

Town of Union Planning Board Minutes

Tuesday, February 9, 2021

A regular meeting of the Town of Union Planning Board was held Tuesday, February 9, 2021, at 3111 E. Main Street and via Zoom Virtual Meeting Software.

Members present: L. Miller, L. Ciccirelli, S. McLain, T. Crowley,
S. Forster, M. Jaros, D. Kudgus, K. Rose (Alternate)

Others present: Marina Lane, Sara Zubalsky-Peer, Sarah Campbell, Bill Walsh,
Alex Urda, Amanda Dorrell, Mark Wanchisen, Erin Hazen, Lisa
Oliver, Jillian Pichura, Carol Layton, Trudy, and Natalie A.

A. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Miller called the meeting to order at 7:09 p.m. and called the roll of the Planning Board members. Ms. Miller noted that there was a quorum present.

Ms. Miller then read the Recommended Procedure and Executive Order regarding virtual meetings.

B. MEETING MINUTES

- Correct the second "Members present" at the top of the first page to read "Members absent."

1. Acceptance of November 10, 2020 Meeting Minutes

Chairman Miller asked for a motion to accept the November 10, 2020, Planning Board Minutes, as amended.

Motion Made: S. Forster

Motion Seconded: L. Ciccirelli

MOTION: Acceptance of the November 10, 2020, Planning Board Minutes as amended.

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

Opposed: None

Abstained: None

Motion Carried

2. Acceptance of Public Hearing Transcripts:

A. 130 Dimmock Hill Road: Special Permit for Domesticated Chickens (Poultry) in a Rural Residential Zoning District

Chairman Miller asked for a motion to accept the November 10, 2020, Public Hearing Transcript for the Special Permit for Domesticated Chickens (Poultry) in a Rural Residential Zoning District, as written.

Motion Made: S. McLain

Motion Seconded: S. Forster
MOTION: Acceptance of the November 10, 2020, Public Hearing Transcript for a Special Permit for Domesticated Chickens (Poultry) in a Rural Residential Zoning District at 130 Dimmock Hill Road, as written.
VOTE: **In Favor:** L. Miller, L. Cicciarelli, S. McLain, S. Forster, T. Crowley, M. Jaros, D. Kudgus
Opposed: None
Abstained: None
Motion Carried

B. 3901 Watson Boulevard: Special Permit to allow Fill in the 100-Year Floodplain

Chairman Miller asked for a motion to accept the November 10, 2020, Public Hearing Transcript for a Special Permit for Fill in the 100-Year Floodplain at 3901 Watson Boulevard, as written.

Motion Made: S. McLain
Motion Seconded: M. Jaros
MOTION: Acceptance of the November 10, 2020, Public Hearing Transcript for a Special Permit for Fill in the 100-Year Floodplain at 3901 Watson Boulevard, as written.
VOTE: **In Favor:** L. Miller, L. Cicciarelli, S. McLain, S. Forster, T. Crowley, M. Jaros, D. Kudgus
Opposed: None
Abstained: None
Motion Carried

C. NYSEG Gas Regulator Station Replacement, 518 Day Hollow Road, Dan Wiser

1. Site Plan Review

Ms. Lane noted that most of the Planning Board members had heard about the project in November when the Planning Board voted on an advisory opinion for the setback variances for the project. However, Ms. Lane was the only one who actually presented at that meeting. Consequently, she asked Mr. Wanchisen, a NYSEG representative, to give a brief summary of the project.

Mr. Wanchisen explained that the property at 518 Day Hollow Road has a gas regulator station with two buildings on it, and each building has one gas regulator. NYSEG is consolidating those two buildings into one building. The project includes an upgrade to a much safer style of regulator, which can

automatically communicate with the NYSEG Energy Control Center in Vestal on Murray Hill Road.

