

# Town of Cazenovia Planning Board

## Meeting Minutes

February 6, 2020

Members Present: Robert Ridler, Chairman; Anne Ferguson; Jerry Munger; Dale Bowers; Bryan Wendel; Gerald Rasmussen, Alternate Member

Members Absent: Hugh Roszel; Thomas Clarke; Jon Vanderhoef, Alternate Member

Others Present: John Langey; John Dunkle; Don Ferlow; Mark Gravelding; Carol Gravelding; Matthew Vredenburgh; Don Ballway; Kenneth Clay Coleman; Thomas Eisenhut; Jim Hagan; Norval Pratt; Kathleen Pratt; Michael Silberberg; Thomas Pratt; Kyle Reger; Anne Redfern; Graham Egerton

-----

R. Ridler called the meeting to order at 7:30 P.M.

-----

Motion by B. Wendell, seconded by A. Ferguson, to approve the January 2, 2020 meeting minutes was carried unanimously.

-----

The next regularly scheduled meeting will be Thursday, March 5, 2020.

The next deadline day will be Wednesday, February 19, 2020.

The next regularly scheduled work session will be Thursday, February 27, 2020.

**LAND DISTURBANCE/SITE PLAN REVIEW/SUBDIVISION**

*Crawford, Albert & Michelle – Site Plan Review –5039 East Lake Road, Cazenovia  
File # 18-1192 (Robert Ridler)*

No one was present to represent the file.

R. Ridler said there is nothing new in the file.

Motion by A. Ferguson, seconded by B. Wendell, to continue the file was carried unanimously.

-----

*Gravelding, Mark & Carol – Site Plan Review – 5092 Lakewood Way, Cazenovia  
File # 19-1256 (Jerry Munger)*

Mark Gravelding was present to represent the file.

J. Munger said it was noted that the Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) needed to be completed.

J. Langey said the Full EAF was technically required for the file even though this was not a very sensitive archaeological or historically sensitive property itself. He said the Board has completed the mandatory 30-day waiting period with Part I of the FEAF having been completed. He then walked the Board through Part 2 of the FEAF, finding all answers to the 18 impacts listed to be either “no, or small impact may occur.” He said he took the liberty of completing Part 3 of the FEAF in advance which he also submitted to the file.

Motion by J. Munger, seconded by B. Wendell, to affirm the matter as a Type I Action and to make a Negative Declaration, based upon the Board’s review of Part 2 of the FEAF, and to approve the site plan as most recently submitted was carried unanimously.

-----

*Silverman, David -- Site Plan Review – 1030 & 1100 Marlyn Park Drive, Cazenovia*  
File # 19-1264 (Brian Wendel)

Matthew Vredenburgh was present to represent the file. He said he had spoken with Mr. Silverman about pulling the outlet from the pipe back from the Critical Environmental Area (CEA) as was suggested by the Board at the work session a week ago, and Mr. Silverman was absolutely agreeable to the change.

B. Wendell asked John Dunkle if he would comment on the engineering of the drainage plan proposed.

J. Dunkle said the proposed plan will improve the drainage in the area. The only concern raised was the discharge into the lake, so pulling the outlet outside the CEA would remedy that concern. He suggested the change be memorialized on the plan or be a condition of an approval.

A. Ferguson asked Mr. Vredenburgh to make a notation to that effect on the sketch of the drainage plan submitted in the file entitled *Site Improvements Love Property "Marlyn Park" Town of Cazenovia, New York*, which he did.

R. Ridler initialed the sketch as well.

Motion by B. Wendell, seconded by J. Munger, to appoint the Planning Board as Lead Agency for the purposes of the State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR), to affirm the matter an Unlisted Action and make a Negative Declaration, based upon the Board's review of the Short Environmental Assessment Form (SEAF) and to approve the site plan as most recently submitted was carried unanimously.

-----

*Caz Carwash, LLC -- ZBA Recommendation – 2567 Route 20 East, Cazenovia*  
File # 19-1242 (Dale Bowers)

Don Ballway was present to represent the file accompanied by Jim Hagan of Hagan Architects P.C. Kenneth (Clay) Coleman and Tim Eisenhut were present in the audience as well.

D. Bowers explained the Planning Board is not the approving Board for this application; this Board was asked by the Cazenovia Town Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) to apply the site plan review process for the project.

