

## **Town of Union Planning Board Minutes**

Tuesday, September 21, 2021

The Town of Union Planning Board held a regular meeting on Tuesday, September 21, 2021, at the Town of Union Office Building, 3111 East Main Street, Endwell, New York.

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

Members absent: S. McLain

Others present: Marina Lane, Rick Materese, Carmen DiDiano, Robert Quick, Sara Loomis, Jared Cornell, Bryan Pert, Maryanne Burke, John Kunzman

### **A. CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Miller called the meeting to order at 7:06 p.m.

### **B. MEETING MINUTES:** Postponed

### **C. 2705 & 2713 East Main Street, AutoZone Addition and Transparency Area Variance, Carmen DiDiano**

Mr. Carmen DiDiano, the project manager for the AutoZone addition project, gave a short presentation. Pending site plan approval, AutoZone intends to purchase 2713 East Main Street and consolidate 2705 and 2713 East Main Street into one lot for a 9,300 square-foot addition attached directly to the existing AutoZone store. This will give them a total footprint of 17,923 square-feet. This AutoZone is intended to be what is known as a hub store. It will have four times the normal inventory of a standard AutoZone store. It is intended to serve as a central point for other AutoZone stores within a certain geographical area. This expanded store will provide the largest selection of auto parts for public and commercial use. The store will still function as a retail store in front, but the addition will be used to store additional auto parts for other AutoZone stores and general commercial customers.

All the utilities are adequate for the proposed addition. There are no changes to sanitary or water and there will be no additional plumbing. The electric, gas, and phone systems will be upgraded to reflect the new location and slightly larger size. Stormwater flow will be managed by an underground system that will be constructed at the rear of the proposed addition and will drain into the existing system. AutoZone is requesting an area variance from the 40% window transparency requirement. They propose three spandrel glass windows, with glass in the front and a solid wall behind, on the front of the new addition.

AutoZone has made a submittal to NYDOT for the first round of comments for the driveways. The two existing driveways at 2713 East Main Street will be closed and one new driveway will be added. Per a NYS DOT requirement, there will also be a pedestrian walkway across the shortest distance from the public sidewalk to the front door of the building. Mr. DiDiano discussed the pedestrian walkway with

AutoZone and they are in agreement with the public access. Mr. DiDiano noted that they were able to relocate the two parking spaces that they lost in the front to the rear of the building so that they still meet the parking requirement. Mr. Forster asked Mr. DiDiano what percent of sales come from people walking in for parts. Mr. DiDiano said that it is a very small percentage. He added that this requirement will not impact their ability to operate the business so they are comfortable about putting in the public access if that will satisfy the NYDOT, and AutoZone recognizes that accessibility is important. AutoZone has contractors who normally build their stores and these contractors use local subcontractors and local suppliers for the project.

The Planning Board members had some questions. Mr. Crowley asked Mr. DiDiano how much extra tractor-trailer traffic would be generated with the addition. AutoZone anticipates that the new hub store would have three to four additional deliveries a week from their semi tractor-trailer trucks. They will increase the inventory they have to satisfy the normal customer but they will also carry specialty items. Mr. Crowley asked how much traffic would be generated by small trucks making deliveries to other AutoZone stores. Mr. DiDiano explained that typically the hub store is designed to serve a radius of 25 miles which will include anywhere from eight to twelve AutoZone stores. The small truck deliveries only occur once a week so you will not see much of an increase in the traffic. Mr. Crowley asked if they also supply repair shops. Mr. DiDiano answered that they already serve some repair shops and they hope that this business will increase with more inventory available. Ms. Lane noted that even if small delivery trucks come in once an hour it would not cause a large increase in the traffic. Mr. Jaros asked where the nearest hub store is located. Mr. DiDiano answered that they have one in Ohio, one in central Pennsylvania; and he noted that these hubs have become a bigger focal point for AutoZone because they are the country's biggest retailer of auto parts in the country.

Ms. Rose asked how long the construction would take. Mr. DiDiano answered that usually construction takes between 70 and 90 days. If AutoZone can get all of the approvals for the project, he projects ground breaking in the spring and the hub would be operating by early summer.

## **1. Declare Lead Agency**

Chairman Miller asked for a motion to Declare Lead Agency.

