

OGDEN PLANNING BOARD

April 8, 2010

Members Present

Gary Parker
Mary Lou Hetzke
Tom Coburn
Linda DelRegno
Tony Halaris
Jim Marshall

Members Absent

Marc Robinson

Others Present

Jack Crooks, Building Inspector
Dave Widger, Highway
John Freel, Town Engineer
Harry Ewell, Conservation Board
Eric Schaaf

I. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

II. PUBLIC HEARING- None

III. OLD BUSINESS- None

IV. CONCEPT

2110 Union Street- application of Crosstown Construction, 2060 Fairport Nine Mile Point Road, Suite 310, Penfield, NY 14526, for conceptual site plan approval to construct a 8,250 sq. ft. two-story office building on an existing 1.03-acre lot. This property is located on the east side of Union Street, approximately 200' south of Clearview Drive. This parcel is currently zoned R-1 Single Family Residential and is proposing by Town Board Resolution, rezoning of the parcel to NC- Neighborhood Commercial. The project will be serviced by public water and sewer. The project will be titled **2110 Union Street.**

Tax Acct# 087.01-1-25

Mr. Neufeld: My name is Rudy Neufeld. I represent Crosstown Construction. I would like to thank the Board for their time this evening; we appreciate that very much. Seeing that this is the only item on the agenda, I will keep my comments brief and everyone can go home early tonight. We are here for concept review. I will give you just a tiny bit of history on the property. Crosstown has owned it for 10 or 12 years. Originally a partner that I had at one time, one of the Credit Unions that wanted to come in town never

panned out, something happened. So we have had the property for quite a while. Probably about a year in a half or two ago, I started some preliminary discussions and spoke with Jack a little bit. Of course at that time, your project to the south of us was in concept, which now I understand has been rezoned. The discussion there was before we did anything, to wait for that project to be rezoned. So we knew what was going on with that, and then it was directed that we should come in with an application. So we did that and about 3 or 4 months ago, we had a very pleasant meeting with the Supervisor and some Town staff. At that discussion, we basically showed them what we were going to do. I will only give you this history in case it comes up; we were asked at that point because we need a detention facility, to talk to our neighbors to the north, which is the school district about potentially combining storm water management with theirs, and ours, because that is kind of a wet area. Our engineers looked into that, we had a nice meeting with Mike Crumb and some of his folks. The concept was well received, but due to technical issues, they just did not think it could be done legally. So although they liked some of the concepts and provisions it might make, they did not opt to go for it. At least we did attempt it, because we told the Supervisor we would. So after we got that information, we were then asked to make a rezoning application, which would be what we are here for this evening. As you know it is going to be zoned to Neighborhood Commercial, which I believe is what the property to the south of us has been zoned; some commercial property, I understand some neighborhood patio homes, and some senior facilities. I think it is going to be a very successful project, and we are happy to be just north of that. So that is what we are requesting. The application will require a variance. We wanted to bring this up to the Board early on. In our discussion with staff and the Supervisor, we wanted to try and create a nice sense of arrival as you are coming from the north into the Town. So we would like to propose as your map shows, that our detention facility, that has to be there and is not optional, could be done in many different formats. This is a particular one that we have in one of our developments in Penfield. As you can see, it has to have some natural characteristics, but we also have a lot of Dolomite boulders. We have cleaned up the edges, put a fountain in it, and it had a light. It is going to be a beautiful two-story brick building. We prefer that be the visual that neighbors and passerbys see, as opposed to a parking lot. So, that would require this Board if they agree, to give a positive recommendation to the Zoning Board. We need one variance for a 60' setback, or 50' I believe, instead of 160'. Again, I know that this is preliminary but we wanted you to know why we made those decisions. Also, one other thing we will be asking for as details go on is; 9' parking spaces instead of 10'. I do not claim to be an expert; we have Eric here this evening. But I guess that is a size that has been granted in a number of municipalities, maybe in yours, I am not sure. They said we should bring it up to the Board. That is kind of the overview, maybe one other thing I will mention. Our company will be owning this building, medical office use, doctor, and dentist, that kind of thing. It will be an all brick building. We happen to be masons by trade, so we are a little bit partial to brick. It will be a very attractive building. Our company will own and maintain it. It is not going to be something that will not be in good maintenance repair. I know you do not know much about our company. We would be happy to provide a list of projects that we have completed and maintained, so that you can get a little idea of what kind of work we do. So I guess that is the overview. I would

be happy to answer any questions that might pertain to me, or we have Eric here for technical things.