Ms. Lane had met with Dan Wiser in November and she was able to see a regulator station that is already in operation. The gas regulator is located in a cabinet-looking building, and gas is piped underground into the building. Mr. Wanchisen explained that a gas regulator takes a higher pressure of gas and brings it down to a lower pressure of gas. Ms. Lane commented that there is also gas piped out to the rear of the building. Mr. Wanchisen explained that the gas piped out through the rear of the building passes through a pressure release valve just in case the regulator fails for any reason. If a gas regulator failed, it would be devastating to the downstream customers that it serves. Every house has a gashouse regulator built into its system. If the NYSEG gas regulator station failed, it would override a house regulator because there would be more capacity than the house could handle. Mr. Wanchisen added that about a year ago many houses were blown up in Boston when a gas regulator station failed. Consequently, it is important to have a pressure relief valve at all regulator stations.

Mr. Wanchisen described the antenna system and the remote monitoring of the station. The site will include a 35-foot wooden pole with an antenna that will communicate with the Energy Control Center in Vestal. Should anything happen at the regulator station, NYSEG will get an annunciator at the Murray Hill office. Once the annunciator is received, it will set off an alarm in the Energy Control Center in Vestal to automatically dispatch gas fitters to the Day Hollow Road Station to resolve any issues.

Ms. Lane then read her report for the Planning Board. The Zoning Board of Appeals approved two side setback variances at their January 18, 2021, meeting. The precise placement of the building will depend on conditions on the ground at the time of installation, but will be no closer than five-feet from the east property sideline and no closer than ten-feet to the west property sideline.

The site does not require water or sewer facilities; however, a new underground electrical service will be required. The existing 30-foot wood pole within the site will be replaced with a new wood pole of similar size, be equipped with a radio antenna resulting in an overall pole/antenna height of approximately 32 feet and relocated to the far rear of the site. Natural gas lines extend into the property, and the enclosure for the regulator station is already fenced in. There is one existing parking space / driveway on the property. There will be a temporary increase of noise during construction, and when in operation, the gas regulator building emits a hissing sound that is mitigated by directing building vents toward the road and rear of the property, away from adjacent residences. Noise from the safety release valves will be minor, largely due to the distance between them and any residences. There is a single light outside the building that will be turned on only when the regulator is being serviced, and one inside the building.

The applicant's proposal was classified as an Unlisted Action under the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA), and the Planning Board issued a Negative Declaration on November 10, 2020. The resulting site shall have more green space than pre-construction, and only 0.5-acre of soil will be disturbed. Contractors shall follow standard stormwater and erosion control measures during construction.

This location was subject to a 239-Review as it is on County Route 60, Day Hollow Road. The Broome County Planning Department did not identify any countywide impacts, nor did BMTS, NYS DOT, BC DPW, or the BC Health Department.

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

- 1) The contractor shall utilize erosion control and stormwater runoff preventative measures during construction.
- 2) The contractor shall apply for a Highway Work Permit from the Town of Union Highway Department prior to any work within the sidewalk. The sidewalk must be restored and noted deficiencies corrected in accordance with Town Standards by October 15 of the year in which the sidewalk has been restored.
- 3) The contractor should be advised that any work within the County right-of-way will require a Highway Work Permit issued by the Broome County Highway Department.
- 4) Prior to the installation of an antenna on the wooden pole, an application for minor site plan review shall be submitted to the Planning Department.
- 5) For any new signage, the applicant shall first apply for a sign permit from the Building Official prior to display. All temporary signs shall be reviewed and approved by the Code Enforcement Office prior to being placed on the property.
- 6) Per 300-55.4, General Requirements,
 - A. All outdoor lighting fixtures shall be shielded or otherwise contained on the property from which it originates (known as "light trespass limitations").
 - B. To minimize the indiscriminate use of illumination, lighting, except as required for security, shall be extinguished during non-operating hours. Where practicable, lighting installations are encouraged to include timers, sensors, and dimmers to reduce energy consumption and unnecessary lighting.
- 7) The Code Enforcement Officer shall review and approve any new exterior lighting prior to installation on site.

8) The fence shall be maintained in a safe, sound and upright condition. Per 300-54.15, if ever replaced in the future, the fence shall have its finished or decorative side facing the adjacent properties. The fence posts and other supporting structures of the fence shall face the interior of the area to be fenced.

9) The property shall be maintained in a neat and orderly manner.

