

**TOWN OF GREENFIELD
PLANNING BOARD**

November 24, 2015

REGULAR MEETING

A regular meeting of the Town of Greenfield Planning Board is called to order by Tonya Yasenchak at 7:00 p.m. On roll call, the following members are present: Tonya Yasenchak, John Bokus, Nathan Duffney, Michael Gyarmathy, Thomas Siragusa, John Streit, Stan Weeks and Robert Roeckle, Alternate Charlie Baker, Town Engineer is present.

MINUTES – November 10, 2015

MOTION: T. Siragusa

SECOND: M. Gyarmathy

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board waives the reading of and approves the minutes of November 10, 2015, as submitted.

VOTE: Ayes: Bokus, Gyarmathy, Roeckle, Siragusa, Streit, Weeks, Yasenchak

Noes: None

Abstain: Duffney

PLANNING BOARD CASES

STEPHEN & BETH PODHAJECKI – Special Use Permit/Site Plan Review

Locust Grove Road

No one is present for the application. T. Yasenchak states that the Board had asked for additional information.

7337 MIDDLE GROVE LLC – Special Use Permit/Site Plan Review

Mike Ballestero is present. T. Yasenchak reviews that the Town Board has approved a temporary junkyard permit for the applicant. We are here to review a special use permit for a large contractor's storage yard. M. Ballestero states that he has provided the Board with the sight distance information and the lighting for the building. T. Yasenchak states that we do have a letter which we will address. The Board had asked for additional information the last time the applicant was present and we were discussing the recycling use. She asks if there are any changes besides the additional information that the applicant has provided. M. Ballestero states no. T. Yasenchak states that the public hearing has been adjourned and we are not going to reopen that until the Board discusses and feels they have enough information to continue a public discussion. S. Weeks states that the major question he has is that when you talk about sorting of materials, is that going to be done inside the building or outside. M. Ballestero states outside probably. B. Duffney states that one of the main concerns last time was the sight distance. He remembers the applicant stating that he was going to put in a slab to do the sorting on. Sight distance seems to be taken care of according to the information submitted. J. Streit questions that the applicant is going to construct a platform on which to sort materials and these materials are going to come in to the property by containers, he asks the nature of the materials and how they are sorted. M. Ballestero states that it is metal and depending on what the material is whether it is sorted by hand or with the grapple, and then put in another dumpster. J. Streit asks if any of the stuff brought on to the property will remain on the property for any amount of time. M. Ballestero states no. J. Streit states that then everything that comes in goes out. M. Ballestero states that the majority of the recycling part of the whole project was for the cars on the property. It is not a major recycling project, it is not a dumpster

November 24, 2015

a month. Do they take some metals in, yes, but it is not a big operation. J. Streit questions that DEC conducted some test sites. M. Ballestero states that he believes that was last year. J. Streit asks if we have copies of that information, the Town Board requested that. T. Yasenchak states that they commented on it but she does not believe that they requested it. She states that on page 163 it states that once the cars are removed, the area may require inspection by DEC. J. Streit states that he thought the minutes indicated a request for the results of those studies. M. Ballestero states that he believes what was requested was any reports that the applicant receives from DEC he is to forward to the Town. S. Weeks states that there is a large structure and asks what is going to happen inside that. M. Ballestero states that is where he is going to store the trucks; if he has to do maintenance on a truck it will be in the barn. He states that in cold weather he might sort some metals inside the building, but for the most part it is for storage and maintenance. S. Weeks states that it is possible that the applicant could sort inside. M. Ballestero states it is. S. Weeks states that in talking about noise abatement, etc. – that is where he is coming from in thinking that since they have the large structure, that might be one way to alleviate those concerns. If we had a couple feet of snow, he would expect that the applicant would do some sorting inside rather than outside. B. Duffney asks after the cars are all gone, what would the applicant say are his projected hours regarding the sorting. M. Ballestero states that it is not a lot – it might be 2 days this week and then he might not sort any metal for 3 weeks. It is not a big operation. He does not know hours per day, it might be an hour, it might be an hour every other day. B. Duffney states that then it could be 20 hours or 40 hours per month. M. Ballestero states that 40 hours per month is a lot and that there would not be a lot of noise involved with it. He would use the excavator or by hand. He does not think that noise is an issue. B. Duffney states that the newer machines are not much louder than an average car, a diesel, Cummins Dodge – about the same noise level. T. Yasenchak states that at one point, she was of the understanding, that some of the work or ripping down the cars was actually going to be done in the garage. She thought that the garage was going to be more useable and that the trucks were going to be parked outside. M. Ballestero states that it is not a large enough structure to take cars apart inside the building. By hand it would be but not with a machine, the structure is not that big. The cars would be done on a pad. T. Yasenchak states that there is only one pad shown on the plan and would that be what he would be using for the cars as well as for the other materials. M. Ballestero confirms this. T. Yasenchak comments that when they are sorting the other materials that happen to be in the dumpsters before they transport on to another location, she thinks that might be too small or there might be too much going on. She states that the Town Board asked the applicant to remove 225 cars during the first year and that is more than 4 per week. M. Ballestero asks if we are talking about the junk yard or the contractor's storage yard. T. Yasenchak states that she understands that they are separate, but if they are using that same 40 x 60 pad, which really isn't huge, she just wants to make sure that we are not using space for the storage yard that is also being designated for what is being used for the junkyard. So we end up not having additional materials stored somewhere else or if he decides he needs another pad, where will that pad go. M. Ballestero states that when they are recycling the cars, they would come on the pad, the fluids would be drained, the car would be dismantled and put in dumpsters. As far as the recycling of metals, it would come in and go on the pad, and then go into another dumpster. The metal coming in is not a big operation and a 40 x 60 pad is sufficient for what they do. If they brought in 10 loads of metal a day, then maybe a 40 x 60 pad is not large enough, but that is not their operation, that is not their business. It is a side to what they do. C. Baker asks on the proposed pad where they will be dismantling the cars, what provisions are they making for collecting the drainage off of the pad to assure that they do not get discharged into the buffer area. M. Ballestero states that the pad will be sloped to the center, there will be no drains in the pad, and if there are any spills on the pad they can clean those. C. Baker asks the process for draining fluids. M. Ballestero states that it is a matter of pulling the drain plug out and draining the fluid into a drum and then it is removed by a waste hauler. He states that they might burn the waste oil but they are up in the air as to whether they will put in a waste burner or not as they are quite pricey and they don't know that they would have that amount of oil to do that. C. Baker states that then the plan is to recycle the fluids. T. Siragusa states that he thought that the vehicles did not have oil in them. He asks if they have spot checked them to be able to say that most of them are drained. M. Ballestero states if they do have fluids, he is going with the assumption that they do have fluids in them. He does not know if they do or not, but he is going to take it as they do have fluids in them, he is going to bring them up and take the precautions. C. Baker states that as to the drainage, the applicant is well under the 1 acre threshold and he is providing edge drains for the new building, so as far as storm water

