

TOWN OF GREENFIELD

PLANNING BOARD

AUGUST 29, 2006

REGULAR MEETING

A regular meeting of the Town of Greenfield Planning Board is called to order by Gary Dake at 7:00 p.m. On roll call, the following members are present: Gary Dake, Dan Cochran, Tonya Yasenchak, Lorna Dupouy, Thomas Siragusa, Michael Thraikill and John Streit, Alternate. Charlie Baker, Town Engineer and Gerry McKenna, Zoning Administrator are present.

AUGUST 8, 2006 MINUTES

MOTION: T. Yasenchak

SECOND: T. Siragusa

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board waives the reading of and accepts the minutes of August 8, 2006 with the following correction:

- **JELENIK CONSTRUCTION, Braim Road – VOTE: T. Yasenchak abstained**

VOTE: Ayes: Dake, Cochran, Dupouy, Siragusa, Streit, Thraikill, Yasenchak

Noes: None

PLANNING BOARD CASES

DAVID EVANS – Lot Line Adjustments/ Minor Subdivision

Plank Road

D. Evans is present and reviews that he has approximately 100 acres that he would like to subdivide into 3 lots with 1 shared driveway.

A public hearing is opened at 7:02 p.m. Bob Hyndman, Denton Road, asks if any of these lots are waterfront. D. Evans states that they are not, that there is a separate 5-acre lot with water frontage on Bucket Pond. S. Weeks, Ashlor Drive, states that he would like to reiterate his concern for shared driveways and what kind of standards will be applied to them, emergency vehicle access, what kind of weight can they handle, etc. B. Hyndman states that there is a runoff issue with the new road. He states that the highway department had bales of hay staged there, which was inadequate, and Bucket Pond now has a sandbar from the subsurface runoff. Now there is a boulder placed there which is still inadequate and has only diverted the flow. He states that this has been brought to Walt Barss' attention. His concern is that now putting in large driveways will add to this problem and he is aware of this because he has family living near there. There being no further public comment, this public hearing is closed at 7:06 p.m.

C. Baker asks if the Town Attorney has reviewed the driveway easement. A copy will be provided to them. C. Baker states that the appropriate notes are on the map, the keyhole driveway note is on the plans and the driveways will have to be designed and certified by a professional engineer. T. Siragusa questions the issue of ownership. G. Dake states that this is a relatively complicated issue and explains that since D. Evans controls each of the parcels in question and because he will be filing a new subdivision map that the Planning Board will have approved, that will effectively get rid of all of those. The new map, once filed,

August 29, 2006

would solve all of those questions because now they would all be new lines as presented by an applicant and approved by this Board. G. Dake states that he agrees with S. Weeks concern about shared driveways. This parcel is not an easy piece of land and he believes that having the keyhole lot requirements on the shared driveways should allow for safe access for emergency vehicles. C. Baker states that the total disturbance on this will be less than 5 acres and greater than one acre, the applicant will be required to file an NOI, and an erosion and sediment control plan as part of that application. That is required by the State. He states that there is no harm in making that part of a resolution. Discussion takes place that the individual homeowners, as they buy the lots, would be required to file the NOI in order to begin the construction to create that disturbance. Suggestion is made that a note be placed on the plans that the future purchasers of the property shall be made aware that these are things that need to be addressed. G. Dake reviews D. Evans letter regarding the SEQRA long form that was filed with the original subdivision.

RESOLUTION – D. Evans, SEQRA

MOTION: M. Thraikill

SECOND: D. Cochran

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board reaffirms its original SEQRA determination of November 2001 for the subdivision of lands of G. David Evans, for property located on Plank Road, TM#123.-2-58.

VOTE: Ayes: Dake, Cochran, Dupouy, Siragusa, Streit, Thraikill, Yasenchak

Noes: None

RESOLUTION – D. Evans, Subdivision and Lot Line Adjustments

MOTION: J. Streit

SECOND: T. Yasenchak

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board grants a subdivision and lot line adjustments to G. David Evans, for property located on Plank Road, TM# 123.-2-58, as reflected on the map submitted by the applicant and revised August 8, 2006, contingent upon:

- **Town Attorney’s approval of the easement language for shared driveway**
- **Addition of note indicating that homeowner will be responsible for the Notice of Intent (NOI) and Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP)**

Discussion takes place that the intent is for the subdivision approval and final plans to match the map revised August 8, 2006.

