

Town of Union Planning Board Minutes

Tuesday, June 12, 2018

A regular meeting of the Town of Union Planning Board was held Tuesday, June 12, 2018, at the Town of Union Office Building, 3111 East Main Street, Endwell, New York.

Members present: L. Miller, L. Cicciarelli, S. McLain, T. Crowley, S. Forster,
M. Jaros

Members absent: S. Daglio

Others present: Marina Lane, Gary Collison, Daron Janicki, Bob Seidel,
Dennis Kalashnik, Brian Laing, Dick Laing

A. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Miller opened the meeting of the Planning Board at 7:03 pm.

B. MEETING MINUTES

1. Acceptance of May 8, 2018 Meeting Minutes

Chairman Miller asked for a motion to accept the 5/8/18 Meeting Minutes, as written.

Motion Made: L. Cicciarelli

Motion Seconded: T. Crowley

MOTION: Acceptance of the meeting minutes of May 8, 2018, as written.

VOTE: **In Favor:** L. Miller, L. Cicciarelli, T. Crowley,
S. Forster, M. Jaros

Opposed: None

Abstained: S. McLain

Motion Carried

C. Laing Self-Storage Facility, 105, 107 & 111 Brink Street, B. Laing

1. Declare Lead Agency

Chairman Miller asked for a motion to declare the Planning Board Lead Agency.

Motion Made: S. McLain

Motion Seconded: L. Cicciarelli

MOTION: Declare the Planning Board Lead Agency

VOTE: **In Favor:** L. Miller, L. Cicciarelli, S. McLain,
S. Forster, T. Crowley, M. Jaros

Opposed: None

Abstained: None

Motion Carried

2. Declare Project an Unlisted Action

Chairman Miller asked for a motion to declare the project an Unlisted Action under SEQRA.

Motion Made: T. Crowley
Motion Seconded: L. Cicciarelli
MOTION: Declare the project an Unlisted Action.
VOTE: **In Favor:** L. Miller, L. Cicciarelli, S. McLain,
S. Forster, T. Crowley, M. Jaros
Opposed: None
Abstained: None
Motion Carried

3. SEQRA Determination

Mr. Brian Laing introduced his father, Dick Laing, and then gave a short presentation about the project. Brian noted that he and his father had a successful self-serve storage business in Conklin and they wanted to expand the business. Mr. Laing lives in Endicott and he found a property that suited their needs on Brink Street.

Currently 111 Brink Street is rented by a tenant and the building will remain occupied by the tenant for the next year. Mr. Laing will occupy the middle unit 107 Brink Street and this unit will also house the office of his non-profit organization. The 105 Brink Street property will be rented back by the current owner. Mr. Laing will grow the business gradually and occupy the other buildings as the business expands. He plans to eventually have 300 climate-controlled storage units located on the 30,000 square foot property.

Mr. Forster asked if Mr. Laing is purchasing the properties and what the name of his non-profit organization is. Mr. Laing answered that he is purchasing the properties. The name of his non-profit organization is the Constance Foundation and the foundation's flagship event is Hockey for Hope, which raises money for Dr. Geller at Lourdes Hospital and UHS to help cancer patients with living expenses. Ms. Miller asked if Mr. Laing would be tearing the buildings down or just converting them. Mr. Laing answered that he will just be converting them. Mr. Laing noted that the buildings just need minor repairs and he also will be installing security cameras at the facility. Mr. Crowley asked whether the property had flooded and Mr. Laing said that according to the records it did not flood. Mr. Forster asked why the units would be climate-controlled. Mr. Laing answered that most of the requests he received at his business in Conklin are for climate-controlled units because people do not want to deal with mildew or mice getting into their belongings. Mr. Laing also noted that traditional storage sweats and many of his customers need climate-controlled storage for food products, such as Sherwin Foods. Ms. Lane asked whether the two employees would work different shifts. Mr. Laing responded that both

employees would work the same hours from eight to five and there would be a keyless entry for twenty-four hour access to the units. There will also be 24-hour security so Mr. Laing will know who is going in and out of the units at all times.