November 24, 2015

control goes, he does not have an issue with it. T. Yasenchak states that she has some notes about how the Board feels about the recycling and if that is a processing or contractor storage yard use. She reads from the definition of a large contractor storage yard. She asks the Board's thoughts on that and whether we are continuing on within that definition as far as his contractor job is to pull the materials off of a site and then bring them to a recycling location. He is bringing them back to his site, taking them out, sorting them so that they can go to the correct locations. S. Weeks states that he thinks that sorting gets pretty close to processing in his mind. That is his major concern and why he asked, if the minimal amount of sorting would be done inside he would feel differently. If the sorting is done outside, the vehicle may not make much noise, but you are sorting metal and he thinks that is a noise creator. He would think that if he were a neighbor he would think that processing was taking place. B. Duffney states that as S. Weeks says, it does fall in processing, but it is a minimal amount of time. It is a fine line. He does not really know what to think. T. Yasenchak states that the Planning Board's option, if they are uncomfortable with that, they can ask for an interpretation from the ZBA. T. Siragusa states that his opinion has not changed. If you read it and by definition that is processing. We do have precedent for that for not allowing or not providing a permit for a contractor storage yard because there was processing. He thinks frequency doesn't matter, we don't know that it is every day for a couple days, maybe not for a couple weeks, but over time and over the years we don't know that. He does not really consider the timing aspect just literally from the book a storage yard is for storage and not processing and this is clearly processing to him. M. Ballestero questions that the definition says that they can sort materials. T. Yasenchak states that it does not. R. Roeckle states that he does not like the definition and thinks that an interpretation would be helpful to be fair. B. Duffney states that during the course of this, if we don't allow the processing part, what then during the removal of the junk cars. T. Yasenchak states that is separate and we discussed that it was not within the Planning Board's purview to review junkyards. Under junkyard he is allowed to do that. B. Duffney questions that while they have the junkyard permit, wouldn't the sorting of the materials fall under junkyard. T. Yasenchak states that she believes that one of the conditions for their junkyard permit was that no new cars would be brought to the property and it was limited to the removal of the junk cars only. M. Gyarmathy states that having been in building construction for 35 years and he thinks that most trades people, when they come across metals, those individuals take those materials to the local scrap yards to be processed. He thinks that M. Ballestero is going to get this opportunity once in a great while from someone who has bought a property and it is cluttered and they don't have the knowledge to take them to the scrapyards so they ask the applicant to bring a dumpster over in which to put those metals. Once in a while M. Ballestero will have to come back to his shop and sort the metals. He thinks that those would not be of the large variety. Most of the time construction people want the money from the metals themselves. He does not see this part of M. Ballestero's business as being a large portion of his business in any way, in his opinion. M. Gyarmathy states that he would consider this sorting because when he gets done with his jobs he has framing materials, sheetrock, wood, etc. and he will come back and sort that out. He feels that is what M. Ballestero is doing here, sorting. If the other Board members are concerned, then maybe getting an interpretation would be a good idea. J. Streit states that to him when you process you change something and he does not see material being changed. As he heard the Chair read the definition of a large contractor storage yard, it allows for the presence of construction materials. Those materials would be brought in and brought out. To him this is a sorting operation, recycling, which he thinks in general is to the benefit of humanity and he does not get hung up on the word 'processing'. He thinks that the applicant is taking materials, sorting them, recycling them and he does not object to that. T. Yasenchak asks if J. Streit feels the need for another opinion. J. Streit states that he would like another opinion on the DEC water test but to him sorting is sorting and processing is processing. They are not elementally changing any of the materials that they are sorting, just taking them from one place and putting them in another. He states that he would need an opinion to define the word "processing". T. Yasenchak states that as to the question of DEC, the difference between what the junkyard is and the DEC testing, or is he asking for that for the large contractor storage yard. J. Streit states that there were several concerns in the public hearing and he went to one of the sites to see first-hand how their thoughts played out. He thinks that the cars are a mess and he thinks it is a good thing that the Town Board has put in for self-limiting and getting rid of the junkyard status. Noise was a major issue also brought up and it is difficult to see how much noise is going to be created that would be obnoxious. Another issue was quality of water and that was a main issue that was flagged. He would like to see what the water test sites said with these cars and vehicles having been there for