VOTE: Ayes: Dake, Cochran, Dupouy, Siragusa, Streit, Thraikill, Yasenchak

Noes: None

HARRY VRADENBURG – Major Subdivision

Dunham Pond, King and South Greenfield Road

Harry Vradenburg and Drew Schauffert are present. D. Schauffert explains that test holes were done on lot 3 with C. Baker present, and that the results were very favorable and would imply that the buildable area on lot 3 is adequate to support a septic system. C. Baker concurs and states that he has spoken with Jeff Piro who is working on an erosion and sediment control plan and would have that done in a couple of days. **The Board completes Part II of the Short Form SEQRA. All questions are answered “no” with the exception of C1, which will be mitigated by a Storm Water Management Plan. J. Streit makes a motion to check Box B, indicating that this will not result in any significant negative environmental impacts. T. Yasenchak seconds the motion. All present in favor.**

August 29, 2006

RESOLUTION – H. Vradenburg, Major Subdivision

MOTION: L. Dupouy

SECOND: M. Thraikill

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board grants major subdivision approval to Harry Vradenburg for property located on Dunham Pond, King and South Greenfield Roads, TM# 150.-2-28 and TM#150.-2-29.11 per the plan submitted, contingent upon:

- **C. Baker to signoff on final engineering**

VOTE: Ayes: Dake, Cochran, Dupouy, Siragusa, Streit, Thraikill, Yasenchak

Noes: None

EDWARD LOWMAN – Minor Subdivision

Hyspot Road

Edward Lowman is present and explains that this property is near the intersection with Russell Road. G. McKenna states that this request meets zoning. C. Baker states that he would like to see a better map with topo and the typical notes. T. Yasenchak questions the sight distance. G. McKenna states that it is straight and flat. E. Lowman states that there is traffic in the morning and evening as Hyspot Road is used as a short cut. D. Cochran suggests having the proposed well and septic on the final map. G. Dake reiterates that a better map will be needed showing topo, typical notes, etc. He states that the concept is fine. A public hearing is scheduled for September 12, 2006 at 7:00 p.m. T. Yasenchak asks if there is a home on the lot on the other side of the proposed lot. E. Lowman states that there is and it is between 50' and 100' away from the property line.

AIRTRICITY – Site Plan Review

Lake Desolation

Bill Wagers is present and explains that this application is for a 60-meter tall meteorological tower to measure wind speed and direction, which would be recorded on a data log and probably, if there is a cell up there, the data logger will automatically download the data to their meteorologist. The pole is a 6-inch diameter, galvanized steel tower supported by 4 sets of guyed wires that are anchored into the ground. There is nothing permanent about it. The tower sits on a galvanized base on spikes that are driven into the ground. There is about 1 ½ to 2 acres of land that would have to be cleared to install the tower and Finch Pruyn would do the work as they own the property. He states that there is a very short access road that is required; maybe 1000' north of the Plank Road trail. G. Dake explains that there is no definition of where the driveway is going to be, what it is going to be like, etc. B. Wagers states that there is not a lot of information, it is in the middle of the woods. The driveway, due north of Plank Road, may vary a little bit depending on the grade. M. Thraikill asks how far this site is from the end of Plank Road, where it starts getting into the jeep trail. B. Wagers states that he has walked in from Lake Desolation Road and it is probably 1 to 1 ¼ miles in. He states that there may be a little grading and trimming necessary. There would be a van type vehicle that would go in off of Lake Desolation Road with the tower sections on it. D. Cochran asks why this location was chosen. B. Wagers states that if the wind is favorable in this area, Airtricity will come back. This is kind of in the center of where the project would be and would give them representative readings. The data collection process is discussed. The approximate elevation at this point is 1870'. T. Siragusa questions that this will be a monopole. B. Wagers reiterates that it is a 6" single pole supported by guyed wires. G. Dake reviews the requirements for site plan review. Fencing is discussed and B. Wagers states that they will do whatever the Town would like. J. Streit asks about lighting and B. Wagers states that it is not over 200, the larger towers will be lit. D. Cochran states that he would like to see this fenced. B. Wagers states that in some other situations they have been required to do nothing, and then in others to fence

