to what type of tenant will be in Building F. Mr. Anderson stated the tenant will likely be a bank or a credit union. He noted that the smaller buildings will have pitched roofs and showed drawings of the 25,000 square foot building as an example.

2. The plan shows that some vehicular access points to the existing Eckerd lot will be blocked.

Mr. Kantak noted they want to control this parking area and separate it from the main drive way. J. Camp noted this could adversely impact the Eckerd lot. Chairman Savacool asked what access rights Eckerd has. Mr. Anderson stated they have a right-of-way for ingress and egress. He noted that the Applicant will not have any parking rights on the Eckerd property and this is another reason it should be separated. D. Arthur suggested that Eckerd could remove the island. Mr. Kantak noted that the existing island on the Eckerd property is to separate their drive thru. J. Camp noted that there could be something in the deed regarding access and noted he is not aware of the legalities of reducing the access to another property. D. Jones suggested they look at the ALTA survey to see if there is an easement. Mr. Anderson stated they do have an ALTA survey and will get a copy to Melvin and Melvin for their review.

D. Arthur noted that the traffic flow and design between Buildings B1, B2 and G seems to be confusing when coming in from Meigs Road. Mr. Anderson noted they wanted the traffic to be able to enter and go right to the back of the site. Mr. Neumeister stated the drive between Buildings G and B is really a service drive and noted they can clarify this with signage. Mr. Anderson stated they can also look into moving the curb cut that brings vehicles into the service drive. Chairman Savacool agreed that this can potentially be addressed with signage; however he feels it will still be confusing in practice. Mr. Anderson stated they will rework this area.

E. Rock asked how a tractor trailer would be able to get to the back loading docks on Building A. Mr. Anderson noted there is extra paving behind that building and Mr. Kantak noted they are still trying to determine what the backs of the buildings are. Chairman Savacool stated he would prefer to see service trucks entering through the upper Meigs Road entrance rather than having them drive through the main part of the site. This would also be good for bus circulation. E. Rock noted that Meigs Road has been frequently discussed at the Planning Board and he is concerned about improvements to the road, especially since tractor trailers will potentially be utilizing it. Mr. Anderson stated the tractor trailers will likely use the light at the main entrance and noted that the bus will likely use Meigs Road.

Chairman Savacool stated they will need to address PDD requirements and make some decisions regarding issues such as parking requirements, square footage, setbacks, etc. so the Applicant can start designing the buildings. Mr. Neumeister provided a document from Design etcetera dated November 13, 2007 listing potential PDD requirements. This document was discussed as follows:

Regarding setbacks (number 2), comment A suggested the front yard setbacks “shall be not less than 50 feet deep facing Downer Street and Meigs Road.” Chairman Savacool asked if the current design adheres to this 50’ suggestion. Mr. Kantak stated it does. He noted they suggested this setback as they are concerned with consistency with Microtel, which is approximately 50’ off of Meigs Road.

Regarding setbacks (number 2), comment B suggested “There shall be rear yards not less than 20 feet deep.” Chairman Savacool asked how they will determine what is the “rear” of each building. Mr. Neumeister stated it may be a better idea to have the setbacks only from the property lines, not the individual building lines. D. Arthur stated this should be determined on what zoning district that property borders. For example, a 20’ setback would make sense if that property line borders a commercial zone, but not if it borders a residential zone. Chairman Savacool asked what the setback is on Building D. Mr. Kantak stated it is just over 40’. Chairman Savacool stated he would like to see it at 50’. He noted that B1 has the same requirements as R2, which is 40’. He also noted they had discussed moving Building D before and asked how far it could be moved. Mr. Anderson stated it could be moved 10 to 15 feet. Chairman Savacool stated that would be desirable as that would get it to a 50’ setback. D. Arthur asked how tall the buildings will be. Mr. Anderson stated they will be single story buildings, but he is not sure how tall they will be. D. Arthur proposed a minimum setback of 50’ for property lines bordering a residential zone with a specific building height and increasing that requirement for any buildings over one story to 60’ to 70’. This requirement would provide the developer with some guidelines and also provide the Board with some control. Mr. Anderson agreed this is mutually beneficial.