Mr. Parker: Thank you for your input. We will start off with any comments that we have by the various Board members, and then come back to you with questions. Are there any comments on this project from the Conservation Board?

Conservation Board- Harry Ewell

Yes, thank you Mr. Chairman. We just wanted to point out that the area of the proposed building is wet a good portion of the year as it is now. The proposed 50' setback forces the detention pond to be too close to Union Street in our opinion. Also, we had a concern...where is 48% green space? I take it the dark green all around the perimeter is all part of this parcel?

Mr. Schaaf: I am Eric Schaaf with Marathon Engineering. We are the civil and site engineering development firm. The parcel is approximately 1.03 acres, which is represented in the outline here. Green space can be calculated a number of different ways. An easy way to do it is to just simply add up the impervious; parking lot plus building, then subtract that from the total, and the rest is more or less green space. So it is an entire calculation.

Mr. Ewell: In our original concept, it was not evident that anything other than where the light green border is, was part of the project, and the dark green was not.

Mr. Neufeld: I believe the gentleman on the Board is correct.

Mr. Schaaf: Yes you are. As I am looking at it, here is the property line. Not meant to differentiate between dark or light green. But within the boundary areas of the property line, again we use that calculation. That is where the green space comes in within that.

Mr. Ewell: So there will be no building in the dark green of course.

Mr. Schaaf: No.

Mr. Neufeld: I do not think I own the dark green.

Mr. Widger: Harry just so you know, I had the same question earlier today. I measured it all up and did it on the calculator. It is about 24,000 square feet of coverage, and there are 40,000 square feet in the lot. It may be a little less than 48 but it is over 30, which is the requirement.

Mr. Neufeld: I think the numbers are fairly accurate, but the depiction is not all of my property.

Mr. Schaaf: Again, we are simply trying to show how it will blend in with the current surrounding property. Again, Mr. Neufeld does not own there, so we cannot control it.

But this is currently shown as woods. So we wanted to show how they were blending in. There is a line that you may be able to see. I do not know how well it reproduced.
(*Portion of tape inaudible.*)

Mr. Ewell: Now there is a wood line, you are definitely taking out the woods.

Mr. Schaaf: Within our property line, this will not be developed.

Mr. Neufeld: We are going to try in relation to that; we do not know until we get exact details on the property. But, any of my borderline trees that are decent trees, will be kept. If it means a little retaining wall, or any conceivable way to keep a green perimeter, we are all in favor of that. That is important to us.

Mr. Schaaf: This is not in design this is a conceptual review. We have received comments from the various Town Engineers and the Highway Department, and we appreciate those comments, and will certainly incorporate them into preliminary design. I do not anticipate there being any technical issues from those comments. I am not prepared to address them because again, we have done a concept. We want to make sure that we get the Board's buy in, before we spend more of Mr. Neufeld's money.

Mr. Ewell: Thank you. Our only other comment is that we have no SEQR determination at this time. We would like some more information.

Mr. Parker: Thank you. Mr. Freel do you have any comments?

Engineering Comments – John Freel

Yes. I submitted a letter to the Planning Board dated April 6th. The majority of the comments that I have are really for the Engineer for when he starts to prepare preliminary plans. In other words, to incorporate these things so that he is not doing it twice. A couple major concerns that I had are; that there is a lot of fill required to do the site grading. Just using the existing and the proposed elevations of the parking lot and also the existing ground shots that exists, it looks like you are going to have about 2-3 feet of fill on the south side of the parking lot and building, and about 5 feet on the north side. That does not include any topsoil that is going to be removed, because you are going to have to get rid of the topsoil to put in the parking lot and the buildings. So there may be a lot more fill required. I hope that you have a lot of fill somewhere.