August 29, 2006

to all points. He states that G. McKenna had recommended fencing around all points. L. Dupouy states that in addition to a better map showing a proper driveway, fence, etc., she would like to see some type of signage giving a contact in case of emergency. T. Yasenchak states that she would like to see a map that shows specifically the site where the tower is going to be erected, the guyed wires and the limit of clearing for this point, and a storm water pollution prevention plan. G. Dake states that we should have this information prior to scheduling a public hearing. He reviews what has been requested to be on the map and the SWPPP with an NOI. T. Yasenchak states that it would be helpful to know how long they intend to keep this up. G. Dake states that the current regulation allows for 12 months with one 12 month extension. B. Wagers believes they will ask for the whole 12 months and may come back to ask for the additional 12 month extension. G. Dake states, and states that he will repeat this at every step of this process, that he is assuming that the Planning Board will ultimately approve this data collection tower, he does not want Airtricity, Bill Wagers, anyone, to misinterpret that as an approval of subsequent windmills. C. Baker suggests that we have a NYS license stamp on the tower design. G. Dake suggests the Board read the new section of code pertaining to data collection towers. T. Siragusa asks if there will be improvements to the existing trail. B. Wagers states only if they are required and if so, Finch Pruyn will be doing the grading only to allow vehicles to get in. G. Dake states that the map should show the driveway from which ever public highway they are using.

MICHAEL VITALIANO – PUD

Route 9N

Lisa Nagle from ELAN, Michael Vitaliano and Frank Giachetto are present. G. Dake states that he met with M. Vitaliano a few weeks ago. M. Vitaliano gives some background and states that it is his intention to retire in this area. L. Nagle explains that the applicant is proposing a PUD for the property, approximately a 20-acre parcel just north of Spier Falls Road. There are some DEC and Army Corp wetlands that have been delineated on the site and there is a utility ROW through the back corner of the property. What the applicant would like to do is create a town house community setting and F. Giachetto is the architect working with M. Vitaliano. They have tried to retain the wooded setting of the site and create a community-type feel. They would also like to build a day-care facility as they see a need for this in the community, not only for residents of this PUD but also residents of Greenfield. L. Nagle states that what potentially allows this density to happen is a Cromaglass system which is a pod system that gets buried into the earth and it is an internal system that deals with all the waste water in the system, using just a fraction of the space of a regular conventional system. They are in use all over Long Island, and what is important about that is that Long Island is over a primary aquifer for New York State. F. Giachetto states that this system is used all over the world. The photo's in the packet are an example of the smaller, cottage-type community that the applicant is proposing – a community around the green. F. Giachetto states that they would like to maintain the rural quality and character, and also to deal with the environmental features that are on the site – the wetlands, the vernal stream – and that forced them to cluster everything towards the center of the site and by doing that, as you go up Route 9N, there would be very minimal impact aesthetically and visually from this development. He reviews the map, wastewater system and storm water detention areas. There will be 2 park areas and nature trails. G. Dake states that this would be a PUD because they are talking about 40 residential units and a day care center on about 20 acres. Under the proposed zoning this area is going to 5 or 6 acre zoning which would suggest that this is a significantly greater density than what the current zoning is and what the proposed zoning is and that can be mitigated by, if the Town Board chooses, a PUD. This is the phase where we are taking a look at this on a very conceptual basis, and it is only fair to Mr. Vitaliano that the Board is very candid with him. L. Nagle states that she spoke with A. Janik and they are on the Town Board's next workshop meeting. T. Yasenchak questions ownership. M. Vitaliano responds that they would have a HOA and that each unit would be individually owned. The day care is open at this time to anyone who would want to own and/or run it. He states that he has no feelings about it being a profit situation for himself. T. Yasenchak asks if someone would purchase it as part of the HOA. M. Vitaliano states that it would not, it would be leased out and independent of the HOA. T.