Motion Made:	T. Crowley
Motion Seconded:	D. Kudgus
MOTION:	Declare the Planning Board as Lead Agency.
VOTE:	<b>In Favor:</b> L. Miller, D. Kudgus, T. Crowley S. Forster, M. Jaros, K. Rose <b>Opposed:</b> None <b>Abstained:</b> None Motion Carried

## **2. Classify the Project as an Unlisted Action**

Chairman Miller asked for a motion to classify the Project as an Unlisted Action.

Motion Made: D. Kudgus  
Motion Seconded: M. Jaros  
MOTION: Classify Project as an Unlisted Action.  
VOTE: **In Favor:** L. Miller, D. Kudgus, T. Crowley,  
S. Forster, M. Jaros, K. Rose  
**Opposed:** None  
**Abstained:** None  
Motion Carried

### 3. SEQRA Determination

Having reviewed Part 1 of the Environmental Assessment Form (EAF), Ms. Lane explained that she had asked the applicant to update the description of the action. The following was added: "Project requires zoning relief from Chapter 300:56.3B to allow 13.6% non-transparent glazing in the front wall of the new addition in lieu of the required 40% transparency." Ms. Lane then reviewed Part II of the EAF and all the environment impacts were assessed as small to none.

Ms. Lane read the Determination of Significance for the Planning Board. "AutoZone Retail Auto Parts submitted a proposal to construct a 9,334 square-foot warehouse addition on an existing 8,589 square-foot retail building, combining 2705 and 2713 E. Main Street, and the retail and accessory warehouse use is permitted in the General Commercial zoning district. The existing building at 2713 E. Main Street will be demolished and the site will be cleared of existing debris, which is a positive impact.

The proposal includes a request for a variance from the 40% transparency requirement on the front facade of new commercial construction. The combined existing transparent windows and proposed non-transparent spandrel glazing will comprise 49% of the total frontage, and shall effectively meet the spirit of the Code requirement.

The combined 2.009-acre property will have the required 72 parking spaces including existing accessible spaces. There are already delivery loading spaces in the rear of the existing retail store. The entrances and exits along E. Main Street shall meet NYS DOT requirements. The warehouse use will not generate a significant amount of traffic over that which currently visits the store.

As the properties have been developed for many years, the project will have no impact on wildlife and flora. There will be no significant impacts from odors, noise, or lighting, and the project will not impact utilities. The site is not in a floodplain or other environmentally sensitive area.

A stormwater remediation system is proposed on the new property, which will drain into the Town's storm sewer system. The stormwater mitigation study has been submitted for review and approval prior to construction.

This property is located within the buffer area of the NYS DEC remediation site #704038, the Endicott Area-Wide Investigation, but is not directly impacted by the contamination.

Upon close review, the project as proposed will not have a significant adverse impact upon the environment.”

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

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

#### **4. Advisory Opinion on Transparency Variance of 40% Transparency Requirement**

AutoZone proposes to construct a 9,334 square-foot warehouse addition to the existing 8,589 square-foot AutoZone building over two properties, 2705 and 2713 E. Main Street. The properties are zoned General Commercial (GC), and retail sales is a permitted use. Per Code, Section 300-56.3, all new commercial construction shall provide areas of transparency equal to 40% of the wall area on street-side facades.

The proposed street-side facade provides three faux windows (non-transparent spandrel glass) over 13.6% of the façade of the new addition. AutoZone is seeking a variance of the 40% transparency requirement, as they intend to use the interior of the street side of the proposed addition for wall-mounted merchandise.

Planning Department staff recommend the Planning Board issue an advisory opinion to the Zoning Board of Appeals recommending approval of the 40% transparency variance to include the proposed non-transparent spandrel windows in lieu of transparent windows.

When considering the entire proposed final facade facing the street, the total wall area facing East Main Street would be 2,231 square-feet (11'-6" high by 194'-0" long).

The total existing transparency glazing is 793.5 square-feet (11'-6" high by 69'-0" long), which equals 35.57% of the total final proposed wall area (2,231 square-feet).

The additional proposed non-transparent spandrel glazing with 3 window units at 12'-6" wide by 8'-0" high on the additional equals 300 square-feet of non-

transparent glazing, which would be 13.6% of the total wall area (2,231 square-feet).

- In total, the 793.5 square-feet of existing transparent glazing plus 300 square-feet of new spandrel glazing equals 1,093.5 square-feet, or 49.0% of the total wall area (2,231 square-feet).
- The cumulative area of transparent window and non-transparent spandrel glass exceeds the 40% transparency requirement.