Mr. Neufeld: Well in fact, you know the boys from Bob Murphy from Macedon Excavating. I do not know if the timing is going to work, but they have 15,000 yards of roadblock gravel. Getting fill is not an issue really at any time. Sometimes it is just a waiting game. We understand that and we knew when we bought it, we will manage and give you a fill.

Mr. Freel: This site is low, and just to bring it up to the road elevation, the road is about 479, immediately on site is about 476. So there is 3' of fill right there just to get it up to

the road elevation. The other real concern is that the Town requires that the grading be about 1 on 5. Just checking a couple of elevations there, they are about 1 on 2.5. They are very steep. So the site engineer is going to have to kind of work his magic to get this to work. I also have John Gauthier's comments. John reviewed it and found out that there is a considerable amount of federal wetlands on the site. He provided a map, and I think he submitted it to the Planning Board, so everyone should have a copy of that. So, that you are going to have to deal with. The other thing is, that swale that runs along the north side of the school property, takes a considerable amount of upland drainage. It is going to have a flood plane associated with it. So you are going to have to determine what the flood plane elevation is. What you have to be careful of is if the flood plane encroaches onto the site and we are putting a lot of fill, what you are going to be doing is pushing that flood plane over onto the school property. You are also going to have to deal with that too when you get into your preliminary plan. That is all we have.

Mr. Parker: Thank you John. Mr. Widger are there any comments from the Highway Department?

Highway Department – Dave Widger

As far as the concept itself for rezoning, I agree that it would be a good spot for a nearby commercial. I would hate to see a residence there, so I think it is poor for that in an R-1 District. As far as the other technical things, we will need to work out. Some of it is culverts, the alignment and how the sanitary sewer is directed. I will most likely be looking for a 90 degree bore underneath...I doubt the State will let you bore on a diagonal like that. They are usually very particular with what they allow. Also, when you hit Clearview Drive, I want you to be over along the right-of-way line. Because unless you are going to be 7-8 feet down, sign installation and stuff in there, basically you are showing a 20' road which is actually up to 25' with gutters and all. So you are basically right under the edge of the gutter. So if you move it to the edge of the right-of way line and go down and then 90 degrees over into the sanitary manhole. You obviously are going to have to have pavement restoration, permits and all of that, as well as if you are coming in high on the manhole and how you are going to drop it down to the bottom because it is an end manhole, and it does not go any further than that. All of those details are going to need to be on the plan. Other than that, it is nothing that probably cannot be worked out. The worst part of it would be working out this federal wetland issue, which is going to be your biggest hurdle if I am not mistaken. That is all I have Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Parker: Mr. Neufeld: Do you have any comments that would give us an indication of what direction you might take to handle the wetland issue.

Mr. Neufeld: I do not know if I have enough details yet. I know that there are several ways to mitigate it. I do not have the answers yet, so do not hold me to this, and stop me Eric if I am going to far. If there is a way to mitigate around it, if there is a way that our storm water management ends up in the federal wetland and that is acceptable, if we have to mitigate by buying a quarter of an acre somewhere else and giving it to the federal wetland. I do not know what the right approach will be, but we are certainly aware of it,

and however we have to mitigate it we are prepared to do so. Whatever the right approach is that these gentleman give us, that is the way that we will go.

Mr. Parker: Ok, thank you.

Mr. Schaaf: Again, Mr. Neufeld has not yet given the authorization, but we are aware of the presence of the federal wetland. We have had preliminary contact with environment resources that have done a lot of wetland mediation for us on other sites. He came back and took a very preliminary look and said yes, it does appear there may be some. His estimate is not as high. Again, the study has not been done; we have given that price to Mr. Neufeld. Again, we do not want to spend the money until we are given some sense that there might be something at the end of the road. So we are aware of it, and we will be prepared to address that along with the other concerns. You are right; it is not the easiest design. But, it is something that we think can be overcome.

Mr. Parker: Thank you. Mr. Widger I am interested in the comment regarding the fact that the pond may be too close to the highway. Is there any regulation that you are aware of that would restrict that?

