

TOWN OF GREENFIELD

PLANNING BOARD

APRIL 11, 2006

REGULAR MEETING

A regular meeting of the Town of Greenfield Planning Board is called to order by Gary Dake at 7:02 p.m. On roll call, the following members are present: Gary Dake, Lorna Dupouy, Thomas Siragusa, Michael Thraikill, Mark Young and Melissa Vacula, Alternate. Tonya Yasenchak is absent. Charlie Baker, Town Engineer and Gerry McKenna, Zoning Administrator, are present. Deane Pfeil arrives late.

MARCH 28, MINUTES

MOTION: M. Young

SECOND: T. Siragusa

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board waives the reading of and accepts the minutes of March 28, 2006 as submitted.

VOTE: Ayes: Dake, Dupouy, Siragusa, Thraikill, Vacula, Young

Noes: None

Absent: Yasenchak, Pfeil

CORRESPONDENCE

G. Dake refers to the memo regarding the informational meeting with Airtricity on April 26, 2006.

PLANNING BOARD CASES

JOHN WITT – Major Subdivision

Lester Park Road

G. Dake states that he spoke with F. Palumbo and they may not be attending this evening.

CHARLES GLESSING – Major Subdivision

Locust Grove Road

This application is postponed to the April 25, 2006 meeting.

ALEC STEPHENS – Major Subdivision

Middle Grove Road (The Point at Moss Creek)

Peter Loyola and Mary Moore Wallinger are present. Lead Agency response letters have been received from DEC, Saratoga County Planning Board and Saratoga County DPW.

April 11, 2006

RESOLUTION – A. Stephens, Lead Agency

MOTION: M. Young

SECOND: M. Thraikill

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board declares itself as Lead Agency on the application of Alec Stephens for a major subdivision of property at 247 Middle Grove Road, TM# 163.-2-74.

VOTE: Ayes: Dake, Dupouy, Pfeil, Siragusa, Thraikill, Vacula, Young

Noes: None

Absent: Yasenchak

C. Baker reviews his letter for April 7, 2006 and states that he was waiting for the road estimate and received that tonight. M. Moore Wallinger states that the surveyor wants to take one more look at the survey before he signs and stamps it. The long form SEQRA is reviewed. Part 1 has been revised to show that lot 13 has been dropped. Discussion takes place regarding the response to question 1 regarding construction on slopes of 15% or greater. D. Pfeil comments that the SEQRA states that DEC permits are required and asks if they have been received. M. Moore Wallinger states that A. Stephens has spoken with DEC and they will not grant any permits until the Planning Board approves the subdivision. DEC has reviewed their application and does not see any problems. Some responses in Part 2 are discussed. C. Baker suggests changing the response to question 3 on page 12 to a yes, as there are Federal wetlands on the property, even though there will not be construction in the wetlands. C. Baker suggests adding small to moderate impact to the issue of siltation and discharge on page 13. Impact on Transportation is discussed and while this was an issue brought up in the public hearing, there is a traffic engineer's report addressing this and there has also been discussion with County DPW. The applicant is asked to prepare a draft Part 3 for the Board to review. C. Baker asks whether or not there will actually be construction on slopes of 15%. P. Loyola states that there are a couple of slopes of 15%, but those are isolated. Discussion takes place regarding the storm water basins and that the Town Board has discussed how to handle this issue, but has not made any decisions. G. Dake explains that he thinks that a logical solution would be for the Highway Department to come up with a figure for the projected annual maintenance cost and then a fee be collected from the developer, which would then be put into an account and would accrue interest. That money would be put towards that annual maintenance cost. He asks the applicant if they have an alternate proposal for the Board to entertain. G. Dake comments that this is not the only subdivision dealing with this issue. A. Stephens questions what happens if that money runs out, if this is a one time cost to the developer. G. Dake states that there is the assumption that the interest would continue the funding, however the rate of interest is an unknown. The Town Board is discussing tax districts, which some of the Planning Board members believe would be cumbersome. D. Pfeil questions if the Town enacts the tax districts what would happen to those developers who had already contributed. G. Dake states that he would think that those developers would be exempt. G. Dake states that he is not too worried about this developer or project, but that there have been developers who do one subdivision and then disappear. M. Young states that the regulations have changed on how towns need to maintain these basins, which is what has caused the concerns. M. Young states that the figures the Highway Department was putting together for the Town Board were not impressive. M. Young states that he, along with a couple of other Board members, visited the property and that it comes out of the swamp very noticeably and he feels it is a great site. T. Siragusa states that he was surprised at how high the property was, but that he is less sure of the lots closer to Middle Grove Road. A. Stephens explains that the Board members were actually walking in an area that is to the west of and closer to the wetlands than where the actual house locations will be. This is pointed out on the map. Further discussion takes place that the SEQRA has to be completed prior to the applicant being granted any approvals. C. Baker states that the road bond also has to be approved, but that is done by the Town Board and can be a contingency of the approval. Possible contingencies to this application are discussed. Discussion takes place regarding preliminary approval versus final approval. The Board completes the Part 3 at this time stating that regarding Impact on Land, "current site conditions reach 15% in isolated areas. Road grading will reduce slopes in construction areas to less than 10%. Proper erosion control measures will be taken."