November 24, 2015

a long time. T. Yasenchak states that our purview is the large contractor storage yard, so she is saying that we can ask how the water quality would be affected by the large contractor storage yard. J. Streit states that if the cars have been here for a long time and the water quality is ok, he would tend to argue that what the applicant is proposing would not materially change that. T. Yasenchak states that we are here to review the large contractor storage yard as if there were no cars at all. J. Streit states to him it is somewhat of an advantage having had those cars there for a long time, if they didn't hurt the water quality, then it is most unlikely that what the applicant is suggesting he is going to do will affect the water. S. Weeks states that the Town Board minutes indicate that Councilman Chandler had indicated that DEC had dug twenty 5' holes and found no contamination. He asks if J. Streit is saying that he would like to see that. S. Weeks states that the Town Board is really the one who should probably be asking for that. The Planning Board could suggest that that is followed up on. J. Streit states that if that evidence is available, why don't we get that to see it for ourselves as we make the judgement for a large contractor storage yard. T. Yasenchak asks if J. Streit thinks that what C. Baker has asked about the sorting of the materials on that pad and how the applicant is attenuating any runoff from that pad, capturing any kind of water that would come off, etc. J. Streit states that he thinks that C. Baker has demonstrated extremely high standards to us in the past and if he is satisfied, then J. Streit would be satisfied. C. Baker states that in separating the project, as far as the contractor's storage yard, the Board could ask for a description of the project and for the applicant to give an operation guideline, exactly what he just told us, the process of draining, if there are fluids in the vehicles, how he intends to do that - drain it into buckets, putting it into a bulk tank, having it hauled off site. That could be documented and put into the record so that if there is a problem or anything reported in the future and someone has to go out there and take a look at it, we can review what was agreed to in this process. As far as meeting the guidelines for storm water management for the contractor storage yard, C. Baker reiterates that it is exempt because it is less than an acre and does not require water quality treatment per the current DEC regulations. The applicant is providing water quality treatment for the building with the drip edge crushed stone that he has shown and he is complying with the regulation, as far as the contractor storage yard. M. Gyarmathy states that this Board has to remember that these are two separate issues. He thinks that DEC governs junkyards and that we are just sitting here talking about a contractor storage yard. T. Yasenchak states that is the only thing that we can talk about. J. Streit states that what he thinks he is saying is a lot simpler than it is being taken. The town's people said they were concerned that what the applicant was going to do there may affect their water supply. We know that there have been a number of cars there for a number of years. An interesting point to him would be, what has the effect of those cars there for a number of years been on the water quality. Once we find out that the water quality is ok, to him, that would tend to indicate that what the applicant is intending to do in the future would not justify the fears of the town's people going forward. Forget about the cars, they are a self-limiting thing, they are being phased out. Whatever damage the cars are going to do they have already done to the water - let's see if that DEC study helps. If it said the water was fine, we wash those cars out of our brains and we go forward and say that it is most unlikely that what the applicant intends to do is going to affect the quality of the neighboring water supply. The junkyard issue has been decided by the Town. The large contractor storage yard is exactly the Planning Board's concern. One of the objections that the people of the town made is what is it going to do to our water and that is a reasonable question. He thinks we should avail ourselves of the best information that we can in making a determination about that and the best way to do that is to take advantage of a study that has already been done. B. Duffney states that he was at the Town Board meetings when they discussed this and he believes that when the DEC was in there, there were no fines, nothing going on. If they had found something there would have been fines, etc. J. Streit states that generally this Board has wanted to see things with their own eyes in the past. T. Yasenchak states that she thinks that what she is not balancing is what C. Baker just said, which is how the applicant is proposing to use the property and the pad for a large contractor storage yard and that within that, the way the applicant is handling it is within the regulations. J. Streit thanks C. Baker for pointing that out, that part is done. He is only saying that if there is information about the water that is available, let's look at it as addressing the concerns of the town's people. J. Streit suggests that it could also be a contingency. T. Yasenchak states that a contingency would just be that you feel that you need to see that information to make an informed decision while taking action on the project. The applicant has already said that he has a way to attenuate any water. T. Yasenchak states that the DEC may not have done actual water testing. Further discussion takes place. S. Weeks states that he sees this as a

November 24, 2015

Town Board issue. The Town Board was dealing with the junk yard issue, they commented that once the cars were removed, the area may require an inspection by the DEC and that satisfies him. He thinks that they are the ones dealing with the junkyard issue and we are trying to deal with the contractor storage yard and as soon as we start combining those, we get into trouble. The Board consensus is that this is a Town Board issue and they do not need to see it. J. Streit states that he agrees that it is a Town Board issue, but are we saying that we collectively agree that the Town Board has offered a tacit opinion that the water is fine. T. Yasenchak states that we do not know if they commented about the water, if they did water tests or soil tests. C. Baker reiterates that the other thing that is important to note is that DEC regulates junkyards. T. Yasenchak states that the reason she does not feel that she needs to see that information is because we are looking at the land and the use as a large contractor storage yard as a special use permit, what is being proposed is less dense and less active than all of those thousands of cars that have been there. The applicant is already proposing an attenuation to limit any possible future contamination. He is capturing anything that is on that pad. It is going to be attenuated, captured and taken away, so he is forward thinking of saying anything new that is happening on this site, he is taking care of and this is the plan. That is why C. Baker said that if we asked the applicant for an operation guideline to document that, then T. Yasenchak states that she can say that she is making a decision based on the fact that she knows that this new use is not going to make anything worse, change the situation that is there now, maybe just make it better. She agrees with C. Baker as to having an operation guideline so that we do have something to point to later on. When we look at special use permits we can do a temporary special use permit, which we have done in the past. There are ways during this process that there can be checks and balances. T. Yasenchak states that we did not finish our discussion about whether or not the Board felt that sorting fell into processing or that they felt that they wanted another opinion. J. Streit states that he said that he would agree with the temper of the Board and they felt that they did not need that. T. Yasenchak states that about 4 people said that they would like another opinion. B. Duffney states that processing is taking something and making something else out of it. Take raw material sort it out and make something out of it. Sorting is taking a material and just sorting it. He uses the example of fire wood. With metal he feels it is just sorting. T. Siragusa states that B. Duffney's example made fire wood into a saleable material which also you could say for recycling - that it had less value and you worked on it and now it has more value. T. Yasenchak states that what B. Duffney is saying is that you are making the fire wood different sizes, cutting it, taking action on it vs. if you had logs of different lengths and you are putting them in piles of the different lengths. S. Weeks states that sorting does not show up in the definition either. He states that after listening to M. Gyarmathy he does have a slightly different opinion now of how intense this would be and it brings him back to the fact that if this were done inside of an enclosure he would have a different opinion than it being done outside. M. Gyarmathy is telling him it is going to be a minimal kind of thing, it isn't going to be very intensive. You are taking higher value material, it is not going to be a lot of stuff. So he is saying, do it inside the building and he would think differently about it. He would say that the applicant is separating materials. He can handle getting away from processing, that the applicant is separating, but he is not as pleased with the idea that the applicant is separating under the open sky in the rain and the snow. There is a big building up there and he does not see any intense use for that and it seems to him that if this is a minimal amount of material, why would you not do it inside the building which addresses some of the issues that people have about noise, mess, run off, etc. He would say that he is ok with that. J. Streit states that the applicant had pointed out that he wanted to use the big building to store his trucks. S. Weeks states that is not a high value use of a building. M. Ballestero states that this is a minimal deal, but he is trying to think of something that you would do outside and not do in your garage. This is state of the art building, it is a clean floor building, it isn't where he wants to throw metals on the floor. It's a shop not a building that he wants to get dirty. M. Gyarmathy states that what the applicant is trying to say is that it is a place where he wants to store his trucks, so he wants to be able to pull his trucks in and not worry about a piece of metal going thru the tires, etc. That is why he has a specific place that he wants to do this. M. Ballestero states that he is not saying, if he won the lottery, that he could not put an enclosure over the pad, that is not out of the question. It was a thought that they had to put a 40 x 60 building over the pad. M. Ballestero states that if it is the noise, can't they call the Town and say he is making too much noise. T. Yasenchak states that we do not have a noise ordinance. B. Duffney reiterates that T. Yasenchak discussed giving a 1 year special use permit and then if there are no major complaints