J. Hagan said since the last meeting they have made a number of revisions to the plan. He said the first thing they did was to adjust some of the pavement dimensions so that the overall impervious surface area percentage would be less than 20% which is the maximum allowed. He said that included the stone area, the building, and the paved areas. In addition, they have shown on the plan the one (1) free-standing sign at the road, as well as the sign on the front of the building facing US Route 20 and the building sign on the west elevation for the Pet Wash. He said the free-standing sign would be 6' X 4', about four (4) feet above grade with landscaping below it, erected on two (2) posts with signage on both sides. The sign on the building facing Route 20 would be a similar design and size, also 6' X 4'. The Pet Wash sign would be 2' X 4'.

R. Ridler asked if the free-standing sign would be perpendicular to Route 20.

J. Hagan said it would.

J. Langey asked if that sign would be downlit or uplit.

D. Ballway said it would have an LED light bar above the sign and it would shine downward.

R. Ridler asked the overall height of the sign.

D. Ballway thought it would be seven (7) feet to the top of the sign and 7 ½ feet to the top of the posts.

J. Hagan said it would be a wooden sign with engraved lettering.

D. Ballway added it would be mahogany wood.

J. Langey asked if they had verified with Roger Cook, the Code Enforcement Officer, that the sign height was within the Town restriction.

J. Hagan said he had reviewed the *Town Code* but had not found any information regarding the height.

J. Langey said that detail should be "double-checked."

D. Ballway said they chose the height for snow considerations, but if they needed to lower it, they were willing to comply.

J. Hagan then addressed the storm water management design saying they still propose a biofilter area in front of the building, a swale system running from the north side of the building around to the west side of the building, but where they previously proposed a retention system, they now propose a pocket wetland with a series of serpentine swales to filter the water and to slow it. The pocket wetland will be in the bottom of the basin, but the basin will still be large enough to handle the detention facilities requirement of the drainage study. There will be landscaping in the biofilter area and the basin area.

J. Langey asked what the landscaping plan would be in those two (2) areas.

J. Dunkle said those types of plant materials are selected to grow in those specific conditions. He said they are native materials, but they are very precisely chosen because of the conditions of the sand and the “way things grow there.” He spoke about a recommended plant list and said he has reviewed those details. He said all the landscaping and all the design look adequate and he was satisfied.

R. Ridler asked Don Ferlow if he was satisfied.

D. Ferlow asked if the growth in the retention area and the wetland would be composed of herbaceous plants/grasses or if there would be some shrubs. He wondered if the same plantings would be used on the westside along the fringe.

J. Hagan said the depth of the retention area on the west side would be 4-5 feet deep so he did not think the vegetation would be visible driving by.

D. Ferlow said if a wetland is going to function properly it should have growth at the fringe, not in the wet. He said that growth did not have to be trees. He felt shrubs would flourish.

J. Hagan suggest he meet with Mr. Ferlow and Mr. Dunkle to address these specific details.

D. Ferlow also cautioned that the plant materials not be purchased from a local nursery, but suggested they be purchased from growers who plant in a wetland environment specifically for planting in wetlands.

J. Hagan then spoke about areas that would be mowed versus areas that would be meadow. He also said they now propose more trees in front of the site, as was recommended. Spruce trees have been additionally proposed to four (4) areas to create a better buffer.

A. Ferguson asked Mr. Ferlow for his recommendation for the caliper size.

D. Ferlow said the sizes proposed were 8' – 10' tall evergreens and 3"- caliper deciduous trees. He thought those sizes were logical.

J. Hagan said they had made an application to the New York State Department of Transportation (DOT) for a highway work permit. He said that will be a 3-step process. The initial phase was the submission of a schematic plan for the overall concept of the plan. He received an email from the engineer from the DOT, Robert A. Gaffney, which he submitted to the file. He said the email listed details the DOT would like to see incorporated for the second submission of the plan. He said he called Mr. Gaffney to verify that the driveway location was acceptable. He reported Mr. Gaffney said the DOT had no issue with the location. He then asked Mr. Gaffney if he had reviewed the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). Mr. Gaffney said there were "plenty of facilities here and it's not going to impact our swale along Route 20."

J. Dunkle said he has seen the comments the DOT has made, and it was his opinion that the DOT will not affect the site plan in any way. He said the details mentioned were technical details and, from the Planning Board's consideration, the highway entrance detail has been advanced far enough for their satisfaction.

J. Hagan said they have received the letter from the Cazenovia Advisory Conservation Commission (CACC) and they have no further comments about that.