April 11, 2006

RESOLUTION – A. Stephens, SEQRA

MOTION: M. Young

SECOND: T. Siragusa

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board, having reviewed the Long Form SEQRA, checks Box B, that a conditioned negative declaration will be prepared for the application of Alec Stephens for property on Middle Grove Road, TM#163.-2-74.

D. Pfeil asks why the second choice is being checked. C. Baker states that there is no real reason to not check Box A declaring a negative declaration because the mitigation is being explained in Part 3 and that is the way the Board has historically done this.

MOTION: M. Thraikill

SECOND: T. Siragusa

RESOLVED, that the motion is amended that Box A granting a negative declaration will be checked for the application of Alec Stephens for property on Middle Grove Road, TM# 163.-2-74.

VOTE: Ayes: Dake, Dupouy, Pfeil, Siragusa, Thraikill, Vacula, Young

Noes: None

Absent: Yasenchak

The Board discusses the issues remaining and what contingencies might be placed on an approval. The Town Board will make the final decision on the road bond. The DEC permit cannot be issued until the applicant has final approval. The consensus of the Board is to go forward with the approval. D. Pfeil states that before walking the site she had some misgivings, and believes that it is a site that you do have to walk. She states that she was impressed with what has been done to mitigate any kind of damage to the environment. It is well thought out and she does not have a problem with it and states that the applicant has done their due diligence.

RESOLUTION – A. Stephens, Major Subdivision

MOTION: M. Thraikill

SECOND: M. Young

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board grants major subdivision approval to Alec Stephens for the Point at Moss Creek, Middle Grove Road, TM# 163.-2-74 and waives the requirement to extend topographic contours 200' beyond the property lines, contingent upon:

- **Town Engineer, Highway Department and Planning Board chairman to approve a payment mechanism and amount on storm water maintenance**
- **Town Engineer, Highway Department and Planning Board chairman to approve road bond dollar amount to be recommended to the Town Board**
- **No construction shall take place until DEC permit is received for road crossing through wetlands**

T. Siragusa questions lot 9 coming back at a later date for further development. G. Dake states that there is the 5 year rule but that does not preclude it ever being built on. He states that would also not preclude any of the neighbors along Ashlor buying additional property from A. Stephens and adding that to their existing lots with a lot line adjustment. A. Stephens states that there has been strong interest in that regard from the neighbors. G. Dake believes that wetlands regs are only going to get tougher, not easier. He states that the Board could add an additional contingency that lot 9 must be accessed from the cul-de-sac.

The following contingency is added:

April 11, 2006

- **Access to lot 9 must be from the newly built road, not from Middle Grove Road, and a note is to be added to the plans regarding this**

VOTE: Ayes: Dake, Pfeil, Siragusa, Thrailkill, Vacula, Young

Noes: Dupouy

Absent: Yasenchak

JEFFREY COLLURA – Major Subdivision

Locust Grove Road

Jeffrey Collura is present and a public hearing is reopened at 8:10 p.m. J. Collura reviews the proposal for the public, stating that he has 94 acres that he would like to subdivide and that he is proposing to phase this. There being no public comment, this public hearing is closed at 8:12 p.m.