When considering the area variance, the proposed solution for remediating the necessary solid walls for storage purposes is similar to the auto parts supply building across the street.”

Because there are several new members on the Planning Board, Ms. Lane explained her justification for the variance. She explained that this is an area variance, which is not as stringent as a use variance. Under an area variance, the ZBA would consider whether this will cause an undesirable change in the neighborhood, and it will not; whether the benefit sought by the applicant can be achieved by some other method, and in this case the spandrel glass is the other method; whether the requested area variance is substantial and Ms. Lane does not believe it is; and whether the variance will have an adverse effect on the environmental conditions of the neighborhood, and it would not. Lastly, they would consider whether the alleged difficulty was self-created. Since the whole purpose of the addition is for storage, they will need to use the walls, and so technically the difficulty is self-created, but justifiable.

Chairman Miller asked for a motion to recommend the ZBA approve the variance of the 40% transparency requirement.

Motion Made:	T. Crowley
Motion Seconded:	D. Kudgus
MOTION:	Recommendation the ZBA approve the variance of the 40% transparency requirement.
VOTE:	<b>In Favor:</b> L. Miller, D. Kudgus, S. Forster, T. Crowley, M. Jaros, K. Rose
	<b>Opposed:</b> None
	<b>Absent:</b> None
	Motion Carried

Ms. Lane explained to the applicant that the ZBA meeting is scheduled for October 25, 2021, before the November 9, 2021, Planning Board meeting. Mr. DiDiano said he will be able to attend both of these meetings.

**D. 1713 Farm-to-Market Road, Accessory Structure without Principal Structure,**  
Robert Quick

Mr. Robert Quick explained that he owns 1713 Farm-to-Market Road. It is a flag lot, just over 43.4 acres. The vacant property is located behind residences on both Farm-to-Market and Twist Run roads.

Since 2017, he has cleared several acres of the overgrown land, built a driveway, leveled places for a home and a barn, and installed underground electric from the street to a panel near where the house will be built. His plan has been to have the driveway, power, septic, well and barn in place by the fall of 2022 and then to start building the house in 2024.

He is requesting a variance to build the barn prior to building the primary residence. While building the home, he needs a place, out of the weather and safe from theft, to store materials, tools, and equipment. The location is not visible from either road or from the neighboring residences, which poses a substantial security risk during construction.

Mr. Quick has observed several unknown individuals trespassing on his property via trail cameras. On another occasion in August 2020, a thief stole over \$20,000 worth of tools and supplies from a construction site on Twist Run Road. With no visible vehicle traffic, no neighboring residences to deter would-be trespassers, and no place to lock tools and supplies, he is limited in his ability to protect himself from loss. He is applying for the variance to build the barn first so that he can protect over \$150,000 in tools, equipment and building materials.

In addition, Mr. Quick also requested a variance for the barn, an accessory building, to be located forward of the principal building in relation to both Farm-to-Market and Twist Run roads. The barn location is approximately 197-feet south of the primary residence. In addition to being out of view from the road, he chose the location so that the barn would not be visible from the home. In order to achieve this, the barn will have to be situated approximately 79-feet forward of the house relative to Farm-to-Market Road.

#### **1. Advisory Opinion on Use Variance to allow accessory building without a principal building**

Ms. Lane noted that normally the Planning Board does not give an advisory opinion on area variances for residential properties, but they do give advisory opinions to the Zoning Board on use variances.

Mr. Quick received a letter from Town Attorney Pope approving his request to put in private septic and well rather than public utilities because Broome County would not permit him to extend the laterals across Farm-to-Market Road, having just paved the road. Ms. Lane had consulted with Code about building the barn prior to the principal residence, and was told that when someone demonstrates clear proof that they are going to build the home, it's reasonable to allow the accessory structure be built for storage of related material.

Ms. Lane then read her recommendations to the Planning Board. "The Planning Department staff recommends that the Planning Board recommend to the ZBA approval of the use variance to permit the barn without a principal use on 1713 Farm-to-Market Road. The intent is to build that structure. The applicant has invested a significant amount of resources on the project, including time, effort, and financially for professional building plans for both

structures, a septic system plan, and the installation of electric approximately 400-feet into the property from Farm-to-Market Road.