Mr. Widger: Not that I am aware of. What most likely you are going to have in here anyways, due to the fact that there is no final grading on here at all, it is just the existing grading, there will probably be a high point between the pond and your outfalls. You are going to have a big ditch in the front. There is a ditch now and then it drops off. That ditch is going to have to be maintained to carry the drainage down along. So probably there is going to be a ditch, then that high bank, and then a pond. So I think it is going to be backing up, because you are not going to have this flowing level into the State right-of-way because they will not let you, and they do not want it that way either. So you are going to have a ditch, then a berm, and then a pond. So I think for anyone to slide off the road, I do not think it would be an issue.

Mr. Parker: It is not a safety issue.

Mr. Widger: No I do not think they would get through the 4' deep ditch first.

Mr. Freel: It is probably 30 or 40' off the edge of the pavement. It is just kind of deceptive on the plans.

Mr. Widger: Yes, we have them around Town, and like John was saying, it is probably almost 40' from the edge of pavement to where the water edge would be anyways. So it is quite a ways.

Mr. Freel: If it did not work, you could probably take a little bit of that pond and wrap it around the north side of the building. You might lose your nice aesthetic pond.

Mr. Neufeld: We could still create a nice...

Mr. Freel: For storm water management if you had to and that was a real issue, you could slide it back and kind of make it L shaped, or you could even come probably a little more to the southeast too. It will fit in there.

Mr. Parker: Therefore making the overall size of the pond more narrow on the roadside if you went to the north if necessary.

Mr. Freel: I do not think it is going to be an issue. There is one to the north at the church up the road that has a pond fairly close to the road too. I cannot think of the name of the church.

Mr. Widger: One thing we have done in the past is making sure that there is a berm in between there. If you go down Shepard Road, over by the industrial park, actually there is no ditch between the berm.

Mr. Freel: But that works better than what was there.

Mr. Widger: Sometimes they are better. I do not think there is a concern, because there is no cross street coming in. So if anyone is sliding off, they are usually doing it at an angle, not at 90 degrees. So it would be tough to get to I would think. I do not have a lot of concern for it.

Mr. Parker: Are there any comments from the Board?

Mrs. Hetzke: Do you have clients that are interested in this?

Mr. Neufeld: Nothing contracted yet at this point. We have had a number of inquiries, but we really cannot begin to say that we have something until we are past the concept stage. We did have an offer to purchase the entire property for quite a good number, but it was from Family Dollar, and we were not interested in having them as a tenant on the property. I do not think that is the right location for them, and I would not want my name with that. So the property could have been sold a year ago, but that was not right for us. We hope to have quite a nice property here that we can be proud of.

Mrs. Hetzke: I think you should put in a nice fountain full of lights.

Mr. Neufeld: We are planning on it. Did you see the picture? Colored lights I am not fond of. The fountain in the picture is in front of one of our developments in Penfield and yes that is exactly what we plan to do.

Mr. Coburn: Rudy I am a little concerned about the variance for setback. The Code calls for 160'. I guess that is because they want the parking lot in the front and the building behind and you have kind of switched that.

Mr. Neufeld: We have reversed it. It certainly can be done the other way. Then it makes more sense probably to not try to squeeze pond, parking, public walking and then the

building. So then we probably have the parking lot in the front, with whatever lighting is required, the building, and then the pond would be in the back. So it certainly can be done, but we think this is a much more attractive approach. But we are open to suggestions from this Board.

Mr. Coburn: Jack do you have any comments on that?

Mr. Crooks: Well I think that argument has been both ways Tom. I have heard the arguments and the Comprehensive Plan was one of their things. They did not want any parking in the front; they wanted the building in the front and parking in the back, as it is done here. That was done before the Comprehensive Plan. The Code clearly talks about having the parking in front, or forces it in the front and the building is in the rear. People want to look at buildings. I think that is the thought now, and would prefer the cars and the rest of that stuff be in the back portion of the construction. I cannot speak for the Zoning Board, but I would think that they would look favorably on this type of design. That seems to be more customarily what is going on now.

Mr. Coburn: Has this variance come up before?

Mr. Crooks: Yes, Advantech on Buffalo Road. What does David have there?