10) The site plan shall be officially approved once the Planning Board Chair has stamped and signed the final site plan.

11) A Certificate of Occupancy shall be required before occupancy of the new building.

12) Site plan approval shall expire after one year, unless substantial improvements have been made pursuant to the approved site plan and a valid building permit. The Planning Board may extend the approval upon request.

13) The applicant shall be required to acknowledge all of the above conditions, in writing, prior to the issuance of an excavation or building permit. The applicant agrees to construct the project in strict accordance with the site plan approved by the Planning Board. Changes to the site plan following approval may require a minor site plan review or resubmittal to the Planning Board, depending on the degree of change per Section 300-63.2. Applicability.

Mr. Forster asked Mr. Wanchisen what the low pressure and the high pressure are for the Regulator Building. Mr. Wanchisen replied that he believed 60 PSI is the high pressure and 15 PSI is the low pressure. He added that PSI for a house gas regulator is only one quarter of one pound.

Chairman Miller then asked for a motion to approve the Site Plan for the NYSEG Gas Regulator Station at 518 Day Hollow Road.

Motion Made: D. Kudgus

Motion Seconded: L. Cicciarelli

MOTION: Approval of the Site Plan for the NYSEG Gas Regulator Station at 518 Day Hollow Road, with stipulations.

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

Opposed: None

Abstained: None

Motion Carried

D. Highland Green HOA, 2990 Pleasant Drive, Use Variance, for Accessory Shed without a Principal Use, Amanda Dorrell

1. Advisory Opinion to the Zoning Board of

Amanda Dorrell, a Board Member of the Highland Green HOA, gave a short presentation about the project. The use variance request is for a shed on the Homeowner Association's property. The shed will be used to house a snow

blower for the association's use. Ms. Lane explained that code does not allow an accessory building on a lot without a principal building, so the Highland Green HOA has applied for a use variance because the accessory building alone is not permitted. Ms. Dorrell had sent some quotes for snowplowing and Ms. Lane forwarded the quotes to the Planning Board members.

Ms. Lane then read her staff report. Ms. Dorrell applied on behalf of the Highland Green HOA to install a 10-foot by 12-foot accessory shed at 2990 Pleasant Drive. The 4.71-acre parcel is zoned Urban Single Family and a storage shed is not defined as a principal use. Therefore, they are requesting a use variance to permit the accessory building on the lot without a principal building or use.

The property, 2990 Pleasant Drive, surrounds the individual lots that comprise the Highland Green Subdivision on Patio Drive. None of the lots on which there are homes within the development is large enough to fit the shed, let alone meet required setbacks. The Homeowners' Association would like a central location for the general storage of materials and equipment associated with maintaining the development.

In order to prove such unnecessary hardship the applicant shall demonstrate to the board of appeals that for each and every permitted use under the zoning regulations for the particular district where the property is located,

- (1) the applicant cannot realize a reasonable return,
- (2) that the alleged hardship relating to the property is unique,
- (3) that the requested use will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood, and
- (4) that the alleged hardship has not been self-created.

The Planning Department staff recommends that the Planning Board recommend to the ZBA approval of the use variance to permit the shed without a principal use on 2990 Pleasant Drive. It is not practical for the Homeowners' Association to build a principle building on the irregularly shaped property at 2990 Pleasant Drive; therefore, it cannot reasonably be used for any principal use permitted in the Urban Single-Family zoning district. The shed does not change the character of the neighborhood. This situation is unique in that the shed is intended for use by an association, not a specific resident.

The only solution that would not require a use variance would be for 313 Patio Drive to acquire the portion of land on which the shed sits, and grant easements for the association to have access to the shed and the drainage system around the development. It would be more practical to consider the Homeowners' Association as an entire entity with a number of principal buildings, and grant the use variance.