November 24, 2015

during that time give it permanently. The neighbors also have to realize that during the course of this they are moving the cars out too. J. Bokus states that you cannot separate the noise. J. Streit states that if we did approve for 1 year, that gives everyone a fair chance to prove their side. S. Weeks states that he would not be in favor of that. He thinks that we need to make decisions based on the best of our knowledge. J. Streit states that he does not understand why this would have to be done inside vs outside. S. Weeks states that we are not fully meeting the definition of a large contractor storage yard and he is trying to find some way to alleviate that and in his mind we need to do that. J. Streit states that B. Bacigalupo had things stored outside and we never discussed making him put a building over those. T. Yasenchak states that those are literally his materials that he brings in that he is going to use, he doesn't sell from his property and he picked it up, left it on his site and when it is needed it is taken off. T. Yasenchak states that the reason we are discussing this is that there has been another plan in the town that had been denied by the ZBA because they were screening material. She thinks that is what we are trying to get at – where is that line? Does this Board feel that we need another opinion – is it processing? If the Board feels that it falls within the definition then we can continue the discussion of the other site/special use permit issues. J. Bokus states that he thinks it is strictly sorting. R. Roeckle states that back on September 8th we had this same discussion basically and we had wanted to find out why G. McKenna made the determination that he did that this was a large contractor storage yard. Did we ever get that? T. Yasenchak states that is why she is asking this Board. R. Roeckle states that if we don't like G. McKenna's answer we can ask for an interpretation. J. Bokus reiterates that he thinks this is strictly sorting, you are not changing anything on the product. T. Yasenchak states that we do not have a definition of sorting, we were just using that as our limit here. Her question is whether it falls under large contractor storage yard or does J. Bokus want another opinion. J. Bokus states that he does not need another opinion. An informal poll is taken and S. Weeks, T. Siragusa and T. Yasenchak would like to see another opinion. B. Duffney, M. Gyarmathy, J. Streit and J. Bokus feel that it does not need another opinion. R. Roeckle as alternate would like to see another opinion. T. Yasenchak states to the applicant that if there are members of the Board who do not feel that what the applicant is asking for is within the definition, then there is a chance as we go forward that they may not vote in favor. If we do ask the ZBA for their opinion, the applicant also runs the risk of them saying that they do not agree and ending it right there, as far as the recycling. M. Ballestero states that he will just store everything on site and then he is not sorting anything. T. Yasenchak states that then the applicant needs to take it off at some time. M. Ballestero states that is the problem, he can bring stuff in and keep storing it, but he can't ever take it off. He states that is basically what he is doing – bringing metals in, storing them and then hauling them off. He does not understand where we are getting processing. They will change the whole thing to that he is storing some metal and then he is going to haul them off. J. Streit questions that we took a poll not to go to the ZBA. T. Yasenchak states that she is explaining to the applicant that there is the possibility that he could be denied and is that a risk he is willing to take. J. Bokus states that he is confused because the Code Enforcement Officer allowed it to come to the Planning Board. T. Yasenchak states that he said it could be a contractor storage yard and then as it has progressed with discussions, it has become more evident that it is more recycling, or he feels that it may be evident that it is more recycling than storage yard. It is before the Planning Board so that perhaps during the process it could perhaps be defined a little bit clearer what he is allowed to do when we take action on a special use permit. S. Weeks states that the Code Enforcement Officer did not make the decision. He states that we should remember that there are 8 people on the Board. T. Siragusa states to M. Gyarmathy that his argument is that all contractors store stuff, all contractors touch stuff and move it from one container to another – all contractors. He asks if all 4 people agree with that and that is called sorting and does he want to change the definition because he feels like it. It sounds like M. Gyarmathy just feels like it. No one has convinced him. J. Streit states that he was a contractor and did it, he didn't just feel like it. T. Siragusa states that then 100% of all contractors touch stuff, process it, come out with a different material and sell it. Is that the definition that is being read in the book. He states that he feels that the other Board members are just deciding that it is small and inconsequential. It is not our job to interpret the law. He states that the Board members are interpreting because it is something that all contractors do and it is inconsequential. T. Yasenchak states that is why we have a diverse Board with a diverse background so that we can make decisions based on diversity. The question is that we did take an informal poll and the majority of the Board members felt that we did not have to ask for a ZBA opinion/interpretation and that is ok, we don't have to, it is not required. We can continue and the Board

November 24, 2015

does not have to agree, they can disagree. T. Siragusa states that we don't have to agree, he would like them to change their opinion. T. Yasenchak states they may not. She states that maybe that is why the Board is feeling a little bit upside-down because we usually, not necessarily have the same opinion, but we all can understand the end game and the process. Right now having a disagreement that is so drawn in the sand, we are having difficulty. We don't have to come to an agreement, we can continue to review it and hopefully have enough information to come to a decision with the votes falling where they may. S. Weeks states that it does bother him that a previous contractor was denied the ability to sift soil to make top soil, so that is sorting. If we say sorting is ok, that begins to impact a whole bunch of other things. T. Siragusa states that is why we have discussions, we try to change people's opinions. T. Yasenchak states that sometimes we just have to say that we don't agree and that is ok. At some point we will decide whether we will take action and then you vote for or against it. J. Bokus questions isn't the bringing and sorting only part of the contractor storage yard. He is still going to be storing trucks there, storing equipment there, etc. This is just a portion of it. T. Yasenchak states that was the original question and whether or not the Board felt that it fell within the definition of contractor storage yard, which J. Bokus said he felt it did. J. Bokus states that there is more to it than just the material, there is the storing of trucks. The applicant could have the contractor storage yard and not bring material in. M. Gyarmathy states that T. Siragusa feels that M. Gyarmathy has changed his mind and he thinks that initially what he said was that he believed that what the applicant was doing was sorting. He also said that if the majority of the Board felt that it was necessary to have the ZBA make an interpretation, that is what should be done. T. Yasenchak states that the Board did specifically ask the applicant to go thru the requirements and document in a succinct format all of the things that we had discussed during our multitude of meetings so that it wasn't just us pulling the answers to our questions from the minutes. We do have on the record that the applicant was going to do that. M. Ballestero questions that he did not do that. T. Yasenchak states that we do not have that, only the applicant's answers. T. Yasenchak asks the Board about reopening the public hearing or waiting for the additional information – the responses to the items in the code and an operation guideline, which could be in one document. Board consensus is to wait. The next meeting is December 8th and if the applicant can get that information to the Board by December 1st to be on the agenda. M. Ballestero asks if that is the operation of the junkyard or just the contractor storage yard. T. Yasenchak states just the contractor storage yard and as C. Baker mentioned it would be the operation guideline as to how the pad would be used and how the run off or any fluids would be taken care of.