Mr. Widger: The property immediately south of this.

Mr. Crooks: Yes, where they are working on the commercial and medical buildings there. They have made some changes.

Mr. Widger: It is going to be the same thing, pond in the front and the parking in the back. So it will actually fit with what has already received concept approval of what is going to be right next door.

Mr. Coburn: So we are not really setting a precedent.

Mr. Crooks: No sir.

Mr. Parker: What is the setback of the senior housing just north of there? That looks to be less than 160' just eyeballing it.

Mr. Crooks: Well the senior housing portion is to the rear, or to the east to that development. Or are you talking about the 2050 Union Street, the Gary Inzana project?

Mr. Widger: Yes.

Mr. Crooks: Yes that is certainly less than 160'. But that is different zoning again, that was seasonal, so the setback requirements are different.

Mr. Parker: Ok.

Mrs. Hetzke: Well aesthetically this looks much better than having parking in front, let's face it.

Mr. Crooks: At Barefoot Landing, that has the building set back considerably from the street, with the exception of the Krony's side, and so you are looking at mostly parking lot and cars rather than the unique structure of the building. I think the thinking has changed considerably.

Mrs. DelRegno: I like it. I think it looks better with the building. I just wanted to say that I like it.

Mr. Crooks: One of the things that I understand from the Town Board, and I did not hear all of the comments, but they want to make sure that these drainage issues, wetlands, and all of that stuff can be handled prior to them getting into the rezoning. This Board may not be aware of it, but very recently in a rezoning application, there was a considerable amount of push back on the SEQR process by a resident. They do not really want to get slapped with that again, it gets very uncomfortable for them. They do not handle SEQR all of the time like we do, so it is not an easy situation for them. So again, I think as we march forward with this, with all due respect to the developer and his engineer, we want to give the Town Board confidence that we have backup to these issues that can be mitigated, be that; wetlands, floodplains, or anything else that we have to work with.

Mr. Neufeld: So we would want to address that before we even went to the Zoning Board in your thoughts? Or at least have a written game plan with some ok from the powers to be?

Mr. Freel: I have a lot of concerns with the wetland. I would like to see how much is covering the site and what can be done to mitigate it. The flood plane too, because if there is a significant amount of water coming down there, we do not need to make things worse over on the school property. I think that you have to work those things out.

Mr. Neufeld: Understood.

Mr. Coburn: It sounds like the first thing.

Mr. Crooks: And whether we go to the Zoning Board for those couple issues, parallel in the process I think the big issue for you Rudy is the rezoning. With this parcel and some of the difficulties with it, we need to make sure that we are in good shape before this Board refers a letter of recommendation to the Town Board for the rezoning. If you have got it rezoned and you have got the backup of this Board, that they believe they can work with the bricks and the sticks, I think the Zoning Board will give that a great deal of weight in making their determination for the required variances.

Mr. Neufeld: So once we have our respectable answers that we are all happy with from our side and from the technical side, then we at least are hearing that this Board will look favorably to give the Town Board a recommendation for the rezoning.

Mr. Crooks: Yes.

Mr. Neufeld: I know that we cannot speak for that Board, but that is all we needed tonight.

Mr. Parker: Right, assuming that...

Mr. Coburn: One more question. How many parking places would you have if you had to go 10' wide?

Mr. Neufeld: I think you have that answer Eric.

Mr. Schaaf: We did not calculate. Again for the concept, we looked at it and quickly determined that 9' would allow us to get to the 42'. We did the calculation on what was required. So it is going to be less than 42. Off the top of my head, we are going to lose 4 or 5; we did not do a calculation. Again, this was concept and we tried to do something that was nice, but at the same time not go overboard.

Mr. Coburn: Jack has the 9' instead of 10' come up before?

Mr. Crooks: Not recently. But again, and I can refer to Dave on this, I think that in general we would rather see them lose 10% of their parking places and still retain the 10' required spaces that our Code calls for. For medical buildings like this, I think our Code suggests one parking space for every 50 square feet of building area.