The Planning Board members had several questions about the project. Mr. Cicciarelli asked how members would access the shed since the shed is located in the back of the development. Ms. Dorrell answered that the

association had built a bridge over the swale and a pathway to access the shed. The shed will be used to store snow maintenance equipment for the association's use. Ms. Dorrell explained that they have snow removal contractors but they are not reliable, and the cost for the outside contractors often reached over \$2,000 for one day's snow removal. The driveway shoveling is the responsibility of the Homeowners Association, the Association owns the driveways, so they were responsible for the residents having access to medical care at all times. Mr. Cicciarelli asked if the shed would be used for any other purpose and Ms. Dorrell answered not at this time. Mr. Cicciarelli asked if fuel for the snow equipment would be stored in the shed. Ms. Dorrell answered that the Association is looking at getting the ULFM gas container to store the gas for the equipment. The container will meet OSHA standards, so it will be compliant. Mr. Cicciarelli asked if there would be any storage outside of the shed, and Ms. Dorrell answered that there will be no storage outside the shed. Ms. Dorrell noted that the Association is very mindful of the aesthetics of the property, and that they have actually cleaned out debris that others have put on the property. Ms. Dorrell concluded that they would definitely not be storing anything outside of the shed.

Chairman Miller asked for a motion to recommend approval by the ZBA for the Use Variance for an accessory structure without a principal use at 2990 Pleasant Drive.

Motion Made:	L. Cicciarelli
Motion Seconded:	D. Kudgus
MOTION:	Recommendation of approval by the ZBA of a Use Variance for an accessory structure at 2990 Pleasant Drive without a principal use.
VOTE:	In Favor: L. Miller, L. Cicciarelli, S. McLain, T. Crowley, M. Jaros, D. Kudgus Opposed: None Absent: Scott Forster signed in at 7:30 p.m., but was not present at the time of this vote. Motion Carried

E. Homestead Village PUD Development Plan, Bill Walsh, Homestead Village Development Group

1. Revoke 2020 approval due to change in use included in the Proposed Development

Ms. Lane explained that in the fall of 2020, the Planning Board approved a new Final Homestead Village PUD Development Plan. Subsequently, the developer of 16 Beech Street decided that he was not going to build at that site, which means that the approved development plan no longer applies. As

a result, the Planning Board should revoke the Homestead Village PUD Development Plan associated with the 16 Beech Street project.

Chairman Miller then asked for a motion to revoke the Final 2020 Homestead Village PUD Development Plan approval due to a change in use included in the approved development.

Motion Made:	D. Kudgus
Motion Seconded:	L. Cicciarelli
MOTION:	Approval to revoke the Final 2020 Homestead Village PUD Development Plan approval due to a change in use included in the approved development.
VOTE:	In Favor: L. Miller, L. Cicciarelli, S. McLain, S. Forster, T. Crowley, M. Jaros, D. Kudgus Opposed: None Abstained: None Motion Carried

2. Advisory Opinion to the Town Board regarding addition of a Battery Storage Facility in the Homestead Village PUD

Erin Hazen gave a presentation about the project. GlidePath has partnered with Bill Walsh for this project. Energy storage is a new technology and it is worth taking the time to understand what the benefits of energy storage are.

The project will be located on Robinson Hill Road, which is part of the existing Homestead Village PUD. The entrance will be directly across from the NYSEG Oakdale Substation, and GlidePath will interconnect to that substation. The battery storage project will host a 120 megawatts Battery Storage facility. To put that in perspective, 120MW would support about 12,000 homes with full power. Like an electric substation, the battery storage facility is operated remotely and it responds to signals from the grid. It is an unmanned facility and is monitored 24/7. The facility will not put a burden on the town's roads, sewers, or schools. The facility will not generate any air or water pollution. There will be noise generation from HVAC units used to cool the storage cabinets. GlidePath has done tests and the noise is comparable to the ambient sound levels in the area, so it will be a quiet facility, as well. The lighting will be on one pole at the gate used for security purposes. A traffic study has been done and will be presented when the site plan is reviewed.