UMH/Brookview MHP – Special Use Permit/Site Plan Review
NYS Route 9N

Mark Millsbaugh from Sterling Environmental, Marty Mancini and John Lister from UMH and David Engel, attorney, are present. D. Engel states that this application was brought before the Planning Board again following their detour to the ZBA which issued an approval allowing this project to go ahead with 64 lots. The one issue that the ZBA identified specifically in sending it back to the Planning Board was the issue of the visibility of the expansion, particularly on the south side. As the Board members are aware, the applicant has proposed a screening plan along the south side with additional plantings of trees. That was included in the submissions made when they were last here in 2014 and those documents reflecting that were included in the submission sent to the Board on October 26, 2015. They also submitted a letter on November 19th from M. Millsbaugh with answers to a variety of questions or issues that were expressed at the November 10th meeting. T. Yasenchak questions that regarding the landscaping buffer, D. Engel is still talking about the additional buffer that was proposed in 2014 and not a new additional buffer. D. Engel states that there were concerns expressed in 2014 and they believe that what they provided to the Board at that time was sufficient. It should be kept in mind here that this project has a long history. They were before the Planning Board back in the last decade over the course of a few years, they obtained all the permits and approvals that were required, those were issued in 2007 and at that time in conjunction with those approvals, they entered into all sorts of restrictions on the use of this property including restrictive covenants that bear on the issue of wetland protection and also on the issue of protecting or creating a buffer area around the property. When you look at the depiction on the wall, the development does not go out to the property line,

November 24, 2015

there is about a 75' area that is forever undevelopable which is going to be maintained in perpetuity as a buffer area and notwithstanding the fact that they thought that that would be unquestionably sufficient there were concerns raised and they have now indicated in the plans that they submitted in 2014 that they would do additional plantings in there of what he believes to be coniferous trees in order to provide a little additional screening in that area. The nearest residence to the south is approximately 350' away from the property line and the intervening terrain is either all forested or heavily wooded. D. Engel states that they think they have now submitted a full application with all of the necessary documentation to this Board and everything is in place. They respectfully request that the approvals that were last issued in 2007 be reinstated. They understand that they have to step thru an EAF at this point and that has to be completed by this Board, but given that they have gone thru SEQRA once before, it should be largely an administrative exercise at this point. M. Millspaugh states that he brought the Board up-to-date at the last meeting but can point out a few key things as this is a public hearing. When the approvals were obtained in 2007, work started on the culvert crossing and there are several crossings in the expansion area. These were subject of a permit with the ACOE and it was date sensitive. The work had to start and be finished within a set period of time. He indicates the culvert crossing that is in as well as the embankment that is associated with it and the culvert crossings where the proposed roads cross the underlying drainage. That was subject to an ACOE Nationwide Permit, work is done and part-and-parcel to that was the creation of a restrictive covenant that forever protects the wetlands, the adjacent buffer area and they included the perimeter of the property in that as well. He indicates the property line, the building setback line as set forth in the code and then they have actually shifted the development away from the property line. He indicates a stand of trees that would stay, no matter what and then there is another 350' of trees. Notwithstanding all of that, they have submitted a landscape plan that shows a line of trees to be placed in the lower spot. The topo has a lower spot where one could look in and that is why the trees are placed in a certain location on the plan. East of that, the topo is coming back up and the trees are higher to offer more screening. All the other permits are in place. At the last meeting there were questions about the DOH approval letter, which he included with the most recent correspondence; the DEC has approved the waste water treatment plant to handle the additional flows, there is no need to modify the plant, it is an existing plant and is just going to receive more waste water. We discussed at the last meeting the status of the storm water permit and the SWPPP and CB provided the Board with confirmation that under the DEC program we have the necessary storm water permit. At this point, they still need the highway work permit and DOT wants that application once the project is approved and the work is ready to be scheduled. They have met with DOT and they have approved the proposed road configuration where several of the existing entrances are going to be closed off in favor of extending Manor Court all the way out. There were questions at the last meeting regarding sight distances and they put that in the submission, as well as traffic counts. T. Yasenach asks about the school bus pick-up and drop off. We had asked about that before, there has been discussion and documentation that questions were asked in 2014, and the letter that we received from Sterling said that the documentation was included but it is only documentation saying that you haven't talked yet. We don't have anything specific. M. Millspaugh states that he believes that what it says is that there was one meeting and an exchange of either phone calls or e-mail correspondence. The School District hasn't made a final determination but what the applicant is representing is that whatever works for them, Brookview Village would accommodate. The site plan approval that was issued in 2007 carried a condition that if the school district wants to move the pick-up and drop-off location, that it would be worked out with them. He states that they would be fine with a similar condition this time around. T. Yasenach states that when we give an approval with contingencies, it means that until we have that documentation that we asked for, it doesn't get signed. She does not understand why we don't have a letter from them saying that they are ok. D. Engel states that we don't have a letter from them because they are not under our control. This is an existing community and the school district is presently serving this community. This project is going to be developed, not in a day, not in a week, it is going to take time and to the school district, this may not be the highest priority matter that they are looking at. He thinks they are welcoming whatever changes the applicant is making in terms of egress and access to the property as he thinks everyone is, but at this point we don't have any commitment from them and it may be something that the best they can do is to tell us that they will have to let experience be our guide as the community gets developed and they see what pattern develops. It is really within the purview of the school district and their function to transport kids to ultimately decide what is the best approach for picking up and