Chairman Savacool noted that the area around Building C is elevated and there is an apartment complex behind it. He asked if it is as important to stay off that property line, noting that they want to put a two-story building in that location. He asked if that area is different than the area behind Building E or D. He noted that the Board can be as specific as it wants in a PDD. It can set setbacks not just in terms of what kind of zoning district the surrounding property is located in, but how it is used. The only problem with that may be the potential for a change of use in the surrounding properties.

Chairman Savacool asked what the Board Members would suggest for setbacks. D. Arthur suggested a 50' setback for buildings of a certain height. J. McFall and L. Barnett agreed. J. Camp asked how tall a single story building typically is. Mr. Anderson stated at least 20' to 25'. Parapets will add to that height. Chairman Savacool suggested a 50' setback for a 35' tall single story building and additional requirements for buildings taller than that. Mr. Anderson noted that Building C or Building G may have a tower. D. Arthur noted that the tower will just be decorative and the building itself is a single-story height. They can clarify this in the PDD. He noted there is a difference between a building that is three-stories tall and a building that is a single story with a three-story high architectural detail. D. Arthur also noted that any building adjacent to a residential area should have a maximum height restriction as well.

Chairman Savacool noted the Board determined that any building up to 35' in height will require a 50' setback. Any building over 35' will need an additional setback equal to 50' plus the additional height of the building over 35'. Also, the maximum height allowed for a building adjacent to a residential area is not to exceed 45'. This would require a 60' setback.

Again regarding the document from Design etcetera dated November 13, 2007 listing potential PDD requirements, it was further discussed as follows:

Regarding parking requirements (number 2), comment D suggested "One per each 200 square feet of floor area." This would equal 997 parking spaces. Chairman Savacool noted the Board wants to avoid having massive amounts of asphalt and it should determine what is an acceptable number of spaces. J. McFall asked if the calculation included back rooms in the stores. Mr. Neumeister stated this was accounted for and it provides a cushion. Mr. Anderson stated he feels the 1:200 calculation is adequate. L. Barnett noted there is a lot of parking between Buildings D and A. He asked what will fill that space if parking is decreased. Mr. Anderson noted that EDR is already addressing the lot between Buildings A and B and stated they can have them consider the lot between Buildings D and A as well. D. Arthur stated he would like to see more visually attractive features and green space in exchange for lessening the parking requirements. He noted that EDR is very familiar with what the Village is looking for. Chairman Savacool suggested they not try to come up with a number today, but should review it and come back with a suggestion.

John Camp completed his review of the engineering memo dated November 27, 2007 as follows:

3. The following items could be discussed in the PDD description:
  - a. Building Square Footage
  - b. Building Height
  - c. Location of Curb Cuts
  - d. Visual Corridor to South
  - e. Pedestrian Access/Circulation
  - f. Interior Traffic Circulation
  - g. Landscaping/Greenspace
  - h. Drainage
  - i. Architecture

J. Camp clarified that he included the above items because they made sense to address in the PDD description, not necessarily because anything in the plans is deficient. He noted the intent would be to try to make sure these ideas are carried through assuming that, for example 30 years down the road, that this is reconfigured somehow. Chairman Savacool agreed that these are all issues that will need to be addressed, but not necessarily all of them now. He asked, as the Applicant is coming up with their final site plan, what are the items on this list that do need to be addressed now.

Building square footage is one issue that is necessary to address. Chairman Savacool noted that they are proposing 199,350 square feet. Mr. Anderson confirmed that they plan to stay at that number. D. Arthur noted that this property is under the constraints of easements and parking so the figure they have now could be made a rough lot coverage. Mr. Anderson stated his instructions to Mr. Kantak and Mr. Neumeister is that the footage is stable. They will, however, tweak parking and traffic circulation and come back to the next meeting.

Chairman Savacool noted that the December meeting is scheduled for December 25, which is, of course, going to be rescheduled. The Board discussed holding the meeting earlier to allow the application to potentially be sent to SOCPA before January.

Upon **motion** by J. McFall and second by D. Arthur to reschedule the December meeting. It will now be held on December 18, 2007 at 7:00 pm. **Carried.**

Chairman Savacool asked that any new materials be submitted to the Board at least 10 days prior to the meeting and even earlier to J. Camp if possible. He asked that the Board Members review J. Camp's memo item 3 and think about those issues prior to the meeting.