Ms. Lane reviewed Part 2 of the E.A.F. and noted that all of the potential impacts were small to none. Per the Determination of Significance, Brian Laing applied to use an existing industrial warehouse complex on three lots for indoor, climate-controlled self-service storage at 105, 107, and 111 Brink Street. The property is currently used for storage and warehousing and deliveries/shipping.

The use will not create any impacts to traffic. Parking for employees and customers along the front of the warehouse does not conform to code, but is pre-existing and the proposed use does not create a need for additional parking. There will be no significant impacts pertaining to odors, noise, lighting or existing municipal utilities.

No soil disturbance is planned. Similarly, there will be no impact on wildlife or plants. The building was built over Brixius creek, which is channeled under the building, emerging from the culvert approximately 200 feet away. The proposed use will not impact the creek.

These properties are determined by the NYS DEC to be within the buffer area of remediation site #704038, the Endicott Area-Wide Investigation. The associated contamination is under remediation and will have no impact on the storage use.

The project was reviewed for any potential negative effects and it has been determined that it will not create any significant adverse impacts to the environment. Planning staff recommend a Negative Declaration under SEQRA.

Mr. Jaros asked whether there was venting at the building for the TCE fumes. Ms. Lane responded that after the IBM plume was discovered the DEC flagged a huge area around IBM. Ms. Lane noted that Gault Toyota and IBM have vents for the TCE, but most properties in the buffer area designated by the DEC do not have any issues. When Ms. Lane runs the environmental forms through the EAF database, certain questions are prefilled by the program and these questions must be addressed in the SEQRA report. To perform her due diligence, Ms. Lane addressed the remediation site in the buffer zone and Brixius Creek because they were flagged by the program. The building is only in the buffer area and TCE does not have to be mitigated in this area.

Chairman Miller then asked for a motion to approve the Negative Declaration under SEQRA.

Motion Made: S. Forster
Motion Seconded: L. Cicciarelli
MOTION: Approval of the Negative Declaration under SEQRA
VOTE: **In Favor:** L. Miller, L. Cicciarelli, S. McLain, T. Crowley, S. Forster, M. Jaros
Opposed: None
Abstained: None
Motion Carried

4. Site Plan Review

Ms. Lane then summarized her staff report for the Planning Board. Brian Laing submitted an application for an indoor self-service storage facility at 105, 107, and 111 Brink Street. The parcel is zoned Industrial (I) and self-service storage is permitted. The warehouse buildings on the three parcels share interior walls, and have a total interior space of 30,600 square feet. The warehouse at 105 Brink Street is currently being used for personal storage, and 111 Brink Street houses a warehouse and delivery business. Mr. Laing plans initially to convert empty space in the central unit, 107 Brink Street, into the proposed self-service storage. As the business builds clientele, he will convert the exterior units into additional self-service storage. At this time, he does not propose any additional construction to the building, other than the individual storage spaces.

There will be two employees on site. The parking requirement, based on the number of employees, is not greater than that required for the existing uses. Therefore, per Code section 300-51.2.D, as there is no increase in the number of required parking spaces, no additional parking is required. At this time, employees park in front of the buildings, along the side of 111 Brink Street, and inside the buildings. Clients of the self-storage business will be able to drive into the garage bay when transferring belongings. Subsequent access will be via key card.

Mr. Laing will apply for a sign permit. There are no changes proposed to the existing utilities and site lighting.

The Planning Department staff recommends approval of the site plan with the following stipulations:

1. Prior to posting any new signage, the applicant shall apply for a sign permit from the Building Official prior to posting any such signage. All temporary signs (including price signs), portable signs, search lights, balloons, sidewalk and curb signs shall be reviewed and approved by the

Code Enforcement Office prior to being placed on the property. Signs that blink, rotate, or move are not permitted.