November 24, 2015

dropping off the kids. T. Yasenchak states that she understands that but her question is why have we not been given anything, it doesn't seem like the applicant has contacted them since last year August. Knowing that we are going to be asking this question or having any kind of dialog, that it is not a deal breaker for her, she is just saying that it was a contingency and the Board would be open to taking action with a contingency, but also, as a Board member, she likes to see that when something is given as a contingency, then that is listened to and taken action on. D. Engel states that he does not think that the use of the word contingency is correct here. If what the Board wants from the applicant is to go back to the School District once more and get something out of them, they will do that and they will get it to the Board by the next meeting if at all possible. If what the Board is suggesting is that the Board's approval of this will be contingent upon the district giving the applicant something specific by a date certain, we don't exercise any control over the school district and they can only do as much as they can at any point in time. T. Yasenchak states that we understand that and have always understood that when an applicant has to deal with other agencies that sometimes the time schedule is not according to how we might like it. She would just like to see that when we ask an applicant for additional information not to address/answer the question by saying that we gave you a letter in August a year ago. She states that if the applicant said that they had sent a letter last week and do not know when they are going to respond, to her that shows that the applicant is going the extra mile to answer the Board's questions. T. Yasenchak states that the Board specifically asked at the last meeting for a different buffer based on what the ZBA had requested the Planning Board to look at. The Planning Board asked that the applicant revisit that and possibly give other options for adding to that buffer and she does not see that. M. Millspaugh states that he understood at the last meeting that that was one option but that it was prior to the Board going to see the site. He questions that after seeing the site does the Board feel that there is a need for a buffer. There is nothing to be seen through the trees except for maybe the top of a unit or two. He has been back thru the code and there is no requirement that an adjacent property can have no view into the next property. If that were a standard he does not know how you could develop anything in Town. D. Engel states that they understood that the Board was going out to see the property. T. Yasenchak states that the majority of the Board did. D. Engel states that their understanding is that this is a wooded, forested area, some of the trees are immature. He states that they can do additional plantings out there, they gave this Board a proposal for further planting in 2014 and it was their understanding that the Board would be going out there and rendering a judgement given the existing conditions and given what they had proposed in 2014 if something further was required. He indicates that the applicant will do twice as many trees if the Board requests. To M. Millspaugh's point, if the standard is that somehow the project has to be invisible to neighbors and couldn't possibly be seen, that is not a standard that is enunciated in the Code and that can't be a standard by which this kind of decision is rendered because who is to determine what the point of visibility is and what the point of viewing should be. They will do whatever the Board wants in terms of reasonably adding to the existing forested terrain. T. Yasenchak states that she felt that the Board was very distinct and almost aggressive at the last meeting in saying that the ZBA felt that we should find a solution to a strong buffer zone that includes mitigation for potential noise, light and other site pertinent concerns that would arise to neighboring properties from a cluster type development. D. Engel states that the ZBA did not get into the details of this visibility issue. They were aware that there was a visibility concern, but the Board didn't look at the proposal and render a judgement on it. It looked at the issue and said that they understood that the issue was visibility. He is not even aware that they knew that the proposal existed. He states that the Planning Board can look at that plan from 2014 and decide whether it is adequate and fully satisfies the terms on which the ZBA sent this back to the Planning Board or look at it and say that for some reason it is inadequate and want more trees. He respectfully urges that the Planning Board consider this thing within the realm of what exists out there right now and what they have already proposed. He states that the Planning Board has to exercise its discretion here reasonably and to that end, the standard can't be that they have to be absolutely invisible. B. Duffney states that he actually walked this area a couple of years ago looking at an adjoining property. The Mulder's house is as far to the east as they possibly could get it so it looks to him like they tried to get away from the road. The issue with the screening, there are some wetlands in there and it is forested but some of the younger stuff isn't high enough yet. Cornell Cooperative Extension could tell you the best evergreens to put in there for screening. The house was probably built without knowing that the mobile home park would be expanding at some point. Screening it there is a good thing. It is not going to be invisible but he believes that the rights of the adjoining property owners with something of this size should

November 24, 2015

be a little bit of a concern. He asks if the mobile homes along the edge are going to be allowed to have spot lights in their back yards for their dogs or kids to play, are they going to shine thru the woods. T. Yasenchak asks if the mobile home owners have the right to put in spot lights in the back. D. Engel states that they will own the units. He knows that they specifically addressed lighting previously with down cast light and limiting fugitive light generally from the development. He states that light goes both ways. M. Millspaugh states that there were provisions in the application for downcast lighting and he questions if any kind of lighting provisions can be put in the lot lease. M. Mancini states that they haven't but they could. B. Duffney reiterates that a few more evergreens would help. S. Weeks states that the applicant has put together a tremendous, comprehensive plan for this development and he congratulates them on that. On the other hand, he is very disappointed that with all the discussion we have had about additional buffering and screening, especially at the very last meeting, that the applicant has not been pro-active in coming to the Planning Board and saying that they have heard the concerns and here is what we will do. He states that it is almost like the applicant is asking the Board how many more trees to plant and that disappoints him because they are so well covered in every other issue. He is looking for the applicant to come to the Board with a proposal of how they can best do it, because they are well aware that it is an issue, it is an issue with the neighbors, it became an issue with this Board, it was an issue with the ZBA. T. Yasenchak states that S. Weeks was at the site visit and asks how he felt after being out there. She states that fortunately we were out there at a time when there were no leaves on the trees so it was actually the most optimal time to be on a site so that we could tell from the project site looking back at the home, as well as being at the home and looking at people standing on the project site, what the sight distances were. S. Weeks states that he thinks that the buffering needs to be extended the whole length instead of just part of the way. He indicates that the Board was standing up towards where the 'upper' ones are and it looks to him like there was quite a bit of visibility there. He would see no reason why they wouldn't extend it all the way along the line. D. Engel states that they will give the Board a plan that extends the buffer all the way, with coniferous trees appropriately spaced and hopefully they will resolve the issue, as soon as possible. They will contact the Board to be scheduled to come back. They sincerely believed that the Board was going to go out, take a look and would look at that in consideration of what had been previously provided as a screening plan. They were not looking to 'dis' anyone or overlook an issue. He reiterates that they did give the Board a screening plan in 2014 but if that is not sufficient, they will extend it out with coniferous trees. M. Millspaugh states that when the landscaping plan was submitted in 2014, it was shortly thereafter that it was decided that it had to go to the ZBA for the determination of an area variance so we never had specific comments back from the Planning Board or from C. Baker on the landscaping plan that was submitted. When he was here for the last meeting there was discussion but the net result was that the Board should go out and really look first hand. He states that they were not blowing the Board off and will provide whatever is needed to provide adequate buffering, but it is important to remember that the whole developable area has been shifted to the north to get away from that property line and some credit should be given for that in addition to the specific placement of trees that are shown on the 2014 plan. They will put them all the way up so that the last tree would be all the way to the east. T. Yasenchak asks if there is a way to do it so that they are not in a line and they are interspersed. M. Millspaugh states that he thinks that what was proposed came after several discussions with the Planning Board. Jeff Yorick, UMH, and Peter Kelleher, Sterling, were here and that resulted in the presentation that was submitted in 2014 and was submitted in response to a specific request from the Board. T. Yasenchak states that is correct and we did not have a chance to adequately review and discuss that. C. Baker asks that as far as planting in the conservation area and he had asked at the last meeting, did they get a chance to check their permit to see if that is something that they can do. D. Engel states that it is there understanding that they can do planting in there so long as it does not upset the whole purpose of having the easement there. They will not be doing any grading, etc. C. Baker states no berms. B. Duffney states that to the concern about kids putting up forts, etc., he did see them. He asks if there is any way to put up fencing adjoining the closest neighbors. DE states that that is not something that they had contemplated. He does not see that as a real concern of this Board. B. Duffney states that he is all for kids being in the woods, but sometimes fences make good neighbors. He asks if all these homes will be single-wides. M. Mancini states that he thinks they are all doubles. M. Millspaugh states that the orange boxes on the plans were drawn at double wide size. B. Duffney asks if the applicant is sure that the roadways are significant for fire trucks to get in and being able to get the homes in. M. Millspaugh states that the record included copies of communications from the fire