### **Site Plan Review regarding 80 East Genesee Street – Coholan**

Mr. Julian Clark from Plumley Engineering is present to address the Board. He noted they had been considering rezoning to a PDD. However, after further discussions with Chairman Savacool, they have decided to leave the zoning as it is and move ahead with the plan to combine 3 or potentially 4 lots into 2. The plan is for a self-storage facility on the south lot (Lot 1), which will consist of 7 buildings totaling roughly 7,000 square feet of self-storage with an office building. He noted they may utilize an existing house off Salina Street for the office if it is in good condition. They will have access to the storage facility from Salina Street through an access easement Mr. Coholan has with the neighboring property owner. As Lot 2 gets developed, they will hopefully have rear access to the property. He stated he is here tonight to get things moving towards a desired approval in January, which will allow them to begin building in the spring.

John Camp reviewed the engineering memo dated November 27, 2007 as follows:

We have reviewed sheet SP 1 of 1 dated November 2007 for the above-referenced project and have the following comments:

1. The plan appears to show reverse subdivisions and adjusted property lines among five existing lots. The five existing lots are proposed to be reconfigured into two lots. Four of the existing lots are zoned "industrial". One existing lot is zoned "commercial".

J. Camp stated the number of parcels (5) is based on his read of the tax map. Mr. Clark mentioned there are only 2 or 3 existing lots total. Mr. Clark stated he will check this again. J. Camp stated there will be a reverse subdivision as well as a lot line adjustment between several lots and the bulk of the property is in an Industrial district and a smaller amount is in a Commercial district. Chairman Savacool asked if the existing home that will potentially be used as the office is zoned Residential. Mr. Clark stated that property is zoned Commercial. J. Camp asked if it is the intent to have the entire property turned into 2 lots. Mr. Clark confirmed this is the intent.

2. As currently shown on the plan, one of the proposed lots will have two zoning classifications. The proposed land-use appears to be permitted in both zoning classifications.

L. Barnett asked if it is a problem to have different zoning designations when combining lots. J. Camp stated he has spoken to R. Carr prior to tonight and reviewed it with D. Jones this evening and it is their impression that it is not that big of a deal. The use appears to be acceptable in both zoning classifications. There is a provision in the code that allows for a single lot to have two different zoning classifications within it.

Chairman Savacool asked if the rear property lines shown on the plan are the existing lines or the proposed lines. Mr. Clark stated they are the proposed lines and the gray dashed line shows the existing property line. D. Arthur asked if the drainage lines shown on this property line are existing or proposed. Mr. Clark stated there is an existing 12" drainage line that will be moved over.

Chairman Savacool asked how much of the property is Industrial. Mr. Clark stated most of it is Industrial and just the 3 properties along Salina Street are Commercial. Chairman Savacool suggested making all of the property Commercial as the Village is trying to eliminate Industrial districts, noting they are not feasible for the most part. It may be best to just change the zoning to all Commercial. Mr. Clark stated this had been discussed as it has been their intent all along to find a path for the zoning and the Applicant will likely be willing to do that.

D. Cronk referenced the parking lot (designated "existing parking") and asked who owns that. Mr. Clark stated that the darkened area belongs to the Applicant and the other portion is within the easement. D. Cronk asked if they have determined what kind of traffic would be involved with this type of use. Mr. Clark stated he will look into this and come back with his assessment at the next meeting.

Chairman Savacool asked why the climate-controlled storage buildings are on two separate sides of the property. Mr. Clark noted they wanted to just do one as part of Phase 1 and the other will be added to offset the smaller size of the units at the other end. D. Arthur noted that many storage facilities also provide truck rentals and asked if there are any plans to have trucks parked on site and rented out. Mr. Clark stated this has not been discussed and he will look into that.

3. The proposed building heights should be shown on the plan. According to section 72-20-D of the village code, in an industrial district "...No structure shall extend above any of the planes inclined at a slope of one (1) foot vertically for each foot horizontally, rising upward over the lot from each of the property lines."

J. Camp noted this comment was written with the idea that this would be zoned as an Industrial lot and stated this comment will not be an issue if it is rezoned to a Commercial zone. Mr. Clark noted that none of the buildings will be more than 12' high.