Energy Storage is a critical part of New York State's plan to transform the electrical grid to clean and renewal energy. Energy storage will enhance the efficiency of the electric grid to better integrate renewable energy resources by deploying stored energy where it is needed most. The energy storage facility allows excess energy from wind and solar projects to be stored and levels things out for the sake of the grid. The benefits of the battery storage

plants will be to smooth out voltage and frequency faults in the electric grid, thereby eliminating power outages. The use of battery storage will also eliminate harmful pollutants from the air and water by replacing fossil fuel based “peaker plants.” Ms. Hazen explained that it takes peaker plants 10 minutes to supply energy to the grid, whereas the battery storage facility does this same function in milliseconds with no fuel, no water and no emissions. In addition, since peaker plants disproportionately harm disadvantaged communities, the battery energy storage is one step towards environmental justice. Ms. Hazen added that GlidePath received an endorsement letter from the New York League of Conservation Voters for the energy storage project.

Mr. Alex Urda, engineer for the PUD site plan, gave a short presentation. The 10-acre site for the Battery Storage facility is in the upper northeast corner of the Homestead Village PUD. The PUD plan has to be reviewed by the Planning Board any time the Homestead Village PUD is modified. As Ms. Lane mentioned, the change in the PUD Development Plan for 16 Beech Street is revoked, but the addition of 12 Beech Street will remain in the proposed PUD to correct an error from the past. The new addition to the Homestead Village PUD will be the battery storage facility. Ms. Lane added that the battery storage project is considered a Public Utility Facility, which is the new use proposed for the Homestead Village PUD Development Plan.

Ms. Lisa Oliver of Fisher Associates reviewed the environmental impacts for the Planning Board. The actual site has a steep grade from the north to the south so GlidePath is looking at terracing the site. The access road to the site will come in from Robinson Hill Road. A stream runs along that public road which GlidePath will avoid as much as possible. The stormwater runoff will be captured in a bio-retention basin, per DEC requirements. There are no wetlands on the site that will be impacted. There are no cultural or historic resources that will be impacted. Ms. Hazen added that GlidePath is committed to maintaining as much wooded area on the site as possible. There will be significant vegetative screening on all four sides of the site.

The Planning Board had several questions about the project. Mr. Cicciarelli asked if there was a possibility of the batteries leaking within the cabinets. Ms. Hazen answered that they are packaged in redundant layers held in individual modules. There are no liquids in the batteries so there is no opportunity for a spill. Ms. Hazen noted the units are monitored 24/7, so if any individual cell was compromised, a message would be triggered to the 24-hour operational center and the maintenance facility would be contacted. If there were a serious fault within a module, it would disconnect itself automatically from the grid to make sure that the situation was stable. Ms. Miller asked how close the maintenance facilities are to the site. Ms. Hazen answered that GlidePath operates regional maintenance centers, and GlidePath requires a response from the maintenance facilities within two hours. Mr. Kudgus asked if there were any other battery facilities in the area. Ms. Hazen responded that she is not aware of what other facilities have been installed in the area, but there are storage facilities being installed all over New York State. Mr. Kudgus also

asked what kind of emissions would be released in case there was a fire. Ms. Hazen noted that all electrical equipment carries the risk of fire, and the system is designed with fire suppression systems to prevent a fire from propagating beyond one cell. The constituents of the battery have been studied and they are similar to the emissions from a Class A fire. Ms. Lane added that the Planning Board had already approved battery storage at the AES Westover site and there were never any incidents there. Mr. Jaros asked if GlidePath has ever had any safety incidents at their other facilities, and Ms. Hazen answered that they have had no safety or fire incidents at their other operating projects.

Ms. Sarah Campbell, the attorney for GlidePath, reviewed what will happen next for the project. This is the first of many steps for the project. The next step is a Public Hearing with the Town Board on February 17, 2020; and sometime before that meeting, we are hoping that Broome County will come back with their comments. If the Town Board favorably accepts the project, then the project will come back to the Planning Board on March 9, 2020, for site plan review. At that time, we will discuss the lighting fixtures and fencing in more depth. Ms. Campbell noted that GlidePath has buried the project behind trees so it will not be visible from the road. GlidePath has conducted a number of studies for the project, and the Planning Board will have an opportunity to review the studies during the site plan review. Ms. Campbell noted the Planning Board will provide input on the fence that will surround the site. Ms. Lane asked if the fence would be a chain link fence, and Ms. Hazen answered that there will be a security fence with privacy slats. Mr. Cicciarelli asked if the project would encroach on the land of the Robinson Hill Nursery. Ms. Hazen answered that the project will not encroach on the nursery and that she has already been in touch with the nursery owner.