November 24, 2015

department and he knows the C. Baker has looked at the site plan and the layout of the roads. T. Yasenchak states that is why the road is proposed as wide as it is. B. Duffney asks how far the backyards are to the property line. M. Millspaugh states that the drawing shows from the back of the unit to the property line is 130' and then the first house is approximately 340'. C. Baker states that the required setback is 35' so the applicant is almost 100' in excess of what is required. B. Duffney asks if the sewage treatment plant is up to standards for the additional homes. D. Engel states that it is up to the standards and it is built to accommodate well beyond what they are proposing for expansion. That is documented. J. Lister states that it is permitted for 50,000 and they are going about 16,000 to 17,000 right now. It was built in 2001 and there have been no malfunctions. M. Millspaugh states that the prior site plan approval stipulated that the applicant would continue to provide the town with annual reports that are submitted to the DEC and C. Baker raised that at the last meeting. They would expect that that would be a condition of approval that they would continue to communicate. T. Siragusa states that he appreciates the applicant looking at the buffer again. To the Chair's point the Board did ask for that. He was glad to go out there and look, and by visiting the site he thinks they really need a buffer. He would like to see something that does the job, whether interweaving and properly spaced, something that would be significant. The neighbor's trees have nothing to do with this and it is all about the subject property and its screening. The distance to the neighbor's house is irrelevant because it is only about the subject property. D. Engel reiterates that they will give the Board something further. M. Gyarmathy states that he visited the site, would like to see a little more work on the buffer and asks the applicant to please take into consideration that it is not just what we see, it is what we hear. There will be a lot of families over there and adding more trees would help absorb some of the noise that will be generated. He was a little taken aback by the applicant informing the Board about what the Board did in 2007. He was not on the Board then and this is his first time looking at the project. For him whatever happened then was a different Board. He appreciates everything they have done and would like to see more done with the buffer. J. Streit states that at the site visit there was very little foliage out which is the best time to look at it because you can see it at its worst. He would suggest that more coniferous trees be planted all along the line. 350' is a lot of distance, but there are an awful lot of units in here with an awful lot of short people who will be running around, he thinks. He could see the property owner to the south's viewpoint living in a pristine environment, but that does not give him exclusive rights to cancel out anyone else's property developing rights. We have two letters from the houses to the south offering the suggestion that UMH remove the 5 units to the south, and he would like the Board to think about that as it would make it a whole lot easier consideration for him. He agrees with the majority of the Board that we need a whole bunch of trees there. D. Engel states that to the ZBA they provided an analysis and he will provide it to this Board as well, as to the economics of this. When they first came to the Board, the proposal for this expansion was over 120 units, then they went to 80 and thru a process of long and arduous meetings such as this with G. Dake leading the way, we ended up with the plan that you see here tonight. He states that all of that would be irrelevant except for the fact that has been repeatedly pointed out here – they acted upon that approval back then and he reiterates the steps they have taken at all sorts of costs. He states that that is not the Board's problem, but the major cost of this development is in the common areas not in the individual lot development. To the extent that they lose lots, what it means ultimately is that the rents go up for the remaining lots. It gets to the point where they take themselves out of the marketability and the economic value of the whole project gets lost, not in theory because you couldn't rent the lots but you would have to raise the rent to the level where there would be no market for this kind of housing. It is a practical problem and one that this kind of development has to deal with. They will plant trees, but to ask them to take out those 5 homes in order to accommodate someone's concern that they might see or hear something is crossing the line from what is a reasonable mitigation measure into something that is something other than that. That is a tremendous burden on the applicant. J. Bokus states that it could be a lot cheaper to put a fence in. He would like to see serious plantings and would like the applicant to consider a fence. D. Engel states that he does not know what they could do in the way of a fence because of the restrictions on that area. He will go back and look at the covenants. Even if it is consistent with the covenants, kids can climb over a fence, run around the fence – kids are kids. T. Yasenchak states that she has stated her concerns about the landscaping. She reviews the items in the code. Personally she is not asking for a fence because children will go around it. She suggests staggering the trees and she is not in favor of asking for a fence.