Another issue J. Hagan said they have addressed was the photometric plan. He said it was a computer-generated plan and explained how to read it and the accompanying footcandle levels. He explained at the paved areas the level would be 2.86 while at the parameters it would be .65. The interpretation of those readings is that the light would be focused on the driveway areas tapering to almost nothing at the property lines. He said the brightness of a full moon on a clear night is 2 footcandles. The lighting near the building would be 8 footcandles and at the edges it would be 2.5 – 2.6 footcandles. He said the lights would be downlit and they would be using dark-sky compliant fixtures.

J. Dunkle added the lights should also be shielded.

J. Hagan affirmed they would be shielded.

J. Munger asked if Mr. Hagan had information regarding the fixtures themselves.

J. Hagan submitted documentation regarding those details.

J. Munger asked the color of the lights.

J. Hagan said the color could be adjusted.

J. Munger felt a softer light would be preferable to a whiter light.

D. Ballway said they were considering lights similar to the ones used by the nearby John Deere distributor.

A. Ferguson asked about lights that were motion-detected or that automatically drop from 100% to 70% in the absence of activity. She said that would alleviate her concerns about having lights on all night.

J. Hagan responded that the business will be operating 24 hours per day so there will be no set schedule when people will be coming or going. He said they were concerned that having lights “going up and down” would be more disconcerting than having uniform lighting. He felt dimming the lights to 70% would be a miniscule reduction and hardly perceived. He said from a technical standpoint determining how to control the dimming would be challenging also.

J. Munger asked the location of the light poles.

J. Hagan showed where the five (5) poles would be located.

Thomas Pratt, the Chairman of the ZBA, came forward from the audience to view the plans. He suggested the use of lights having individual controls.

J. Hagan was unfamiliar with that type of light. He was unsure how that would work on a 20' pole.

T. Pratt countered the light was designed for that purpose.

J. Hagan said they would prefer not to use that type of lighting.

T. Pratt wondered if lighting would be an issue for local homeowners.

J. Hagan said he created a drawing using a Google Map superimposing the site plan map over it to illustrate the visibility of the light poles to the two (2) neighboring homes. One was approximately 300 feet to the closest light pole across the street. The other was approximately 500 feet from the light pole at the front of the building. Between the topography and the trees, he postulated that the impact of the light poles would be minimal.

T. Pratt said lighting was an issue raised by a neighbor at a previous (ZBA) meeting.

A. Ferguson noted the number of plantings along the west side of the property has been increased. She said one item not yet discussed was noise.

J. Hagan believed the dryers would be the loudest machines in the automatic car wash process.

D. Ballway said the dryers are 78 decibels (dB) at 40 feet which he said is the level of traffic 50 feet from the highway.

J. Langey asked about the specifications related to the vacuum stations.

D. Ballway did not know that measurement. He asked Mr. Eisenhut who was in the audience and who operates the car wash in Hamilton.

D. Ballway said they could obtain that information.

J. Langey asked if the proposed vacuums would be identical to those in Hamilton.

It was said the vacuums would be identical so those readings could be gotten.

R. Ridler asked if noise-attenuated vacuums were manufactured.

T. Eisenhut did not think they were, but he said newer machines were quieter than older models and spoke about the sound of the vacuums and dryers at his facility.

A. Ferguson appreciated the revisions in the newly submitted plans to accommodate the Board's concerns. She said she was satisfied with the lighting as long as the Applicants are amenable to considering an alternative if, in the future, there are complaints from the neighbors.

D. Ballway believed the lights will have settings that could be adjusted on the pole. He said they would want to have sufficient lighting for safety and security. He repeated he envisions it looking very similar to the John Deere dealership with soft lighting and said there will be a number of trees around the facility as well. He said they have endeavored to please both the Planning Board and the Zoning Board without opposition. He said the cost of this proposal is almost double the cost of the Hamilton facility. He would want to ensure that people know they were open and that their business hours would not shrink (due to lighting).

D. Bowers commented that the Applicants are installing 10-foot trees so in a matter of five (5) years the trees will be higher than the lights.

D. Ballway said he knows the two families living in the vicinity and that they are on friendly terms, saying Sandy Yoder asked to have the car wash put in her front yard.

A. Ferguson said the Zoning Board will need to get the final (planting) plan from Mr. Ferlow.

J. Langey asked about security cameras.

D. Ballway said they have not made decisions regarding cameras yet and deferred to Mr. Eisenhut about what is in place in Hamilton.