August 29, 2006

Yasenchak states that Route 9N is very busy, this is in a lower density stretch, and she does not see people putting their driveways onto 9N, this would actually take people away from the road, she has no negative feelings about the concept and asks about the range of selling prices. L. Nagle states moderate end and M. Vitaliano states \$250,000 to \$300,000. T. Yasenchak asks about the garages. L. Nagle states that they will be designed so that the garages go underneath. T. Yasenchak asks about any public access or is the trail system just for the residents? M. Vitaliano states that it is a private community. T. Yasenchak asks if any of the property borders the Kayaderosseras. L. Nagle states that there is a property between this one and the Kayaderosseras Creek. T. Yasenchak asks about the stream along the side. F. Giachetto states that he believes it is part of the natural flow of drainage through the site and it ponds when there is a lot of rainfall. It is a vernal stream that fills when it is wet. L. Nagle states that the DEC wetlands have been flagged. T. Siragusa asks if this would be phased. Discussion takes place that it would be phased over 2 – 3 years. T. Siragusa states that it is an interesting concept, it looks green on paper, it looks nice, but it is outside of the zoning and a PUD is a way to create its own zone, it is clustered housing and L. Nagle has brought in some nice plans. He states that this is double the density of what is being proposed in the new zoning, and he does not see 40 units in what would be 5 or 6 acre zoning. D. Cochran states that the Town is trying to zone less density instead of more. He states that it is a fine looking project and asks about a name and signage. M. Vitaliano reiterates that it will be a community with some sort of a designation. L. Nagle states that she does not think that it particularly needs a sign. D. Cochran asks about wells. L. Nagle states that there will be a water system. L. Dupouy comments on her experiences as a military family for the past 30 years and states that she has seen, with the lower end units, that people buy the units for investments and then when you have renters in there they do not always take care of the property as well as the owner. She would like to see some very strict standards with the HOA. She comments that in some of these developments, vinyl siding is used and they sometimes, over time, end up not looking very good. She questions whether the units are going to be 2 stories and the garage being a separate level. F. Giachetto states that the garage will not take up the whole footprint, maybe half of the footprint will be living space and then a story on top of that. L. Dupouy states that she loves the concept of the community that they have provided, but that appears to be only for the high-end units in the back and she does not see that delineated for the others. She states that in the South she has seen planned communities where they want to make a little something for everybody and it is the less expensive housing, then the next layer of housing would be for middle management, and then the core and back is where the executive homes would be. She states it has not worked well because people who want to live in higher end homes don't like driving through the least expensive housing. M. Vitaliano states that when he gave the range in dollars, that was more for internal improvements rather than external, they will all be fairly uniform looking, it will not be what L. Dupouy is describing. He states that as far as the exterior, they are looking at concepts but are not set in stone on any one. L. Dupouy states that if this were to go through, she thinks that we have to be as creative as we can for any type of middle-income housing, we do not have enough in the area. If a sign is proposed, she would like to see an attractive, inviting sign. J. Streit states that there are some attractive features and clarifies that the amount of \$250,000 is for half of a duplex, and questions that these will ultimately be Town Roads. M. Vitaliano states that they will not, they will be self providing and have no effect on the Town. J. Streit states that this is a lot more attractive than he thought, with the reservation that he might think of some objections later, he would not offer absolute approval. M. Thrailkill states that conceptually he likes the idea of middle-income homes in Greenfield, it looks like a lot with 40 units there. Route 9N is very busy, very heavily traveled. There is no place to walk, run, or bicycle except around in circles within this unit and there would be a lot of people who might want to go out and run and you cannot do that on that Road. He states that at 6:00 in the morning there are 40 cars coming down the road when he is trying to get out and he would like to see a traffic study. The aesthetics are important, conceptually he thinks it is a good idea, there is a need for this kind of housing, but he thinks it is too much for this spot. C. Baker states that it seems to be a lot of units, especially with no water or sewer in the area. G. McKenna states that he understands the justification for the density, but he does not know enough about the project. J. Streit asks the applicant to briefly describe the Cromaglass system. F. Giachetto states that it is similar to a sewage treatment plant and goes on to explain how it works and that it has been around for about 30 years. M. Thrailkill states that even if the roads are to be maintained by the HOA he is concerned with repaving, etc. M. Vitaliano states that the HOA is set up for contingencies like that as the

August 29, 2006

units are assessed, and this is one of the reasons the 40 units are a benchmark for the project, anything less would put such a strain on the individual home owners that it wouldn't be affordable. Money is put in contingency "pots". He states that he understands the problems with the ice, etc., but does not believe that these roads will be beat up as much as a Town road. L. Nagle explains that the HOA has to be approved by Albany. T. Yasenchak reiterates M. Thraikill's comments about everybody traveling south in the morning and that is going to be a very difficult area for traffic, and agrees with the suggestion for a traffic study. G. Dake states that the applicant has done an excellent job of designing this and the question is whether the Town wants this level of density, which will be the key issue. The Planning Board's charge will be largely on the engineering issues and the density is going to be largely a Town Board question. Traffic is going to be a key issue here; DOH approval on water and sewer; as to the internal roads, we may want to work on the assumption that if the Town ever has to take over the roads, they are something that the Town could live with. If the Town wants this kind of density, the applicant has designed a beautiful project for that type of density.