November 24, 2015

A public hearing is opened at 9:26 p.m. Mrs. DeChants states that she has lived in Brookview for 30 years and has never heard a question regarding the school buses. The buses pull in every morning. She does not understand what the issue is. T. Yasenchak states that the Board just wants to make sure that in reconfiguring the entryways and the additional homes that there would be an adequate safe place for the children to be picked up. Mary Scout, NYS Route 9N, states that they are the neighbor to the south of the Mulders. It has been long and arduous, but there are rules and from all those original units down to what it is now when it really could have been another way. She states that the applicant stated that there is only going to be a 15' yard and she thinks it says that a landscaped yard has to be 50'. On the treatment plant, from the notes that she has read from past Board meetings, it was 50,000 gallons per day and the proposed with the new 64 units was going to be 47,500 which kind of bumps it up close. They were told that they were all going to be double wides and all brand new. She is wondering if that is still the case. The back area where they are saying from the house to the property line, will they be allowed to have sheds back there that actually pushes closer to the property line. She states that on the micro pools there is fence and there is a rip rap basin and that is going to come right into Belle Creek, that is something they want looked at. She knows that the Board did SEQRA a while ago, but land changes. The DEC had told her that they did have a permit which was expired and that was only for the culvert. That if in fact the micro basins were not done, if the lots were not done, that they would need a new permit and with a new permit do you get a new survey because in 8 years things have changed in that land. She reads a letter into the record from her husband J. Bulmer, which the Board has copies of. M. Scout states that in the Zoning Code it states that the lots are supposed to be 100' in width and she believes that there are 10 lots that do not have the 100'. Paul Bulmer, commercial real estate broker and here representing the Mulders, reads H. Mulder's letter at this time. P. Bulmer states that he thinks it is really important and the ZBA failed to recognize when they looked at this plan, those 10 units. He states that the Zoning Code says that a lot should be 10,500 square feet but it also states that there is a minimum width requirement of 100'. He does agree with the majority of the plan with the lots running parallel to the road. They either need to turn the lots or they have to go back and get a variance for those. The variance that they were granted was for up to 64 units and did not address the width, which he thinks still needs to be addressed. He believes this is still in violation of the code. The buffer should not be provided by H. Mulder and his trees. Regarding the economics, when this was before the ZBA they were against this becoming an economic argument, they were not going for a use variance. He does not agree that the economics should have been as major a factor as it was or even a factor at all in granting that variance. He thinks that is a key part here because when the Planning Board evaluates whether or not those 5 homes should be removed and the others turned, which may actually decrease further numbers of the homes, the economics should not be part of what is being weighed here. The Planning Board's charge is to make this an appropriate development not only for the applicant but the neighbors. One thing that the applicant could have done was extend the special use permit which they did not do and probably would have been given. Nicholas Frirsz, Pine Robin Road, thanks the Board for their public service. Regarding the buffer that cannot be covered by conifer trees and that is the impact of the home prices in the area. There are 3 houses in their neighborhood that have basically gone empty for over a year because they see the writing on the wall that property values are going to fall. He thinks that the variance board did this town a great disservice by granting the applicant this particular variance and he is very concerned for this town because he has seen this before in another small town. His experience in the other town was basically the same thing – over development and not well thought out development, and people trying to skirt the laws that were in place. Board members are guardians of the Town. This is going to be a big problem for Greenfield if we let this continue on. He is surprised it got this far. He is not against all development, it is their property and they should be able to do what is within the law. It has been pushed passed its limits for that area and this beautiful little township of Greenfield. He thinks it is going to have an environmental impact, an economic impact because it is money out of the tax payer's pockets. If property values go down, it is coming out of our pockets. Tom Cronin, Canyon Crossing, states that he has lived here for 20 years and the project wasn't built in 2007 so why are they following zoning laws from that time? If it is to be built in the future, it should follow current zoning laws. Shame on the ZBA for doing this to us, for doing it to the Planning Board. He thanks the Planning Board for their time and being a public servant, but please do the right thing for the home owners. He states that in the development they have at least 3 or 4 homes that have been for sale and

November 24, 2015

the price keeps getting reduced. People see the writing on the wall with what is going on. There being no further public comments, this public hearing is adjourned at 9:47 as there is additional information that is expected and there are no further public comments at this time.

B. Duffney states that the applicant had stated that from the backyard to the property line it was like 135'. M. Millspaugh states that from the property line to the corner of the nearest unit was 130'. T. Yasenchak states that the zoning code requirements are 50' for a side setback and when they said 15' it was for their development purposes only. So when they lease their lot, the person leasing it will only have a 15' backyard but then there is another 115' to the actual property line. B. Duffney states that C. Baker had stated that the rear setback is 35'. C. Baker states that he believes it is. B. Duffney states that then the applicant is giving up 125'. He asks how far apart the homes are and that some double wides are up to 70'. M. Millspaugh states that the buildings appear to be about 40 to 45' apart and that they are drawn at 70'. B. Duffney asks C. Baker what is the distance required between the units. C. Baker states that is in the NYS Building Code. B. Duffney states that in regard to the request from J. Bulmer regarding no excavation from April 1 to November 1 to take place from Fridays at 5 p.m. to Mondays at 9 a.m., there is a short window in the summer for construction. T. Yasenchak states that the Town Code states 6 a.m. to 9 p.m. and it does not limit the days. B. Duffney states that with 15' backyards he questions the sheds. M. Mancini states that it would have to be within the site. S. Weeks questions the flow to the treatment plant being 47,000. C. Baker states that is the estimate with the expansion and they are permitted to 50,000. T. Yasenchak asks how the applicant would address the 'creep' of sheds in their lease. J. Lister states that they have regulations and that UMH will be the ones setting the homes and the sheds. He states that this could be years down the road. They might start out with 5 or 10 homes and they may not sell, but if they do they might go to 10 more. This is not going to happen in one year. M. Millspaugh states that J. Lister's point is well taken, they may just do the initial loop and see how the market is and work their way around. They are going to put the road work and the utility work out to bid. If they are good prices there may be an advantage to building out the utilities to get that investment behind them or they may only do one part for now. The units can start populating from the one end. T. Yasenchak states that we look at it as an impact standard as if everything was built out, but understand that they may only build half of it. She asks if when they start putting the homes on the lots, will they start in a certain area or will they allow people to pick their lots. J. Lister states that UMH will be putting the homes on and they will all be new homes. T. Yasenchak states that whether a home is 4000 square feet or whether it is 900 square feet it is still a home and dependent on one's own economics it is still a home and if they live here they are still part of our community. That is important for diversity in our community so that we don't just end up with large homes. She designs homes for a living and loves to do 4000 square foot homes, but everyone is a member of our community. She does not feel that new homes of this type make our community any less or impact it from that perspective. She welcomes anyone into Greenfield no matter the size home they live in. People who do lease these lots, their lease fees actually pay taxes so they are still tax payers in a manner to our community and they should be respected as much as neighbors who we look to protect their investment as well. D. Engel states that they will reach out and see what they can come up with in terms of the buffer. He suggests they be on the December 29th agenda. J. Lister states that he met with the school district and knows what roads they want to use. M. Millspaugh states that the plate submitted on July 24, 2014 needs to be updated based on tonight's discussion. He points out that trees were added to that throughout the park. They will stagger within the buffer and with the species.

Meeting adjourned 10:05 p.m., all members in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Rosamaria Rowland
Secretary