2. If any new outdoor lighting is proposed, the applicant shall first submit cut-sheets to the Code Enforcement Officer for approval.

3. Per NYS law, all commercial buildings must be inspected by the Municipal Fire Code Inspector every three years. It is your responsibility to coordinate the next inspection by calling the Code Enforcement office at (607) 786-2920 prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Compliance.

4. The site shall be maintained in a neat and orderly manner. No outdoor storage shall be permitted.

5. Site plan approval shall be valid for one year, unless substantial improvements have been made pursuant to the approved site plan.

6. The applicant shall be required to acknowledge all of the above conditions, in writing, prior to the issuance of a building permit. The applicant agrees to construct the project in strict accordance with the site plan approved by the Planning Board. Should the applicant change the site plan, the applicant must resubmit a new site plan to the Town of Union Planning Department and Code Enforcement Office.

Mr. Laing plans to keep the site neat and orderly. Currently there are many weeds growing through the blacktop and Ms. Lane and Mr. Laing have discussed remedies for this issue. If the cracks continue to expand Mr. Laing has suggested that he can add plantings to make the site more attractive to the clients.

Chairman Miller then called for a motion to approve the Site Plan for Laing Self-Storage at 105, 107 & 111 Brink Street, with stipulations.

Motion Made:	T. Crowley
Motion Seconded:	M. Jaros
MOTION:	Approval of the Laing Self-Storage site plan at 105, 107 & 111 Brink Street, with stipulations.
VOTE	In Favor: L. Miller, L. Cicciarelli, S. McLain, T. Crowley, S. Forster, M. Jaros
	Opposed: None
	Abstained: None
	Motion Carried

**D. Fence Area Variances, 220 Airport Road, D. Janicki
Advisory Opinion to the ZBA**

Mr. Gary Collison, an attorney for Yorktowne Apartments, gave a short presentation. His client had erected a fence with the attractive side facing the

Yorktowne Apartments as opposed to the neighbor, and the fence is closer to the road than the eight foot setback that is required per the Town Code (sections 300-53.15 C and 300-53.15 H). Mr. Collison's client had reached out to the owner of the neighboring property to ask if he would permit representatives of the fence company to correct the problem. The neighbor said that he would not allow the representatives onto his property. In the alternative, the neighbor suggested he would allow access to his property if he is given access to the apartment's driveway. Yorktowne Apartments would not allow the neighbor to have access to their driveway as he had used it in the past for the storage of dirt.

Mr. Collison noted that the neighbor has a history of visual blight and handed out photos to illustrate the blight. The photographs demonstrated that the neighbor at various times has stored building materials, old tires, and piles of dirt in his back yard. In addition, Mr. Janicki stated that during the winter the neighbor points a drain pipe for a runoff problem on his property directly into the apartment parking lot, creating icy conditions for the tenants walking through the apartment parking lot.

To resolve the blight and safety issues, Mr. Janicki hired a fencing contractor to erect a fence. Mr. Collison said they hope to have the variances approved because the neighbor has been consistently uncooperative in addressing the blight and safety issues.

Mr. Crowley asked Mr. Janicki why the fence contractor had not advised him that the fence should be installed with the post side facing his property. Mr. Janicki responded that the contractor had informed him of the correct method of installing the fence, but that he had instructed the contractor to face the more attractive side toward the apartments. Mr. Janicki noted that he has owned the property since 1985, and for decades has been dealing with blight issues, which have made it very difficult for him to rent the apartments. In addition, the neighbor took a front loader and dumped a load of dirt at the back of the apartment property, which the neighbor claims he owns. Mr. Janicki then had to rent a front loader to remove the piles of dirt to avoid creation of a mud slurry in the apartment parking lot. Mr. Seidel, a member of the maintenance staff for the Yorktowne Apartments, stated that this winter he had been constantly clearing the parking lot of ice and mud to prevent the tenants from falling there.