Ms. Hazen said that there will be a website that the public can access to get any information they want. Ms. Campbell said that often people are afraid of issues that they do not understand, and the website will make the project totally transparent. Ms. Lane said that the main point is that the battery storage facility is a grid stabilization project. When the Planning Board reviewed the battery storage project at AES Westover, she learned that a big part of the fluctuations in electricity are due to wind and solar energy, which is generated based on what the environment is providing. The battery storage will capture and save all those fluctuations in energy and strengthen the grid.

Ms. Hazen added that one of the things that drives building new transmission lines is peak demand. The grid has to have enough capacity in the wires to match that peak demand. By having energy storage on the grid we can change that peak. For example, even though everyone in town is running their dishwashers, energy storage is leveling out that demand, so that we are not pulling from the grid and not pulling from the wires. The benefit of not having to go through the transmission wires for that one peak allows us to shave the peak, and eliminates the need for more transmission wires.

Mr. Jaros asked if Ms. Hazen was talking about grid stabilization locally. She answered that the grid stabilization is regional, but the immediate effects are local. Mr. Cicciarelli asked whether this would enable the growth of wind and solar projects in the area since the project is tapping into the NYSEG substation. Ms. Hazen answered that the project will set the groundwork for the grid being able to accept more wind and more solar. Mr. Forster asked if the big winner in all this was NYSEG. Ms. Hazen answered that rate payers of New York will be the winners by having a more stable grid, fewer blackouts, more efficient production of electricity, and less air and water pollution. Mr. Jaros asked whether the regional benefits would be for the Southern Tier. Ms. Hazen noted that the project will strengthen the entire grid, but that the benefits are concentrated closer to the facility. Therefore, the grid in Broome County will be strengthened. Mr. Jaros commented that his understanding is that the electricity goes where it is needed, and Ms. Hazen agreed with this. Ms. Lane noted that electrons are on a super highway interconnected all over the place, and you cannot stop electrons from going from one county to another. Ms. Hazen compared the process to the pressurized plumbing system in a home. Ms. Hazen noted that when a homeowner turns on a particular faucet, that is where the water goes.

Ms. Lane then read her staff report for the Planning Board. The Town of Union received an application from Homestead Village Development Group, LLC for a new Homestead Village Planned Unit Development (PUD) Plan located at 4101 Watson Boulevard, 4311 Watson Boulevard, the Homestead Village Subdivision, 13 Beech Street and 16 Beech Street. The proposed PUD includes the addition of an energy storage facility on 9.66-acres of 4311 Watson Boulevard, a 256-acre lot extending north between Watson Boulevard and Robinson Hill Road. Oakdale Battery Storage, LLC proposes a 120 MW commercial Battery Energy Storage System, which would connect to the grid at the NYSEG substation across the road on Robinson Hill Road. The purpose is to provide stability to the electrical grid by storing or discharging electricity as needed.

The batteries would be maintained in 116 steel battery cabinets on concrete pads or piers. The battery cabinets are 8-feet by 53-feet, and 9-feet tall. Each container includes integrated chiller systems to provide ventilation and cooling. The containers have sensors within for emergencies.

The amendment includes formally adding 12 Beech Street (#142.07-1-6.2) into the PUD, as it should have originally been included. A PUD, for everyone's information, requires a minimum of ten acres, a minimum of two uses and the uses have to be approved by the Town Board. So every PUD is a different type of a development. Greater than twenty-five percent (25%) of the total property has been dedicated for open space, as required. These amendments to the PUD require the submittal of a new Preliminary PUD Development Plan. All the properties are zoned PUD and the uses are permitted. In PUD zoning districts, only specific uses are prohibited and that

allows greater flexibility in development plans, unlike other zoning categories where typically you have a list of specific uses that are permitted or prohibited.