4. Detailed calculations should be provided to show that the proposed stormwater management facility is designed in accordance with the appropriate standards. The stormwater management plan should ensure that the project will not result in adverse effects to properties downstream and upstream from the site.

Mr. Clark stated they are 90% done with these calculations.

5. The site contains at least one watercourse. The applicant has shown a drainage easement around one watercourse. This easement is important as it will convey stormwater from a considerable area upstream of the project. The applicant should provide calculations to show that the 100-year stormwater runoff can be contained in this easement.

J. Camp noted there is an easement that is essentially parallel to the proposed property line down the middle of the entire site and, based his on site visit and USGS mapping, there is a decent sized watercourse that runs through there and they are, therefore, asking the Applicant to provide an easement that will contain a 100-year storm so the Village can ensure that that area will remain open and not have the potential to impact anyone upstream or downstream during larger storms.

6. According to USGS maps and aerial photography, the site recently had two distinct low, wet areas. Based on the topography shown on the plan, one of these low, wet areas may have been filled in. If this is the case, we recommend that the stormwater storage volume lost as a result of this action be replaced at the site.

Mr. Clark stated this was likely a pond that was part of the manufacturing process and was filled in before Mr. Coholan was involved in the project. J. Camp noted the 2 low areas can be seen on the USGS map in the corner. He

agreed with Mr. Clark that there used to be an area where water was stored and they should look into whether this provided a benefit to stormwater storage and, if it did and that benefit is lost, then it would be recommended that that volume be replaced. This could be replaced in an area adjacent to the easement they are currently proposing. This would be an attempt to return the site to the characteristics that it had prior to this being filled in. The act of filling that area in had the potential to force stormwater in two directions, downstream and potentially upstream. This should be looked at closely to see if this filling in of that area had an adverse affect and, if so, the Board can recommend a way to mitigate that in a way that could be fairly painless for the Applicant.

J. McFall stated he is concerned that there are no plantings shown along the yards of the homes on Curtis Avenue. There should be some separation. D. Arthur suggested a raised berm.

L. Barnett asked how his client would control what goes into self storage and asked if chemicals, gasoline, or explosives could be stored on the site. Mr. Clark is not sure if there are restrictions in the contract. D. Arthur asked if there is a containment or barrier requirement for the ground. J. Camp stated he has never seen one, but there may be. He suggested the Applicant could put some restrictions in the contracts as to what can be stored.

Judy Plouffe is present to address this proposal. She stated she was always told Jardine's had a lot of heavy metal on the site. She stated she had dirt from the property brought into her yard that never grew anything and is concerned about pollution of the soil. She asked if this has been cleaned up. Mr. Clark stated the soil has been tested and did have low levels of contamination, but nothing significant. They never had to go further with the DEC. Mr. Coholan looked into this prior to purchasing the property. Mrs. Plouffe asked if there is any way for the Board to check. J. Camp stated he will have someone at C & S who is knowledgeable in this area look into it. Mr. Clark stated he would imagine that his client received some sort of reports regarding this and what was found was obviously not too extensive. Chairman Savacool stated the Board will look into this as it is an issue that has been raised. They will also look into containment requirements, what is required for a gas station, for example. D. Arthur asked Mr. Clark to get information from Mr. Coholan as to what he has in place regarding the storage of chemicals, etc. and find out if he is building in any protections for this. Mr. Clark stated this is most likely covered in the contract and stated as far as he knows the units will just be on concrete slabs. J. Camp stated he will look into whether this has been addressed on similar sites. The Board can request any environmental studies that have been done by the DEC. D. Arthur noted they can also look into any design requirements by Store America.

Mrs. Plouffe noted that years ago when it was first sold to Mr. Coholan he was planning patio homes. She asked if this changed due to contamination. Chairman Savacool stated he is not sure why the plan changed, but he does not believe it was for that reason.

Chairman Savacool asked if this type of site is typically fenced. Mr. Clark stated they are sometimes and he will talk to his client about this.

Upon motion by J. McFall and second by E. Rock, the meeting was adjourned at 9:50 p.m. The next Planning Board meeting is scheduled for December 18, 2007.

Respectfully Submitted,

Susan A. LaQuay  
Planning Board Secretary