The neighbor had also allegedly sprayed obscenities on the cedar shakes of the apartment building and Mr. Janicki had to purchase new cedar shakes to repair this damage because the paint had stained the shakes. Ms. Miller asked Mr. Janicki whether there was anything legally that he could do to stop the neighbor's malicious actions. The police had advised him that they could not address the issue unless he personally witnessed the neighbor spraying the building. Ms. Lane commented that she had met with the neighbor on several occasions to show him that he did not own the back portion of the Yorktowne

Apartments lot, but that the neighbor still insisted that he owned a portion of the lot.

Mr. Forster asked Mr. Janicki how close to the road the fence is. Ms. Lane answered the question as she handed out pictures of the fence and noted that the fence is approximately eight feet from the road and that there is a second means of egress from the parking lot. Mr. Cicciarelli asked whether the fence was on the neighbor's property line. Mr. Janicki answered that the fence is on his property with only six inches on the other side of the fence, which means that Mr. Janicki would have to go on the neighbor's land to cover the exposed support beams.

Mr. Crowley wondered how the fence matter had come before the Planning Board. Ms. Lane said that sometimes Code will pass a property on their way to other sites and will notice a situation that needs to be corrected. Mr. Crowley asked whether Mr. Janicki would need to reapply for the variances if they are approved by the ZBA and the fence starts to deteriorate and needs replacement. Ms. Lane answered that variances granted by the ZBA follow the land and they would not have to reapply for the same variances.

Ms. Lane then read her report to the Planning Board. Yorktowne Apts. #2 LLC owns and manages a multifamily apartment business located at 220 Airport Road. They have applied to maintain a fence which was improperly erected between 220 Airport Road and 226 Airport Road. The property is in an Urban Single Family zoning district and a fence is permitted.

Daron Janicki, on behalf of Yorktowne Apts. #2 LLC, has applied for two variances:

- 1) To have a fence higher than three-feet within the eight-foot front setback, and
- 2) To maintain the fence with the posts and support structures facing toward the adjacent property.

The fence is set back from the actual street by approximately eight feet, and does not interfere with visibility as vehicles exit the property. In addition, there is a second means of egress further to the east which can be used. Planning staff recommend the Planning Board recommend approval of the variance to have the six-foot high fence within the eight-foot front setback.

The applicant has offered to add boarding to the exterior side of the fence, but the offer was rejected by the adjacent neighbor. Planning staff recommend that the Planning Board recommend the ZBA approve the variance to maintain the fence with the posts and support structures facing toward the adjacent property.

Chairman Miller called for a motion to recommend approval of the area variances by the Zoning Board of Appeals for a fence higher than three feet within the eight-foot front setback and to maintain the fence with posts and support structures facing the adjacent property at 220 Airport Road.

Motion Made:	S. Forster
Motion Seconded:	T. Crowley
MOTION:	Recommend the ZBA approve the variances to have a fence higher than three-feet within the eight-foot front setback and to maintain the fence with posts and support structures facing toward the adjacent property.
VOTE	In Favor: L. Miller, L. Cicciarelli, S. McLain, T. Crowley, S. Forster, M. Jaros Opposed: None Abstained: None Motion Carried

**E. Use Variance for a Digital Sign, 751 Farm-to-Market Road, D. Kalashnik
Advisory Opinion to the ZBA**

Mr. Dennis Kalashnik, on behalf of the Church Board of the Russian Ukrainian Baptist Church, spoke about the sign. The church purchased the sign without realizing that they needed a sign permit. When the church hired an electrician to install the sign, he asked whether the church had approval to install it, and that's when the church realized that they would need a permit from the town before they could proceed with the project. The church is replacing the old sign because the letters keep falling off. Occasionally the church has special services which they wish to advertise on the new sign, rather than erecting a banner each time they have an event.