Mr. Schaaf: I believe that was it. Five spaces for every thousand gross square feet. So we have got 8,250, so that turned into 42. Each Town is different. In some Towns quite honestly, we have received more push back on the number than the size. Today's cars are being designed a little smaller than the 10' that was put in place a few years ago. The number of staff positions...again, different Towns calculate usage; some for staff, some for visitors or people coming in and out. The staff people by in large, will be in and out of this place twice a day if they leave for lunch. If they do not leave for lunch, they are going to pull in once and then pull out. As opposed to a retail place where you are going to get the constant turnover with people coming in and coming out. That is why we went with the slightly smaller parking spaces, to keep the number. But if it is the Board's preference that we go to 10' and reduce it by a half dozen spaces, we are willing to work with that.

Mr. Crooks: This Board has a right to adjust the number of required parking spaces in the plan if you can find justifications from the developer as to what the case may be. So we do have some flexibility there.

Mr. Neufeld: Mr. Crooks that means that we do not need a variance, that would be a Planning Board determination?

Mr. Crooks: I believe that the Code allows for that. But as Dave will tell you, there is also in some of the new phase II or phase III storm water management regulations, they are trying to curtail some of these massive parking lots and reduce the number of required spaces, to allow for less impervious surfaces greater natural recharge.

Mr. Widger: That is true. It is something that has actually come down with the new regulations that are coming out this fall in September. They are looking to downsize parking spots. I said something to Jack about it, because I do notice on a lot of the parking lots with our regulation that there seems to be a lot of excess spaces in a lot of what we require. I have seen it around Town in some of the parking lots. It just seems that it is not all used. Obviously you have to have some for storage space. You are going to lose a couple spots anyways because you have no dumpster enclosure in here, so you have to put one of them someplace.

Mr. Neufeld: I thought we had it in the corner, unless I forgot to write it in.

Mr. Widger: No there is nothing there, so you would lose a couple spaces for putting a dumpster enclosure in.

Mr. Neufeld: I would like to put it way in this back corner, it is wooded with no visuals, I would like to fence it in. I cannot stand pulling into a parking lot and seeing a dumpster with junk next to it, I want that whole thing enclosed.

Mr. Widger: My point I am trying to say is, the big push is get less impervious surface, and making your parking spaces smaller is one of the things that is suggested in lieu of taking less spaces, is make the spaces smaller. Make them 9x18 rather than...

Mrs. Hetzke: Yes but the people who have SUV's and let's say it was a pediatricians office and you have this woman who is trying to get her baby in the car seat and everything else, you need some space.

Mr. Widger: Well, actually most of your SUV's these days are actually smaller too. If you start looking at them, most of them other than the big Lincoln Navigators, other than that there are only a few left that are the size of pickup trucks. Maybe you can do a mixture. Maybe the one row in the back or on the side can be 10 footers or whatever, just for the wider vehicles. I am just trying to tell you what the big push is, which is trying to get rid of the impervious surface is what they are trying to do.

Mr. Parker: Plus they are not going to make the Hummer anymore.

Mrs. Hezke: Well you could make one side and say just for compact cars.

Mr. Neufeld: Yes, like they do in parking garages.

Mr. Widger: But he is absolutely right. When you look at some of the cars that are on the road now a days, and you look at the ones that they are selling, they are definitely getting smaller.

Mr. Schaaf: We are very reasonable. We can work with you in terms of the number of parking spaces. If you think 42 for this building is too high and you want us to build fewer, we can work with that.

Mr. Freel: Do you have a sense of what you need for parking spaces?

Mr. Neufeld: I think 42 is a good number. If I am going to the dentist or the doctor and there are no parking spaces, and I do not know if that is excessive, I am not an expert on that. But if 42 is a good number, or 41, or 40...

Mr. Freel: I think that would be a good starting point, if you kind of knew what you needed, then you could argue one way or the other.

Mrs. Hetzke: You almost have to know what is going in there.

Mr. Neufeld: That is the problem.

Mr. Widger: It depends on what is in there.

Mr. Coburn: Does anyone on the Board know if this is part of the Heritage corridor?

Mr. Crooks: It is not. The only Heritage corridor's are south of Route 31.

Mr. Widger: We still want it to look nice.