G. Dake comments that there are two pieces of correspondence from Shirley Howard that were received prior to the last meeting, with concerns regarding current runoff from the area of lot 4 onto her property which she believes would be exacerbated by a subdivision and excavation. G. Dake asks the applicant to try to address those issues as the Board will want to discuss them. The Board has not received response to the lead agency letter. C. Baker states that he spoke with Gary Robinson who will be responding to some of these issues. He states that the biggest issue is related to storm water management. He states that the storm water pollution prevention plan that was submitted indicates that there is an increase in flow from the pre-development to post development flows, and there is no provision on the plans for storm water management. Discussion takes place regarding SEQRA review. G. Dake states that since the property is bisected by the road, the Board could conceivably conclude that that is a natural subdivision and can deal with one side of the road separately from the other for subdivision purposes. This has been done in the past. One of the things in item 6 of C. Baker's letter, which is why you should be looking at these things in concert, is what do you do as far as the road separations. The horseshoe shaped parcel is shaped in this way in the event that it is possible that someday he may wish to put a road into the back. If the applicant is to put a road into the back, it should either be lined up with Griffin Road or it should be separated at least 500' from Griffin Road. Since he owns the property that borders Griffin Road, he could move the road to make it line up to make it a cross intersection. M. Young states that because he only owns one side, it could be a bigger hurdle. J. Collura states that if he moves it up the hill further he will have a sight issue and may have one at this point. There could be some drainage issues that influence each other across the road as well. G. Dake states that the safe approach would be to do SEQRA on the whole thing, knowing that if we change phase 2 or develop phase 3, we are going to be reopening SEQRA. C. Baker states that if the Board takes that approach, the applicant will need a greater level of detail. G. Dake states that is part of the downside and that SEQRA is designed to force Planning Board's to think ahead. He states that he would suggest doing the SEQRA on the whole thing and accept the fact that the level of detail is different on both sides of the road and that you really address, as details only, the east side of the road. M. Young states that the applicant has been very honest about why he wants to keep that opening, and without that opening, phase 1 is easy. He states that what C. Baker is talking about, with some storm water management controlling the flow that is going under the road, phase 1 is fairly simple. But the way he is looking at it, the applicant will have to either adjust phase 1 to meet the 500 feet and check the sight distance, and at the point that phase 2 starts, that would trigger the road improvements for Griffin Road which is a dirt road without a suitable turnaround at the end of the road. M. Thrailkill states that if there is a way to work it out, he would be comfortable with going ahead and looking at phase 1 and keeping phase 2 separate. He asks if the applicant can move the access to lot 5. J. Collura states that he believes it is much safer in this location. C. Baker states that if the applicant eliminates one future entrance, he will be limited to the length of a dead end road. T. Siragusa states that it seems that the spirit of SEQRA is to look at everything and he states that there seem to be enough issues here that aren't fully understood or answered, that he would be more comfortable looking at the whole thing, but to do all the engineering on the phase 2 seems unreasonable. J. Collura asks if the Board

April 11, 2006

wants to see house sites. G. Dake states that he does not believe it has to go to that level, but it has to be in the part 1 so that as the Board looks at part 2, there may be issues with some items. G. McKenna states that lot 5 should be considered a keyhole and should have the correct language on the plans. G. Dake states that C. Baker's letter deals with the issues quite clearly and the Board needs to have both sides in part 1 in the description, there are things that are not answered in the SEQRA, and the sooner the applicant can get that to the Board, the sooner it can be addressed. When the Board visits the location, that will help them to understand the issues.