Mr. Kalashnik had presented the project to Dee and she advised Mr. Kalashnik to write down the terms he wanted for the sign. Mr. Kalashnik is not familiar with the code so he just guessed. He now wants to know what the code allows in terms of digital signs. He said that if the code restricts the sign to only one message, the church is fine with that because their goal is just to replace the sign that is falling apart.

Ms. Lane explained that the code does not allow digital signs in an Urban Single Family district, and that these signs were allowed only in a General Commercial district. Ms. Lane noted that the schools can have digital signs because they are exempt from the town's rules and regulations. Ms. Lane further explained that the code permits one color for the text, and the message on the sign cannot change more than once per day.

Ms. Miller asked who had determined that the message should change every ten seconds. Mr. Kalashnik answered that since Code Enforcement asked for an answer immediately, without really knowing how often it will change, he told her that the message will change every ten seconds. Mr. Jaros asked whether different messages will be displayed every ten seconds, and Mr. Kalashnik explained that first the sign would say the name of the church and ten seconds later it would list the time of the service, then it would revert to the name of the church. Mr. Crowley asked if the sign had been custom built for the monument in front of the church. Mr. Kalashnik responded that the sign is prefabricated and the church purchased the sign from out of state to save money. Mr. Crowley commented that a local sign contractor would have known that digital signs are not permitted in that zoning district.

Mr. Kalashnik needs to apply for a use variance for the digital sign because the church is proposing a use on a property where a digital sign is not normally allowed. In this case, a digital sign is not a use that is permitted in an Urban Single Family zoning district. Ms. Lane noted that use variances normally have to meet four tests, one of which is that it cannot be a self-created hardship.

Ms. Lane believes that the church, unfamiliar with code requirements, thought that a digital sign would be permitted because they saw the digital sign across the street at the school. Ms. Lane asked how many faces the sign has, and Mr. Kalashnik replied that it has two faces so that it could be seen from both sides of the road. Mr. Crowley said that the sign is set back off the road so he does not have any problems with approving it.

Ms. Miller noted that nobody follows the speed limit on the road, the kids dart in and out, and it is a very, very high traffic area. Ms. Miller said that you are not only distracted by everything going on at the school but she feels that changing to a digital sign would add to those distractions. Mr. Crowley asked Mr. Kalashnik if the sign can be set so that it does not change and Mr. Kalashnik answered yes. Mr. Crowley noted that if the text is changed only every twenty-four hours, it will be like any other sign. Mr. Cicciarelli noted that he passes the Middle School digital sign by Hillside Terrace, and it is one of the most distracting things along that road because it takes your focus off the road. Mr. Jaros, who is a teacher at the middle school, noted that they have already spoken to the school about it numerous times. Mr. Jaros noted that if the church's sign did not change it would not present the same distraction that the school sign does. Ms. Lane also advised Mr. Kalashnik to pay attention to the lumens (the brightness) of the sign and to make sure that the lumens are set on low so the sign is not a distraction, if the use variance is granted.

Ms. Lane then read her recommendation to the Planning Board. The Planning Department staff recommends that the Planning Board recommend to the ZBA denial of the use variance to replace the face of an existing sign with a new digital sign face. Planning staff recommend that the Zoning Board of Appeals

consider whether the proposed use meets the criteria for use variances, in particular that the digital sign would not be a self-created hardship.

In addition, the proposed sign is at a very busy section opposite a public school. Digital signs are meant to catch the eye of passers-by. Per the US National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, most accidents are not caused by alcohol or speeding, but by distracted drivers, and that even a two-second distraction “significantly increases individual crash risk.” Staff suggests that this location across from a school is not appropriate for a digital sign.

Permitting the digital sign in a residential zoning district would set an undesirable precedent, but if the ZBA does grant the use variance for the digital sign, we recommend the sign conform to the current regulations governing digital signs in General Commercial districts. This includes using only one color, and changing the message no more than one time per day. In addition, the night-time brightness level should be set so the sign is legible, but does not cause glare.