Planning staff recommends the Planning Board recommend to the Town Board approval of the new Homestead Village PUD Preliminary Development Plan to include construction of the energy storage facility, classified as a public utility facility per Code. The subsequent new 421.3-acre Planned Unit Development would include the following mixed uses: a townhouse residential development, a hotel and conference center including a golf course, office use, and a public utility facility.

There is an existing public utility facility, the Oakdale substation, across the road on Robinson Hill Road, one house to the south that will be screened with significant landscaping, and a large landscaping material supply company to the north. The remainder of the area is wooded. The proposed facility will not have a significant impact on the adjacent properties.

In addition, planning staff recommends approval of the formal inclusion of 12 Beech Street, a dental office use, into the Homestead Village PUD Development Plan to correct a former oversight.

Chairman Miller asked for a motion to recommend the Town Board approve the addition of the Battery Storage Facility to the Homestead Village PUD.

Motion Made:	T. Crowley
Motion Seconded:	S. McLain
MOTION:	Recommend the Town Board approve the addition of the Battery Storage Facility to the Preliminary Homestead Village PUD Development Plan.
VOTE:	In Favor: L. Miller, L. Cicciarelli, S. McLain, T. Crowley, S. Forster, M. Jaros, D. Kudgus Opposed: None Abstained: None Motion Carried

F. The K-9 District Dog Daycare, 4324 Watson Boulevard, Kassandre Murdock

1. Declare Lead Agency

Chairman Miller then asked for a motion to Declare Lead Agency

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

Motion Carried

2. Classify as a Type II Action

Chairman Miller then asked for a motion to Classify the Action as a Type II Action

Motion Made: D. Kudgus
Motion Seconded: T. Crowley
MOTION: Approval to Classify the Project as a Type II Action.
VOTE: **In Favor:** L. Miller, L. Cicciarelli, S. McLain, T. Crowley, S. Forster, M. Jaros, D. Kudgus
Opposed: None
Abstained: None
Motion Carried

3. Call for Public Hearing for Development in the 100-Year Floodplain at 7:00 p.m. on March 9, 2021.

Chairman Miller then asked for a motion to call for a Public Hearing for Development in the Floodplain on March 9, 2021, at 7:00 p.m.

Motion Made: L. Cicciarelli
Motion Seconded: M. Jaros
MOTION: Approval of the motion for a Public Hearing for Floodplain Development on March 9, 2021 at 7:00 p.m.
VOTE: **In Favor:** L. Miller, L. Cicciarelli, S. McLain, T. Crowley, S. Forster, M. Jaros, D. Kudgus
Opposed: None
Abstained: None
Motion Carried

Ms. Lane gave a brief summary of the project. She reminded the Planning Board that they had approved the truck repair business at 4324 Watson Boulevard for Aaron Colvin. Gates Doors used to be in the front of this property and the applicants want to move their dog daycare business in there. Ms. Lane feels that the project is a good fit for this building because even if it were to flood, they do not need to move a lot of equipment; they can exit the property very easily. The owners had a dog daycare business in Johnson City and there were never any complaints about the business. The business will have training, grooming and daycare. There are no residents near the site, which makes the location ideal for this dog daycare business.

G. Other Such Matters as may properly come before the Board

Ms. Lane asked for a recommendation for the Planning Board Vice-Chairperson. Mr. Forster stated he would recommend Mr. Cicciarelli for Vice-Chairperson of the Planning Board.

Ms. Miller called for a motion to recommend Mr. Cicciarelli as Vice-Chairperson of the Planning Board.

Motion Made: D. Kudgus
Motion Seconded: S. Forster
MOTION: Recommendation for Mr. Cicciarelli to be the Vice-Chairperson of the Planning Board.
VOTE: In Favor: L. Miller, L. Cicciarelli, S. McLain, S. Forster, T. Crowley, M. Jaros, D. Kudgus
Opposed: None
Abstained: None

H. Adjournment

Chairman Miller asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:27 p.m.

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

Next Meeting Date

The next meeting of the Planning Board is tentatively scheduled for Tuesday, March 9, 2021, at 7:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,
Carol Krawczyk