The Planning Department also recommends the Planning Board recommend to the ZBA approval of the area variance to allow the accessory barn to be built forward of the house. The ordinance requiring accessory structures be to the side or rear of the property is based only on aesthetics, not any building code requirement. The barn will not be visible from the public, and the location is proposed specifically to screen it from the public.”

Chairman Miller asked for a motion to recommend the ZBA approve the variance to allow an accessory building without a principal building.

Motion Made: S. Forster  
Motion Seconded: T. Crowley  
MOTION: Recommendation that the ZBA approve the variance to allow an accessory structure without a principal building.  
VOTE: **In Favor:** L. Miller, D. Kudgus, S. Forster, T. Crowley, M. Jaros, K. Rose  
**Opposed:** None  
**Absent:** None  
Motion Carried

## **2. Advisory Opinion for Area Variance to allow accessory building forward of a principal building**

Chairman Miller asked for a motion to recommend the ZBA approve the area variance to allow an accessory building forward of a principal building.

Motion Made: S. Forster  
Motion Seconded: D. Kudgus  
MOTION: Recommendation that the ZBA approve the area variance to allow an accessory building forward of a principal building.  
VOTE: **In Favor:** L. Miller, D. Kudgus, S. Forster, T. Crowley, M. Jaros, K. Rose  
**Opposed:** None  
**Absent:** None  
Motion Carried

## **E. 600 Boswell Hill Road, Transfer of Special Use Permit for a Camp, Jared Cornell and John Kunzman**

John Kunzman, the owner of Pine Valley Campground, gave a short presentation. The campground was started in 1964 by his parents and in 1984 he and his wife purchased the campground from his parents. Now because of their age, they want to retire and have sold the property to Burke Campgrounds of NY, LLC. They would like to transfer the campground special permit to the new owner.

Jared Cornell, who works for Burke Campgrounds of NY, LLC, a subsidiary of A.L. Burke, Inc., also gave a short presentation. His great-grandfather started building houses in Broome County in 1944, and then commercial buildings. Since then, the company has transferred into real estate investment. They own a number of apartment complexes, mobile home parks, and some commercial buildings. Mr. Cornell and the Burke family were very excited to acquire such a beautiful campground and they would like to breathe new life into it. They are a small family business with about thirty employees with strong roots in Broome County. Mr. Kunzman added that they were thrilled that the campground was going to a local family-owned business.

Ms. Lane stated that the transfer requires a vote from the Planning Board. Because the original approval was in 1990, she had consulted with Alan Pope, the Town Attorney, and he said that because the uses had not changed from the original approval, it would be appropriate to transfer the original special use permit to the new owner. Ms. Lane added that if the new owners make improvements, they should consult with the Code Department to make sure the improvements are allowed. If they increase the campground uses or area from what was originally approved, they will have to come back to the Planning Board.

Ms. Lane then summarized her staff report for the Planning Board. The size and activities at the campground have not changed over the years, and therefore, the transfer of the special permit is permitted, per Code 300-66.11.

Planning Department staff recommend approval of the transfer of the Special Permit to Burke Campgrounds of NY, LLC, with the following stipulations:

1. The applicant shall work with the Building Permits Department to ensure compliance with all NYS Building Code standards and requirements. Contact the Permits Office at (607) 786-2920 to make an appointment for an inspection.
2. Any improvements to the campground beyond that approved in 1990 may require a revised Special Permit. Contact the Planning Department before instituting any such changes.
3. All future changes shall comply with the Town Code § 300-40.4 Camps.
4. Special permit modification approval will be required if there are any changes in the use of the property.
5. The Special Permit shall expire should the property be sold to another entity, per § 300-66.11. Transferability:
  - a) A special permit is not transferable except upon approval by resolution of the issuing board.
  - b) A special permit shall authorize only one special use and shall expire if the special use ceases for more than three months for any reason.
6. The applicant shall be required to acknowledge all of the above conditions, in writing. The applicant shall agree to follow the stipulations of approval in strict accordance with the approval of the special permit. Changes to the site plan



following approval may require a minor site plan review or submittal to the Planning Board, depending on the degree of change per Section 300-63.2. Applicability.

Ms. Lane explained that the original letter of approval in 1990 did not spell out the uses that were approved for the campground. Typically, an outdoor concert requires a special use permit. The Planning Board can approve an event that is held annually, or, if you have some dates within a year, the Planning Board can approve them all in one meeting. Under the new code, outdoor recreation or entertainment events require a special use permit.