Chairman Miller called for a motion to recommend denial of the use variance for the digital sign by the Zoning Board of Appeals at 751 Farm-to-Market Road.

Motion Made:	S. Forster
Motion Seconded:	S. McLain
MOTION:	Recommend the ZBA deny the use variance for a digital sign at 751 Farm-to-Market Road.
VOTE	In Favor: S. McLain, S. Forster Opposed: L. Miller, L. Cicciarelli, T. Crowley, M. Jaros Abstained: None Motion Failed

Chairman Miller next called for a motion recommending denial of the use variance, but if the ZBA does grant the use variance, that the sign conform to the current regulations governing digital signs in General Commercial districts, including one color only, one message change per day and nighttime brightness level that does not cause glare.

Motion Made:	T. Crowley
Motion Seconded:	L. Cicciarelli
MOTION:	Recommend the ZBA deny the use variance for a digital sign at 751 Farm-to-Market Road, but if the ZBA grants the use variance, the sign conform to current regulations governing digital signs in General Commercial districts.
VOTE	In Favor: S. McLain, L. Cicciarelli, S. McLain, S. Forster, T. Crowley, M. Jaros

Opposed: None
Abstained: None
Motion Carried

Ms. Kalashnik noted he was moving in the beginning of July so Ms. Lane asked him to have the church write another letter authorizing the new person who would be appearing before the ZBA.

F. H.B.E. School Conversion, 26 Kentucky Avenue, Housing Visions

Ms. Lane noted that the Planning Board is declaring Lead Agency for the environmental review for the property at 26 Kentucky Avenue only. The Village of Endicott will do a separate environmental review for 23 Jackson Avenue.

1. Declare Lead Agency

Chairman Miller asked for a motion to declare the Planning Board Lead Agency.

Motion Made: L. Cicciarelli
Motion Seconded: S. McLain
MOTION: Declare the Planning Board Lead Agency
VOTE: **In Favor:** L. Miller, L. Cicciarelli, S. McLain,
S. Forster, T. Crowley, M. Jaros
Opposed: None
Abstained: None
Motion Carried

2. Declare Project an Unlisted Action

Chairman Miller asked for a motion to declare the project an Unlisted Action under SEQRA.

Motion Made: T. Crowley
Motion Seconded: M. Jaros
MOTION: Declare the project an Unlisted Action.
VOTE: **In Favor:** L. Miller, L. Cicciarelli, S. McLain,
S. Forster, T. Crowley, M. Jaros
Opposed: None
Abstained: None
Motion Carried

G. Other Such Matters as May Properly Come Before the Board

Ms. Lane noted that Ms. DeNardis FOILed the Town for the May Planning Board minutes. Ms. Lane explained to Ms. DeNardis that the minutes are not normally released until they are accepted by the Planning Board, but had invited Ms. DeNardis to join her as she reviewed the draft minutes with the recording. Ms. Lane noted that Ms. DeNardis left after fifteen minutes and did not listen to the entire recording of the minutes.

Ms. Lane then discussed the preliminary draft of changes to the Town's sign code. Ms. Lane noted that the draft is easy to read and the proposed changes are printed in red. Mr. Cicciarelli asked Ms. Lane what prompted the changes. Ms. Lane answered that one of the things that prompted the review was that Ms. Golazeski and Ms. Lane have wanted to change the sign code to eliminate the need for variances that come before the boards repeatedly. As an example, Ms. Lane noted one proposed change would allow a total of two wall signs as long as they are on different walls. Ms. Lane stated that Ms. Golazeski and she are in favor of this change because it would not have a negative impact, and so many businesses submit applications for two signs.

Ms. Lane next addressed changes for shopping center signs. Ms. Golazeski wants to change the code for shopping center signs because it has been very difficult for her to figure out a sign's square footage in large shopping plazas. The suggested change would allow a single freestanding sign no more than 80 square feet if there are four businesses or less. An additional fifteen square feet may be added to the freestanding signs for each business over four, up to a maximum of 300 square feet.