T. Eisenhut explained the placement of his 12 cameras at the Hamilton car wash.

J. Langey asked where the surveillance feeds.

T. Eisenhut said it feeds to his cell phone as well as to a monitor in his office on site.

J. Langey asked about the retention of the recordings.

T. Eisenhut said it can be retrieved for 30 days.

J. Langey asked if the Cazenovia Fire Department has seen the plan and has any issue with the proposed rescue lane.

J. Hagan said he had not gotten a response from the Fire Department.

J. Dunkle said he has spoken with the Fire Department representative and that the Fire Department is "OK."

R. Ridler said the Planning Board will submit a letter to the ZBA giving the Planning Board response to the site plan details as they have been recently submitted.

D. Bowers said they would also acknowledge the plan they have developed together meets the requests of the Engineer for the Town, John Dunkle, as well as Jim Cunningham.

Motion by D. Bowers, seconded by J. Munger, to submit a letter to the ZBA stating they approve the site plan details as most recently developed by the Applicants with the acceptance of John Dunkle, the Engineer for the Town, Jim Cunningham, the Water Pollution Control Facility Operator, and Don Ferlow of the CACC was carried unanimously.

K. Coleman said they would like to attend the next ZBA meeting and wondered if the letter would arrive in time.

R. Ridler assured him the letter would arrive before the next ZBA meeting.

*AMD Creative Glamping (Luca Trails, LLC) -- Site Plan Review – Route 20 East*  
File # 19-1267 (Thomas Clarke) Cazenovia

No one was present to represent the file.

A. Ferguson said the Applicant has asked to be continued.

Motion by A. Ferguson, seconded by B. Wendell, to continue the file was carried unanimously.

-----

*John E Libby Living Trust/ Pratt, Norval & Kathleen -- Line Change – Bass Road &*  
File # 19-1268 (Hugh Roszel) 2555 Bass Road, New Woodstock

Norval (Chip) Pratt was present to represent the file. He explained the application was for a line change between two parcels owned by his father-in-law John Libby, saying his intention is to purchase the parcel to the east to build a new home in the future. He explained he and his wife currently own a 60-acre horse farm on Route 80 which they hope to sell in the future.

Referring to the drawing entitled *Proposed Conveyance of Lot Three and Part of Lot Five of the Happy Hill Farm Subdivision* by Michael L. McCully Land Surveying PLLC dated 02-02-20, Mr. Pratt showed the proposed line change.

He said they intend to have up to six (6) horses, a new barn, and a new house on the enlarged lot once they assume ownership.

Motion by A. Ferguson, seconded by D. Bowers, to appoint the Planning Board as Lead Agency for the purposes of SEQR, to affirm the matter an Unlisted Action and make a Negative Declaration, based upon the Board's review of the SEAF and to move the file to a public hearing at the next meeting was carried unanimously.

J. Langey asked about the acreages of the parcels after the line change.

C. Pratt said the parcel they would acquire would be 12.8 acres and the parcel retained by his father-in-law would be 24 acres.

He was given instructions regarding the notification of the neighboring property owners about the public hearing at this time.

-----

*Silberberg, Michael -- Line Elimination – East Lake Rd & 4577 East Lake Road*  
File # 19-1269 (Bryan Wendell) Cazenovia  
*Silberberg, Michael – Site Plan Review – 4577 East Lake Road, Cazenovia*  
File # 19-1270 (Bryan Wendell)

Michael Silberberg and Matthew Vredenburgh were present to represent the file.

B. Wendell explained the applications were for a line elimination between two (2) properties with a site plan review for a new home after the demolition of the existing home, which formerly belonged to the Stevens'.

Referring to the drawing entitled *Map of Lands of Joann Stevens (#4577 East Lake Road) Town of Cazenovia Madison County New York* created by David Vredenburgh dated 8-20-2019, Matt Vredenburgh said the 1.135-acre parcel to the south was somewhat wooded. He said there is a 36" drainage pipe that runs through the middle of the property. He explained there was a culvert that comes under East Lake Road which is a private system.

D. Bowers clarified that the first item the Board would be determining was the elimination of the line that separates the two (2) parcels.

It was agreed that the first application to be considered was the line elimination.

M. Vredenburgh explained there is an existing house on the northern lot with a pool patio that runs along the lakeside of the house, an inground pool, an easement which allows part of the driveway to be on the neighboring property to the north, and a small shed in the northwest corner of the property. He said the existing pool was about 70 feet from the water; the existing house was about 94 feet from the water; the existing pool patio was about 60 feet from the water; and the driveway was about 105 feet from the water. The current impervious surface area of the 1.156 lot was 28.2% and the impervious surface area of the undeveloped lot was 0%.