Mr. Kunzman noted that the campground operates year round and he asked whether the special permit for the campground would expire in three months. Ms. Lane answered that it is understood that the business is year round and is different from hosting one outdoor event.

**1. Vote on Transfer of Special Use Permit for a Camp, with conditions.**

Chairman Miller asked for a motion to transfer the Special Use Permit for a Camp, from JMK Campground LLC to Burke Campground of NY, LLC, with conditions.

Motion Made:	S. Forster
Motion Seconded:	M. Jaros
MOTION:	Approval of the motion to transfer the Special Use Permit for a Camp, from JMK Campground LLC to Burke Campground of NY, LLC, with conditions.
VOTE:	<b>In Favor:</b> L. Miller, D. Kudgus, S. Forster, T. Crowley, M. Jaros, K. Rose
	<b>Opposed:</b> None
	<b>Absent:</b> None
	Motion Carried

**F. 1060 Robinson Hill Road, Animal Husbandry SUP, Area Variance for Shed Location, Andrea DellaValle**

Ms. DellaValle is very passionate about her ducks and she would like to keep them in front of the house where she can see them. Mr. Forster asked if the prefabricated coop would be moveable. Ms. Lane replied that she is recommending that Ms. DellaValle have a concrete slab and gravel with wooden boards over it under the coop. Ms. Rose commented that you can see wire around the coop and she assumes that Ms. DellaValle keeps it there because the back of the yard is all tree-lined and there are animals that might attack her chickens.

Ms. Lane hopes to update the poultry code so that it includes other zoning districts besides rural residential. The Code Department gets many calls about poultry being in areas that one wouldn't normally expect them. She asked the Planning Board members to think about other areas that might be appropriate for chickens or ducks.

**1. Declare Lead Agency**

Chairman Miller asked for a motion to Declare Lead Agency.

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

**2. Classify the Project as a Type II Action**

Chairman Miller asked for a motion to classify the Project as a Type II Action.

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

**3. Call for a Public Hearing for a Special Use Permit to Keep Poultry, to be held on October 19, 2021, at 7:00 p.m.**

Chairman Miller asked for a motion to call for a Public Hearing for a Special Use Permit to Keep Poultry, to be held on October 19, 2021, at 7:00 p.m.

Motion Made: D. Kudgus  
Motion Seconded: T. Crowley  
MOTION: Call for a Public Hearing for a Special Use Permit to Keep Poultry, to be held on October 19, 2021, at 7:00 p.m.  
VOTE: **In Favor:** L. Miller, D. Kudgus, T. Crowley, S. Forster, M. Jaros, K. Rose  
**Opposed:** None  
**Abstained:** None  
Motion Carried

**G. 1571 Union Center-Maine Highway, Development in Floodplain, Sam Arcangeli**

**1. Declare Lead Agency**

Chairman Miller asked for a motion to Declare Lead Agency.

Motion Made: D. Kudgus

Motion Seconded: M. Jaros  
MOTION: Declare the Planning Board as Lead Agency.  
VOTE: **In Favor:** L. Miller, D. Kudgus, S. Forster,  
T. Crowley, M. Jaros, K. Rose  
**Opposed:** None  
**Abstained:** None  
Motion Carried

**2. Classify the Project as a Type II Action**

Chairman Miller asked for a motion to classify the Project as a Type II Action.

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

**3. Call for a Public Hearing for a Special Permit for Development in the Floodplain, to be held on October 19, 2021, at 7:05 p.m.**

Chairman Miller asked for a motion to call for a Public Hearing for a Special Permit for Development in the Floodplain, to be held on October 19, 2021, at 7:05 p.m.

Motion Made: M. Jaros  
Motion Seconded: D. Kudgus  
MOTION: Call for a Public Hearing for a Special Permit for Development in the Floodplain, to be held on October 19, 2021, at 7:05 p.m.  
VOTE: **In Favor:** L. Miller, D. Kudgus, T. Crowley, S. Forster, M. Jaros, K. Rose  
**Opposed:** None  
**Abstained:** None  
Motion Carried

**H. 2308 Riverview Drive, Development in Floodplain, Jay li**

**1. Declare Lead Agency**

Chairman Miller asked for a motion to Declare Lead Agency.