The change for Off Premises signs was initiated by the Town Board. This change would allow off premise signs only within General Commercial and Industrial Zoning Districts and within 500 feet of the right-of-way of NYS Route 17/Interstate 86. Ms. McLain commented that change would allow signs like the gateway signs that Vestal has, and is concerned with the change that would allow these digital message signs to alter the sign message every 8 seconds. Ms. Miller and Mr. Cicciarelli noted that they were not in favor of this change either.

Mr. Crowley asked about whether there are any changes that addressed the opaque (cling) signs that many business are now using. Ms. Lane said Mr. Crowley's question was a good one and she made a note to discuss this with Ms. Golazeski.

Both Mr. Cicciarelli and Ms. Miller did not support the proposal removing the restrictions on digital signs for Fire Districts or Fire Companies. Ms. Lane said that the Endwell Fire Department on Country Club Road was asking for a digital sign. Ms. Miller noted that this was a very bad intersection and if someone was distracted by the sign there would be accidents. Mr. Cicciarelli noted that if digital signs are allowed, he wanted to make sure that the person who allows the sign should be financially responsible in litigation.

Mr. Jaros commented that the digital sign by the Town Square Mall is very distracting because most drivers have a tendency to look at it. Ms. Lane added that advertisers pay the sign company to be on the sign, and then town, by allowing it, gets a percentage of announcement time on it.

Ms. Lane noted the next change addressed nonconforming sign face changes. The proposed code allows changes to a nonconforming sign face as long as the sign structure does not change. Ms. Lane stated that the Village of Johnson City has already made this change to their sign code.

Mr. Crowley noted that he would like to see the sentence, “Per the US National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, most accidents are not caused by alcohol or speeding, but by distracted drivers, and that even a two second distraction “significantly increases individual crash risk.”” included as a code reference. Ms. Lane also would like to see guidelines for the level of brightness of illuminated signs at night added to the code. Mr. Cicciarelli asked that the Planning Board also make recommendations that internally illuminated signs use the new LED efficient bulbs.

Ms. Golazeski has also suggested that the size of monument signs be changed and that internal illumination of monument signs be permitted in commercial districts. Ms. Lane asked the Planning Board to review the changes so that they could submit their recommendations about the changes to the Town Of Union Town Board.

In other news, the Town was notified that the County is selling 1 North Page Avenue to National Pipe and Plastic. Ms. Lane explained that the Town had previously zoned that property years ago to RUM/O, Residential Urban Multi-family/Office for the prior owner when he wanted to convert it to student housing with offices on the first floor. Then the Town rezoned the property in 2011 to Urban Multi-Family, so the newly proposed office use is not permitted. Consequently, the property will go through a rezoning and then site plan review. The Town Board will be the lead agency for the rezoning procedure.

Ms. Lane noted that they have recommended that the Town Board rezone the property to Commercial Office because Commercial Office is the most restrictive Commercial zoning district and it will permit an office building. Mr. Forster asked whether they could store pipe in this zoning district and Ms. Lane answered no. Ms. Lane said that there is some remediation needed on the property to remove fuel tanks and transformer fluid that leaked onto the property. Mr. Crowley noted that National Pipe and Plastic will close the office on Commerce Road, as the new office would be located near the plant.

Mr. Jaros asked whether National Pipe and Plastic could add a fence along the other side of the building, because that is what the neighborhood would like to see.

H. Adjournment

Chairman Miller asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:27 PM

Motion Made: M. Jaros
Motion Seconded: S. Forster
MOTION: Adjourning the meeting.
VOTE: **In Favor:** S. Miller, L. Cicciarelli, S. McLain,
T. Crowley, S. Forster, M. Jaros
Opposed: None
Abstained: None
Motion Carried

Next Meeting Date

The next meeting of the Planning Board is tentatively scheduled for Tuesday, July 10, 2018, at 7:00 PM

Respectfully Submitted,
Carol Krawczyk