JAMES DORSEY – Site Plan Review

Maple Avenue

James Dorsey and Clark Wilkinson are present and review the project. C. Wilkinson states that this is a 1 ½ acre site on which the applicant is proposing two commercial buildings. Phase one is an 8000 square foot building and phase 2 is 6500 square feet with a second story of 3750 for a total square footage of 15,750 for personal service in accordance with the zoning. They are proposing space for 67 cars, 1 for each 250' of space; the rear structure is to be built first; the property entrance on Maple Avenue is being combined with T. Ellis' property and will be a two-way entrance with 2 two-way accesses to Hillside Avenue. The proposed buildings are to utilize the existing septic. C. Wilkinson states that he has responses to the comments in C. Baker's letter. He has prepared the SWPPP and has brought that with him tonight, and everything is designed to keep the storm water on site which is what happens now. Public water comes from an existing main out on Maple Avenue. He goes on to review his response memo to C. Baker's review, which he provides copies of. C. Baker states that his initial thoughts are that there is an awful lot on this site and he believes it should go to DEC regarding the exceeding of 1000 gallons per day. He believes it should be addressed now and not in the future. He states that he still has a concern for the water supply even with C. Wilkinson's explanation. G. McKenna questions the warehousing for the rear building. J. Dorsey states that he will not be doing that, he has someone interested in leasing the entire rear office building. G. McKenna states that he believes the applicant has taken care of the egress and parking. L. Dupouy states that she would be interested in details, as C. Baker mentioned, regarding the water supply. J. Dorsey states that he had all the water supply lines replaced with copper lines and states that they are only proposing bathrooms for these buildings. M. Thraikill questions the direction of traffic flow. C. Wilkinson explains. J. Dorsey states that most of the people going to the site will be repeat people who will be going to their office for work. M. Young states that this is bigger than he initially thought and while Hillside appeared very narrow with all the mobile homes on the property, he has measured it and the blacktop is 20'. He states that most of the residents using Hillside are Wilton residents. He questions how we would notify the Wilton residents. G. Dake suggests sending a copy of this to Mike Dobis chairman of the Wilton Planning Board and to the Saratoga Springs Planning Board with a cover letter that this is a courtesy asking for input. This will also have to go to County. He states that storm water will be a key issue and states that while the Town of Greenfield does not have architectural review, some concept of the elevation for the front building would be welcome. He states that signage is an issue that he would like to see addressed early on. He believes that Hillside may need some improvement. J. Dorsey states that he met with Kurt Woodcock and showed him the plans when he had initially proposed this project. He states that the road is 2 to 3 years old and he has a letter in his file regarding this. D. Pfeil questions landscaping. C. Wilkinson states that this is shown on the plans. M. Thraikill questions if there is a percentage of greenspace. C. Wilkinson states that they do not exceed the maximum impervious surface requirements. G. Dake states that lighting details are also necessary. This application will be sent to the County for referral. Discussion takes place as to whether a DOT curb cut is necessary. The applicant will contact DOT. D. Pfeil requests that the applicant provide a plan with color added to make it easier to discern. A public hearing is scheduled for April 25, 2006 at 7:00 p.m. A traffic study is discussed and felt that it would not be necessary for the amount of cars being proposed here.

April 11, 2006

MARK PEPPER – Subdivision Revision

Sand Hill Road

Mark Pepper is present and reviews that he received a minor subdivision in 2002 and a lot line adjustment in 2005. He states that they were hoping to wait the 5 years before doing another subdivision between his parents' property and his property to provide some additional income to his parents. He is here to ask about getting the 5 year rule lifted. M. Pepper explains what they would like to do on his map. G. Dake states that he is not inclined to approve this because this is why the Town has the 5 year rule. He explains the couple of times that this has been done were under extenuating circumstances. After much discussion, the Board consensus is that while they do not have a problem with the concept, they do not wish to waive the rule.

GEORGE VANDER PLOEG – Minor Subdivision

Wilton Road

G. Vander Ploeg is present and explains his proposal. G. McKenna states that this meets with current zoning. G. Dake questions the mobile home and garage that are on the property lines. G. McKenna states that he is okay with the garage, but would like to see the mobile home moved if possible. C. Baker states that there should be some erosion control notes and details, separation distance between the well and septic should be 150'. G. Vander Ploeg states that he thought it could be 100' if the well had 50' of casing. C. Baker questions whether or not there is enough room between the house and the lot line to put in the septic system. He states that it should be oriented parallel with the contours. D. Pfeil questions the steepness of the driveway. This is reviewed from the contour lines. **The Board completes Part II of the Short Form SEQRA. All questions are answered "no". M. Young makes a motion to check Box B, indicating that this will not result in any significant negative environmental impacts. Lorna Dupouy seconds the motion. All present in favor.** A public hearing is scheduled for April 25, 2006 at 7:00 p.m. and the application will be forwarded to Saratoga County Planning.

THOMAS KUBIAK – Site Plan Review

Route 9N

Thomas Kubiak is present and reviews his plans. The driveway is actually 24' wide with 12' on each side of the property line and is shared with the neighbor. He explains that he will be adding 3 parking spaces to the existing 2 and will be eliminating a portion of the driveway to the rear connecting it to another parcel. This area will be seeded. T. Kubiak states that there is enough lawn on the north side of the driveway that he could convert to driveway if necessary. G. Dake questions if there is a formal agreement with the neighbor regarding the shared driveway and that if there is not, it would be beneficial. G. McKenna is satisfied with the driveway and agrees that there is plenty of room should the driveway need to be expanded. A public hearing is scheduled for April 25th at 7:00 p.m. This will be sent to Saratoga County for referral.