ALEC STEPHENS – Bond Reduction

Moss Creek

C. Baker states that A. Stephens has taken an interesting approach on his bond for the project on Middle Grove Road. When the Planning Board last saw the project we had an estimate of \$320,000 to post a bond to cover the construction costs to build the road. A. Stephens has gone ahead and done a fair share of the work in there and in lieu of that, he is looking to not post the full \$320,000 bond. C. Baker states that they have cleared the entire right-of-way, they have installed storm water basins, they are in the process of putting the gravel down for the road, and he is scheduled to do the binder asphalt by September 15th. With this schedule he is hoping to get the initial bond number reduced from the \$320,000 to somewhere in the area of \$70,000 to \$80,000, with the idea that the bulk of the work has been completed before that bond is in place. In addition to that, he has established an escrow account to cover the construction inspection to date and through the paving. The Town Supervisor, G. Dake and C. Baker have had numerous conversations and the Town Attorney as well. C. Baker states that it is a different approach than what we normally see. G. Dake states that leaving the road half cut in next to a wetland seems like the worst possible response, so moving forward struck him as being a good approach as long as it was done under inspections. C. Baker states that the goal is to allow A. Stephens to get this road built so that he can start building the houses. G. Dake states that the level of control the Town has is that until the Town has a bond, he does not have a subdivision. G. Dake has not signed a subdivision map for this project yet, he has one large driveway right now, out of pocket. C. Baker states that we will continue to have a level of influence with each one of the building permits, as they come along, on anything that needs to be corrected any time along the way and prior to the final dedication to the Town. G. Dake states that the Town holds a percentage of the bond for 1 year after the road is dedicated to the Town in case there are unforeseen maintenance issues along the way. The Planning Board will probably be asked by C. Baker to approve a bond recommendation to go to the Town Board. C. Baker states that he did get a fax yesterday afternoon. He states that one of the contingencies for A. Stephens was to reach a number for the storm water maintenance, and his feeling is rather than come up with that number now – again, we have plenty of time to do this before the Town officially takes that road - let the applicant get the basins in, get the vegetation established, we will then have a better idea of what it is going to take to maintain those basins, and then when it comes time for the dedication of the road, that might be the more appropriate time to come up with a number. He states that he discussed this with A. Stephens briefly, it seems that this is not going to hurt anybody, and might give us a better idea of what is going to be involved. T. Yasenchak questions the inspections. G. Dake states that is why the applicant was asked to set up an additional escrow fund. T. Yasenchak states that she feels this puts the Town in an awkward position of almost forcing us to do that for the applicant. G. Dake states that the Planning Board did approve the road design and while this is out of order, EDP can stop the applicant at any time. T. Yasenchak states that if things are in the Town law as being required and then we do this, what stops the next builder from doing this. G. Dake states that this has not been painless for A. Stephens and the

August 29, 2006

problem is that the financing he is using proposed a bond, sent in a copy of the bond and M. Schachner didn't like it, and they could not reach an agreement. He states that he does not think it is something we will run into again. J. Streit states that it is a gamble on the applicant's part because if the Town does not accept the subdivision, he has a road to nowhere. G. Dake states that John Witt also does not have a road bond and has spent a bit of money.

YOUNG ROAD LLC – Minor Subdivision

Young Road

Michael Ginley, attorney and resident of Greenfield, is here on behalf of the owners of the north side of Young Road. He explains that the land was owned by the Uebrick family and Young Road LLC purchased the north side, about 38 acres, and Sandra Kilinski bought the south side which is approximately 15 acres. He states that he is one of the owners of Young Road LLC along with his father. The estate agreed to sell the land in two different pieces. Neither the estate attorney nor himself do much zoning work and didn't realize that it couldn't be sold without being subdivided. They thought that Young Road, being the natural buffer between the two, allowed them to just get two surveys, two legal descriptions, and sell it off. They closed about a month ago and then he happened to be talking to G. McKenna, who told him that they did have to go through the Planning Board. G. Dake reviews the acreage, that the property is divided by the road and that G. McKenna did speak with him about this. He states that he did not believe that either he or G. McKenna had the power to just administratively do this because technically it is a subdivision. He suggests that this is a natural subdivision, he would recommend that we do SEQRA and waive the public hearing. It is obviously two good size lots that are divided by a road and no harm is done. M. Ginley states that the one concern that he has is the waiver of the 5 year rule regarding further subdivision. G. Dake states that we do have precedent for that. **The Board completes Part II of the Short Form SEQRA. All questions are answered "no". J. Streit makes a motion to check Box B, indicating that this will not result in any significant negative environmental impacts. T. Yasenchak seconds the motion. All present in favor.**

RESOLUTION – Young Road, LLC

MOTION: M. Thrailkill

SECOND: J. Streit

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board grants a minor subdivision to Young Road, LLC and Sandra Kilinski for property bisected by Young Road and located at 244 Young Road, TM#161.-1-6 waives the public hearing and waives the 5-year rule regarding no further subdivision.