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

Motion Carried

**2. Classify the Project as an Unlisted Action**

Chairman Miller asked for a motion to classify the Project as an Unlisted Action.

Motion Made: D. Kudgus  
Motion Seconded: S. Forster  
MOTION: Classify the Project as an Unlisted Action.  
VOTE: **In Favor:** L. Miller, D. Kudgus, S. Forster,  
T. Crowley, M. Jaros, K. Rose  
**Opposed:** None  
**Abstained:** None  
Motion Carried

**3. Call for a Public Hearing for a Special Permit to place a residential pool and gazebo in the floodplain, to be held on October 19, 2021, at 7:10 p.m.**

Chairman Miller asked for a motion to call for a Public Hearing for a Special Permit to place a residential pool and gazebo in the floodplain, to be held on October 19, 2021, at 7:10 p.m.

Motion Made: D. Kudgus  
Motion Seconded: M. Jaros  
MOTION: Call for a Public Hearing for a Special Permit to place a residential pool and gazebo in the floodplain, to be held on October 19, 2021, at 7:10 p.m.  
VOTE: **In Favor:** L. Miller, D. Kudgus, S. Forster,  
T. Crowley, M. Jaros, K. Rose  
**Opposed:** None  
**Abstained:** None  
Motion Carried

Mr. Forster asked Ms. Lane what the applicants would do with the dirt after the pool was installed. She answered that she would make the removal of the dirt from the property a stipulation of approval for the project.

**I. 3623 George F. Highway, Special Use Permit for Auto Sales, Kevon Othman**

Ms. Lane distributed the revised site plan to the Planning Board. The revised site plan shows three additional display spaces for a total of six display spaces. Mr. Crowley asked if the revised site plan meets the requirements. Ms. Lane answered that the plan does meet all requirements because the Othmans were granted the variance for a 0-foot front setback. Mr. Materese asked if the revised site plan had been approved by Broome County. Ms. Lane answered that for a minor change to the site plan, it is not necessary to refile with the County. Ms. Lane also explained that the Use and Occupancy agreement that the applicants

are working towards with Broome County and the DOT is to display vehicles outside of the property perimeter. The applicants would have to come back to the Planning Board once they get that approval

### **1. Revised Site Plan**

Chairman Miller asked for a motion to approve the Revised Site Plan for Auto Sales at 3623 George F. Highway.

Motion Made:	S. Forster
Motion Seconded:	T. Crowley
MOTION:	Approval of the Revised Site Plan for Auto Sales at 3623 George F. Highway, with stipulations.
VOTE:	In Favor: L. Miller, S. McLain, S. Forster, M. Jaros, D. Kudgus, K. Rose
	Opposed: None
	Abstained: None
	Motion Carried

### **J. Other Such Matters as May Properly Come Before the Board**

Ms. Lane noted that there will be a ribbon-cutting for the conversion of the elementary school at 23 Jackson and 26 Kentucky avenues into Endicott Square apartments on October 13<sup>th</sup> at 12 noon, and everyone from the Planning Board is invited.

An outside engineering firm, Barton and Loguidice, is reviewing the solar project and they will make a presentation at the October 19 Planning Board meeting.

Concerning the Walsh storage project, they have not submitted their drainage plan for the project, so that project will not be reviewed at the next Planning Board meeting. Ms. Miller noted that she sees trucks at the Walsh fill site every day. Ms. Lane reminded the Planning Board that they had approved a fill plan for the property in 2020, and the Walshes take advantage of any construction project to add fill to the property. She is disappointed the Planning Board had not approved the Army Corps' recommendation for a 50-foot setback from the wetland because with only a 10-foot setback between the fill and the wetlands, it is unlikely, with all the rain, that fill is not going to end up in the wetlands.

Mr. Forster attended an event at Traditions at the Glen, and Mr. Walsh told him that there are photos that show that the area for the proposed solar arrays was a horse farm seventy years ago. The area has grown in since then, and therefore the proposed solar facility would not be on the site of an old growth forest. Ms. Lane responded that she is glad that an impartial outside engineering firm is reviewing the project.

### **K. Adjournment**

Chairman Miller asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:16 p.m.

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

Respectfully Submitted,  
Carol Krawczyk

**Next Meeting Date**

The next meeting of the Planning Board is tentatively scheduled for Tuesday, October 19, 2021, at 7:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Carol Krawczyk