DAVID JELENIK – Sketch Plan

Greene Road

Dave Jelenik and Clark Wilkinson are present. C. Wilkinson explains that there is an existing deeded right of way on this property to the existing house that D. Jelenik is working with the property owner to negotiate being allowed to use for a Town Road, with a portion to remain as private driveway. There is also an established stream crossing and established wetland crossing. He states that they are proposing a cul-de-sac of the maximum length of 1250' with eight of the 9 lots accessing off of that cul-de-sac and the last

April 11, 2006

lot to the rear would be a continuation of the existing private drive. He states that he made sure that there was the minimum area for the houses and septic. He states that he believes there is adequate area, on a concept level. He reiterates that they would use the existing road and crossings, and there is power that feeds the existing house. G. Dake states that this is challenging and he is struggling with lot 9. The adopted land use plan has this as one of the low density areas which would suggest that these will probably be 6 acre minimum lots when the new zoning is adopted. M. Young comments that the minimum cul-de-sac requirement is 210'. D. Jelenik states that he is trying to make more rural estate type lots and there is plenty of acreage here. M. Young comments that there is a curve on Greene Road and he would like to see a traffic study. D. Pfeil states that she believes this should only be 6 lots and does not see the necessity for the keyhole lot. C. Baker states that he would like to see soil borings done and to witness them. G. McKenna states that there are no frontages on the plans. G. Dake states that when the cul-de-sac is brought up to size, it might eliminate the keyhole lot and this is no slam dunk. He reiterates that the zoning is being rewritten. D. Jelenik states that he has been in touch with the Supervisor about the zoning rewrite and that it might be in place by August. D. Jelenik thinks that his engineer can get this project back in front of the Board and get it done in advance of that time frame.

ANTHONY VACCARIELLI – Subdivision Revision
Triple J Way

Loren Brown, representing the applicant, Anthony Vaccarielli and Paul Male are present. L. Brown states that he is here to advocate for the applicant. He states that with regard to the last comments that were made, P. Male has addressed those and provided C. Baker with a letter and a copy of a new drawing. The cul-de-sac has been increased, all the other issues have been addressed and he is here to advocate a speedy decision, a recommendation to the Zoning Board of Appeals and hopefully a favorable one. He states that this was an approved variance some 10 or 12 years ago and it has been extended annually for a period of years. G. Dake states that was to John Jordan, the previous owner. L. Brown states that through oversight, a renewal application was not made in March of this year, missed by a week, and the reason why there is urgency is because there is already a building going up on lot 3. That building will be completed in just a few weeks and A. Vaccarielli is very anxious to continue building on the lots as they now exist. He has assured L. Brown that if he gets final approval he will upgrade the road as soon as possible and hopefully it can be dedicated to the Town. L. Brown states that the applicant, through P. Male, has complied with all the requirements that were at issue last time. G. McKenna explains that this has been going on for years, variances have been granted for frontage because it was originally subdivided on a right of way, it was originally a 4-lot subdivision, only one of the lots complied so three of the lots have been getting area variances for frontage. G. Dake asks about the current road. G. McKenna states that it is a private road which dead ends on lot 4. G. Dake states that it is not to Town specs and that the rules have changed. P. Male comments that the cul-de-sac was increased. C. Baker states that it is still short. G. Dake asks which lot is built on. A. Vaccarielli states that lot 3 is being built on. G. Dake asks which lot owns Triple J Way. G. McKenna states that belongs with lot 4 and he explains that lot 3 does not need a variance as it is being built on. Lots 1, 2 and 4 need variances. G. Dake states that the road needs to be built to Town standards but can remain as a private road. A. Vaccarielli states that he has lot 3 sold and was looking to get a building permit for lot 2. G. Dake asks about frontage on Route 9N for lot 1. G. McKenna states that it does have frontage, but it is not enough. P. Male states that he attended the ZBA meeting and they tabled the application to the May meeting. G. Dake asks C. Baker about outstanding issues. C. Baker states he and W. Barss have looked at the road and that the slope is over 8%. They agreed since there are a limited amount of homes, it is not going to be extended, it really doesn't look that bad in the field, so they agreed that they can live with it. He states that the road is 20' wide, needs to be widened to meet the rural road section and it is currently gravel. P. Male states that the material is okay, but it is not to the proper thickness and they will put an overlay on it. C. Baker states that there are storm water management issues that need to be addressed. He did receive a package last week and did write a response letter today. G. Dake asks the applicant what he wants to do next. A. Vaccarielli states that he wants to be issued building permits for lots 1 and 2 without