T. Siragusa questions that there are any issues at all with this land regarding topo, etc. G. McKenna states that it is a little steep but it is a 38+ acre lot which is in the RD zone requiring 8 acres. T. Yasenchak states that saying that we will waive the 5-year rule does not assure further subdivision approval once the applicant goes through the process. C. Baker asks if S. Kilinski is part of the LLC and if not should we have some kind of authorization from her. G. Dake states that since she already bought the other side, all the Planning Board is doing is legitimizing the legal transaction.

VOTE: Ayes: Dake, Cochran, Dupouy, Siragusa, Streit, Thrailkill, Yasenchak

Noes: None

TIMOTHY KAHL, Minor Subdivision

Sand Hill Road

C. Woodcock, who is purchasing one of the lots, is present representing the application. G. Dake reviews that this is approximately 35 acres, which is being subdivided into 3 lots – 5 ½, 10+ and 19+. G.

August 29, 2006

McKenna states that this meets and exceeds current zoning. G. Dake states that the current owner lives on lot 2. D. Cochran asks about topo and states that he would like to see that added to the map along with the standard notes, the stamp and any wetlands. R. Rowland states that she spoke with the surveyor today who realizes that the plans are not stamped and was waiting to see what else the Board may want on the plans. T. Yasechak questions the road and sight distance. G. McKenna states that it is pretty straight and flat. C. Baker has no comments. A public hearing is scheduled for September 12 at 7:00 p.m. G. Dake suggests a no disturbance line be placed on the plans 100' from the brook.

RALPH MACCHIO – Lot Line Adjustment

Locust Grove Road

G. Dake explains that this was an approved lot line adjustment on which the time for signature has lapsed.

RESOLUTION – R. Macchio, Lot Line Adjustment

MOTION: D. Cochran

SECOND: L. Dupouy

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board reaffirms its approval of a lot line adjustment for Ralph Macchio for property located on Locust Grove Road, TM#112.-2-61 and TM#112.-2-21 per the map submitted.

VOTE: Ayes: Dake, Cochran, Dupouy, Siragusa, Thrailkill, Yasechak

Noes: None

Abstain: Streit

ZBA REFERRALS

Timothy & Kathy Monica – G. McKenna reviews that this is a request for a Temporary Use Variance to live in the existing mobile home while a new modular is constructed, new well and septic. No Planning Board issues.

Stephen Smero – G. McKenna reviews that this is a request for 5 area variances for buffers for the property across from the Town Hall. G. McKenna comments that they are making the situation better than what it is.

RECOMMENDATION – The Planning Board recommends in favor of approval.

Jama Peacock – G. McKenna explains that this is for signage for the same building. The zoning allows 10 square feet. The applicant has three signs planned – one of 15 square feet, one of 12 and one of 6. They are only allowed 2 signs and are requesting variances for 1 extra sign and 2 variances for size. G. Dake comments that he likes that the application indicates where the signs are to be placed. Discussion takes place regarding the necessity for the sign saying “Doc Peacock’s”. G. Dake states that he is not necessarily opposed, but is not sure of the need for that sign. L. Dupouy states that the signs seem very professional and an upgrade, and then the third sign seems more countrified. She states that if a sign has to go, that would be the one. T. Yasechak states that three seems excessive. D. Cochran suggests leaving this to the ZBA. T. Siragusa states that he is ok with the 3 signs. No recommendation is made, the minutes of the discussion will be forwarded to the ZBA. J. Streit suggests passing along that the Planning Board is questioning whether the “Doc Peacock’s” sign would be extraneous and a distraction.

August 29, 2006

DISCUSSION

G. Dake states that he has had numerous conversations with Bill Ure, his attorney, a representative from Jelenik and the attorney for the seller. He understood that there was a verbal extension of the purchase agreement to today's date. He has encouraged everyone to work together to resolve this issue and he states that they are getting further apart and not closer together.

Meeting adjourned 8:58 p.m., all members in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Rosamaria Rowland
Secretary