B. Wendell asked about the current drainage situation.

M. Vredenburgh said all the water from the Jephson Estate (to the east) gathers at the bottom of the hill, is picked up in catch basins, some being part of the old private systems of the Jephson Estate, goes into a manhole and underneath East Lake Road,

dumps into a large, eroded and bare dirt channel, “scours away” until it hits the 36 inch pipe on the undeveloped property.

A. Ferguson asked if the pipe was above or below ground.

M. Vredenburg said it was below ground. He said it has not been well-maintained, so over time debris has deposited in front of the pipe making water flow over the top eroding its cover further down the line and water dumps into the lake along with the fertilizers and pesticides.

B. Wendel asked if there were any questions about the first piece of business which would be to move the line elimination file to a public hearing.

R. Ridler asked if once the lots are combined would the easement for the driveway on the neighboring property “go away.”

M. Vredenburg said it could since they do not plan to have a driveway in that location in the future, but he was not sure the easement would be relinquished.

Motion by B. Wendel, seconded by D. Bowers, to appoint the Planning Board as Lead Agency for the purposes of SEQR, to affirm the matter an Unlisted Action and make a Negative Declaration, based upon the Board’s review of the SEAF and to move the file to a public hearing at the next meeting was carried unanimously.

Discussion then followed regarding the proposed site plan.

Referring to the drawings entitled *Silberberg Residence S-102 Environmental Benefits Plan* dated February 6, 2020 and *Silberberg Residence S-101 Site Plan* dated January 22, 2020 created by MDVLA, Mr. Vredenburg showed the Board the locations of the proposed house with an attached garage and an attached pool house, the new pool with an infinity edge, a small patio between the three structures, a driveway and front walkway from East Lake Road, a small walkway down a set of stairs leading to a dock, a small patio overlook, and the existing shed.

A. Ferguson asked if pool house was connected to the house by a covered roof.

M. Vredenburg said it would be connected by a pergola.

M. Vredenburg then talked about the impervious surface area. He repeated currently there was 28.2% on the developed lot and 0% on the undeveloped lot. Combining the lots would result in the current development being 14.7%. The new development would result in a reduction of 26 square feet and development would be further from the water. He said while rerouting the drainage ditch, it would be a great opportunity to make some significant environmental improvements. Along the shoreline, they plan to

utilize the *Guidelines* for the Town. There are three (3) areas with existing oak, maple, and cedars which they plan to cluster more vegetation around so that about 70% (220 feet of 300 feet) of shoreline will have a naturalized look. He referred to a document he created entitled *Silberberg Residence Shoreline Planting Plan* dated February 6, 2020 which listed the kinds of vegetation he was proposing. He said there would be approximately 3600 square feet of coverage which would be about 60% of the CEA. He said two (2) gaps in the tree canopy would be maintained for views to the lake from the new residence. He said only the unhealthy and poor-quality plant material along the shore will be removed. He had photographs of the growth which he submitted to the file at this time to aid the Board in visualizing the existing vegetation. The view from the lake would be naturalistic. The side facing the residence would be more residential in nature. The requirement that 75% of the new plantings be native would be met and the goal of 70% of the shoreline be naturalistic would be achieved. He said they also would be eliminating the non-code-compliant conditions which exist within the first 100+ feet of the lake. He felt the relocation of the driveway was particularly notable. He said the old house was guttered but the downspouts dumped onto the existing patio into the lawn toward the lake. They propose to collect the run-off and dump it underground into drywells. The entire new house will be guttered. A number of higher quality trees would be planted around the property which would live for another 150 years. Oaks, sugar maples, and white pines were proposed replacing the ash, poplars and other species with less longevity. He said 15,000 square feet of tree canopy would be added. He said one silver maple would be lost in construction of the house.

J. Langey asked about erosion control during construction.

M. Vredenburg stated all the proper erosion and sediment control absolutely would be followed.

M. Vredenburg spoke again about the drainage improvements proposed. He said they would create a channel with some storage for larger storm events, armoring it so that it would not erode. They would create some check dams where water would be collected and detained so sediment and suspended solids can settle, and the water would be given a chance to infiltrate before reaching the lake.

D. Bowers had some questions regarding the walkway at the lake. He also said he would like to see the driveway easement removed. He asked if the property will be connected to the municipal sewer connection, so that the holding tank easement can also be removed.