April 11, 2006

having any huge impact on waiting. He states that they are going ahead on planning, but right now he has a sale and it has been quite difficult to get sales in there. G. Dake states that not having the road settled adds to the dilemma from a marketing standpoint as well. He states that he does not expect to settle all the engineering on the road tonight, it is going to take some time. He asks if there is some logical way to say that the applicant gets the variances on lots 1 and 2, but we withhold the CO's until we have a road built? A. Vaccarielli states that could work, but he thinks lot 1, 2 and 3, had he sold those lots last year to a third person, they would be claiming hardship left and right, and he could be developing lot 4 into the cul-de-sac. G. Dake asks how they would claim hardship. A. Vaccarielli states that if the ZBA did not grant a variance for those. G. McKenna states that someone purchasing the lots should know about it as this has been going on for years. G. Dake states that this project has dragged on for over 10 years, and he would like to see something that says that we are going to move forward and not work on 3 lots a decade. He states that he believes if we throw some kind of a time line on this, it will actually help the applicant because once this road is built or the subdivision progresses, the marketing is actually going to get easier and not harder. G. Dake asks if the intention is still to split lot 4 into 4 lots. P. Male indicates on the map their plan with the cul-de-sac. The possibility of a detention pond on lot 1 is discussed. M. Young states that the Board does not want to stand in the way of this so that it just sits dormant, and at the same time you have to sell something to pay for the road. If the first house doesn't do it, he would like to come to some kind of compromise. Discussion takes place as to what level of construction is expected on roads prior to being accepted by the Town. Discussion takes place that the variances would have been approved had the applicant returned to the ZBA prior to the variances lapsing. G. Dake states that part of the reason that the Planning Board did the negative recommendation is to have the applicant come back to the Planning Board for discussion. He states that if this is not completed in the next year, he does not want the applicant to receive renewals from the Zoning Board. He would like the applicant to have to come back to the Planning Board. A. Vaccarielli states that he has run power all the way up to the top and he is working. He states that he has momentum now and the site is looking good.

RESOLUTION – A. Vaccarielli, ZBA Referral

MOTION: L. Dupouy

SECOND: D. Pfeil

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board grants a favorable recommendation to renew frontage variances for Anthony Vaccarielli, Tri City Corporate, for lots 1 and 2 on Triple J Way, with the understanding that prior to variances being renewed again next year the Planning Board takes another look to make sure that the project is moving forward.

Discussion takes place that lot 4 is planning to be further subdivided so it is not included in this referral.

VOTE: Ayes: Dake, Dupouy, Pfeil, Siragusa, Thraikill, Vacula, Young

Noes: None

Absent: Yasenchak

ZBA REFERRALS

Clarence Covell, Temporary Use Variance – No Planning Board issues.

Richard & Diane Euler, Interpretation – This interpretation is for the term educational/academic use.

RESOLUTION – R. & D. Euler, Interpretation

MOTION: M. Thraikill

SECOND: M. Vacula

April 11, 2006

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board is aware of the proposed use in the application of Deborah Fellows and Ken Rohling for a Special Use Permit for the property at 280 Miner Road, TM#111.-1-8.12 and is comfortable with that use taking place on this property however the Zoning Board interprets it.

VOTE: Ayes: Dake, Dupouy, Pfeil, Siragusa, Thrailkill, Vacula, Young
Noes: None
Absent: Yasenchak

DISCUSSION

The spring site walk is discussed. Board members will meet at the Town Hall at 1:00 at proceed from here.

L. Dupouy states that she thinks J. Mihalek has done a great job with the garage and it looks really good. G. Dake states that he is also very impressed and J. Mihalek has obviously put effort into making it better. D. Pfeil states that she does not agree. The trees are all dying in the front and there are trees falling over. G. Dake states that he is still not done. L. Dupouy states that she is talking about the cars being lined up.

L. Dupouy states that, regarding all the developments being proposed, she thinks the Planning Board has to wrestle with the question of what is in it for the stakeholders when the shareholders make something. As a former educator, this is going to impact on the amount of children going to school and the developer should, in her opinion, make some contribution to the school when it comes time to enlarge it or enhance it, or side walks, bike paths etc. G. Dake states that this is something that the Board should discuss and that the Planning Board is not as aggressive as other communities. He suggests that L. Dupouy ask that question of J. Witt's engineer the next time they are before the Board, since he is also on the School Board in Saratoga Springs.

Meeting adjourned 10:17 p.m., all members in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Rosamaria Rowland
Secretary