Mr. Coburn: That was the next questions, architecturally how is it going to look?

Mr. Neufled: We do not have architectural plans. It is a two-story building. It will have a gabled roof; it will not be a flat contemporary look. It will look basically like a; I do not want to say a large house, because we want it to have a commercial feel. But it will be like a large brick residence with aluminum windows and will be maintenance free. I do not have a concept yet. I certainly will at the next stage. It is more of a squareish building; it will have a one-story entrance roof. It will be a two-story brick building.

Mr. Coburn: We would want this probably to blend as best as possible with the construction that is going on to the south.

Mr. Neufeld: I do not know what the guys south of me are doing yet, but we can certainly look at that. The next time we are before you ladies and gentleman, we will have a very nice rendering of what we would like this building to feel like with the

rendering of the pond, the parking lot, and the whole nine yards, so you can really know what we are thinking.

Mr. Parker: Are there any other comments?

Mr. Halaris: It looks like a good idea.

Mr. Neufeld: Yes, we think it is the right thing. We understand what to do Eric?

Mr. Schaaf: Yes. If I may, I would just like some clarification. You were saying that this Board might require more detail in order to give a recommendation to the Town Board regarding the zoning. Are you asking us simply to address some of the key issues? Or are you asking us to come in for a full preliminary? I am not sure that it would be much of a difference. Because in order to address those, I am probably going to have to go through and do, almost all of the design work.

Mr. Freel: If you are asking me, I think you have to deal with the issue of the wetlands and the floodplain. The other stuff can all be worked out. If you can get those things worked out without doing any more plans, I would try and go that route.

Mr. Schaaf: For wetlands, certainly. For the floodplain, we can do some gross calculations that would probably be close, and then we can begin once we get into the final design.

Mr. Freel: Yes. I want to see the extent of the flooding.

Mr. Schaaf: Ok. What would the format be that you would like to see us come back? concept review part II only with some additional paperwork? Would you like us to simply submit the technical reports to Mr. Freel, whatever the Boards pleasure?

Mr. Crooks: I think a revised concept including some of the questions that have been presented by the Board and comments from the Town Engineer and Highway Superintendent. Town Engineers, I will include Mr. Gauthier. Some color renderings...I will go back to what they were saying earlier. The new Unity Health building that is entered off of Big Ridge Road, is going to be probably one of the anchor buildings for the style that the rest of that piece will be developed.

Mr. Neufeld: I would love to see that too.

Mr. Crooks: It is there for your viewing.

Mr. Neufeld: Is it here in the Town.

Mr. Crooks: Yes, right off of Big Ridge Road about a quarter of a mile east of Union Street on the north side.

Mr. Neufeld: I think we are clear. Those three pieces can be addressed at a concept too.

Mr. Schaaf: Would we still need the five-week advanced notice for re-concept in order to get on your agenda?

Mr. Crooks: About two and a half weeks. We do meet twice a month, which gives you...

Mr. Schaaf: No that is fine. Is that it?

Mr. Parker: I believe so.

Mr. Schaaf: Thank you gentleman very much.

Mr. Neufeld: We appreciate your time.

V. EXPIRATIONS -None

VI. MAPS FOR SIGNING

VII. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

RESOLUTION #1

Approval of the Planning Board meeting minutes of **March 25, 2010** as presented.

Introduced by Mr. Coburn

Seconded by Mrs. Hetzke

MAY IT BE RESOLVED that the minutes of the Planning Board meeting of **March 25, 2010**, stand approved after corrections are made.

Vote of the Board

Ayes: Halaris, DelRegno, Hetzke, Coburn, Marshall, Parker

Nays: None

Absent: Robinson

VIII. WORK SESSION

IX. ADJOURNMENT

Introduced by Mrs. Hetzke

Seconded by Mr. Halaris

MAY IT BE RESOLVED that the Planning Board meeting of April 8, 2010 was adjourned at 7:52pm.

Vote of the Board

Ayes: Halaris, DelRegno, Hetzke, Coburn, Marshall, Parker
Nays: None
Absent: Robinson

Respectfully submitted,

Jack Crooks, Secretary