R. Ridler asked if it will be connected to the Village sewer.

D. Bowers believed it was already connected at this time. He then asked for an explanation of the development in Zone C (100' – 500' from the shore).

M. Vredenburg was unsure what was being asked.

D. Bowers said there would be 57,252 SF of development in Zone C; 8588 SF (15%) was allowed; 9875 SF (17.2%) was existing; 12329 SF (21.5%) was proposed. He pointed out that would be an increase of over 6% of the allowed amount.

M. Vredenburg responded they could distribute more development closer to the lake in Zone B (20' – 100' from shore) where they were allowed 10% (2574 SF) but they were only proposing 1.8 % (459 SF).

D. Bowers said his point was that the combined lot size is 2.3 acres and the proposal is for an 8000 SF house, not including the pool, or the driveway.

J. Dunkle said regarding the drainage way, it handles the run-off from multiple properties. He said a drainage easement would be needed so that the Town could access any problems, which they did not have and were not able to do now because it was on private property.

J. Langey recommended they obtain that easement through a stormwater management agreement/easement.

J. Dunkle concurred saying it would be determined who would take care of that in the agreement once they get to that point. He said he assumed that because the culvert was located in that area that it was a low point along East Lake Road. If that was the case, they would need to “look hard at a flood route.” He said they need to look at the capacity of the entire design to ensure water was not going to jump the bank and surge toward the house. He said a hydrology analysis would be needed. He said from the Owners' perspective they would want to ensure the house was protected and the channels could handle all the possible flows. He felt there was still a considerable amount of work to be done on the design.

D. Bowers spoke about a similar situation in Oran as an example.

M. Vredenburg agreed they want to protect the house, the property, and the lake.

J. Dunkle said one would start with a solid structure, and then address the aesthetics after it proves functional.

D. Bowers said he would also like the CACC to review this to make sure the amount and types of plantings proposed would meet with their approval.

D. Ferlow said he had one comment (after seeing the plant list for the first time at this time). He noted 40 microbiota desussata were being proposed and he questioned how well they would do. He said the rhus aromatica would definitely grow. He said the

viburnum trilobum and ilex verticillata were good plants, but they were the only “high things” proposed. He said the photographs appeared to show that the growth along the water was a thicket.

M. Vredenburg said it was “not that nice.” He then explained where they propose to enhance plantings.

J. Langey asked the total estimated disturbance on the property.

M. Vredenburg presumed it would be less than an acre.

J. Dunkle asked Mr. Vredenburg to confirm that and to make sure it would be a realistic calculation.

R. Ridler asked about the setbacks from the property lines.

M. Vredenburg approximated it would be 42 feet between the pool and the southern boundary and 60 – 70 feet from the northern boundary.

J. Langey asked the age of the existing structure that would be removed.

M. Vredenburg speculated it was built in the 80's.

It was believed the structure was less than 50 years old, and would have no historical significance.

B. Wendel said the Board would have more time (to further review the site plan).

M. Vredenburg asked what he was to anticipate. He knew he was waiting for a review from Mr. Ferlow regarding the planting plan.

He was told there would need to be approval of the drainage plan from Mr. Dunkle, and that the Board would consider the amount of development in Zone C as well as the amount of development of the whole project.

More discussion followed about the development increases and decreases in the various zones, as well as the storm water management practices proposed for mitigation, and the lakefront development.

A. Ferguson said she appreciated all the efforts made thus far.

D. Bowers explained he was just acknowledging the percentages.

M. Vredenburg said, in calculating the zones, there was always a percentage that was skewed when attempting to maximize the overall allowable development of a site.

A. Ferguson repeated that she acknowledged all the efforts made to mitigate the situation, but believed Mr. Bowers point was that the Board needs to recognize for the record that it exceeds the ideal amount of development in one zone, but it perhaps would be compensated by the proposed stormwater mitigation.

R. Ridler also commended Mr. Vredenburg on the fine job he has done so far in creating a plan to address the Board’s concerns.

Motion by B. Wendel, seconded by D. Bowers, to continue the file and the discussion to coincide with the line elimination public hearing at the next meeting.

J. Langey asked the Board if they wanted the decision regarding the line change to coincide with the decision regarding the site plan review. He felt this would be wise and believed the 62-day decision requirement for the line elimination would afford ample time.

-----

Motion by D. Bowers, seconded by A. Ferguson, to adjourn the meeting was carried unanimously at 8:50 P.M.

-----

Sue Wightman, Planning Board Secretary  
February 7, 2020