

# Town of Cazenovia Planning Board

## Meeting Minutes

### April 4, 2024

Members Present: Robert Ridler, Chairman; Anne Ferguson; Dale Bowers; Thomas Clarke; Mary Margaret Koppers; Jerry Munger, Alternate Member;

Members Absent: Linda Cushman; Roger Cook, Alternate Member

Others Present: John Langey; John Dunkle; Edward (Ted) Spencer, Esq; Audra Schmidtka; Brian Davis; Melissa Davis; Riley Dixon; Thomas Dixon; Jeffrey Howe; James Howe; John Watson; Lluís Torrent; Adrian Arias; Roberto Cebrian; Michael Frazee; Vincent Wagner; Jennifer Wong; Dennis Gregg; Sheila Fallon

-----

R. Ridler called the meeting to order at 7:31 P.M. and asked that attendees sign in.

Roll was taken; all were present except Linda Cushman & Roger Cook. Jerry Munger served as a voting member for the proceedings.

The next regularly scheduled meeting will be Thursday, May 2, 2024.

The next deadline day will be Wednesday, April 17, 2024.

The next regularly scheduled work session will be Thursday, April 25, 2024.

Motion by A. Ferguson, seconded by M. Koppers, to approve the March 7, 2024 meeting minutes was carried unanimously.

### **HEARINGS**

*Schmidtka, Audra with Hosmer Properties, LLC – Line Change – 2026 Rippleton Cross Rd  
File # 24-1522 with Rippleton Cross Road  
(Dale Bowers)*

Edward (Ted) Spencer, Esq and Audra Schmidtka were present to represent the file.

D. Bowers explained the proposal involved a lot line change for a parcel on the corner of Lane Road and Rippleton Cross Road. He explained part of the parcel was on the north side of Lane Road and part was on the south side of Lane Road. The land on the south side of Lane Road would be absorbed into a lot adjacent to the property to the south. He elaborated that the proposal had first had review by the Town of Cazenovia Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) for an area variance because the parcel on the north side of Lane Road would only be 2.94 acres (after the line change was completed). He asked if the Board had any questions regarding the application.

The Board had no questions.

Motion by A. Ferguson, seconded by J. Munger, to open the public hearing was carried unanimously.

R. Ridler invited comments at this time.

Hearing no comments, motion by D. Bowers, seconded by T. Clarke, to close the public hearing was carried unanimously.

Motion by D. Bowers, seconded by A. Ferguson, to approve the line change as most recently submitted was carried unanimously.

### **LAND DISTURBANCE/SITE PLAN REVIEW/SUBDIVISION**

*Davis, Brian & Melissa – Site Plan Review – 4580 Fox Lane, Cazenovia  
File # 23-1501 (Anne Ferguson)*

Brian and Melissa Davis were present to represent the application.

A. Ferguson explained the Davises received a special use permit from the ZBA for the keeping of a maximum of two (2) horses on their property. She said an open item from the ZBA for the Planning Board was regarding a drainage issue. She asked John Dunkle if he had any comments relative to the drainage solution proposed by the Applicants involving a trench.

J. Dunkle responded that he had reviewed the proposal and he felt it was reasonable, however, he said the drainage issue was not part of the consideration involving the Planning Board. He said the drainage issue was a matter among two (2) or three (3) property owners and does not affect Town drainage in any manner. He advised the Board to refrain from involvement in private property drainage issues.

B. Davis interjected the drainage was a non-issue.

R. Ridler clarified it was a non-issue for the Board, not a non-issue for the Applicants.

B. Davis agreed saying it was a private issue.

J. Dunkle said the Board would not want "to own" the proposed solution since it may not be acceptable to all the private property owners. He apologized to the Applicant if the ZBA made the drainage an issue. He continued by saying his advice to the Board was to direct the Applicants to address that issue with all the adjoining property owners.

B. Davis expressed understanding.

T. Clarke asked if there was a drainage easement for the property.

J. Langey said the Town was not requesting a drainage easement.

A. Ferguson noticed there was an existing drainage easement however.

J. Dunkle repeated the existing drainage easements were between private property owners. He said the Applicant appears to be utilizing that existing easement to a greater extent with the solution he was proposing.

A. Ferguson said the other issue raised by the ZBA for the Planning Board was the placement and solution for the manure. She noted the Applicants were considering either a dumpster or a pad, and she asked if that choice had been resolved.

B. Davis replied either option would work.

A. Ferguson believed the concern was the weight of a dumpster, as well as the access to the dumpster during wet seasons.

M. Davis responded a pad “would be more ideal.” She said they could have someone come and remove the manure if it were on a pad.

B. Davis explained they own a compact tractor with a bucket and he did not believe they would have an issue with requiring a big truck to remove the dumpster.

A. Ferguson asked if the designated area for the pad location would be behind the barn, referring to the drawing created by Michael J. McCully Land Surveying, PLLC dated 12-14-23, last revised 02-01-24 entitled *Location Survey on Lot One of the Doust Subdivision Map #2124 Known as No. 4580 Fox Lane, Town of Cazenovia, County of Madison, State of New York*. She noted the site plan had been updated to show the Applicants would install a concrete pad for either housing the manure in a container or a dumpster.

M. Davis explained the pad would not require a container, saying the pad would have walls on three (3) sides. She elaborated it would not be a removable structure. She repeated that unit “would be more ideal.”

A. Ferguson expressed understanding and noted the manure would be removed once a month. She also noted another condition of the ZBA approval was the submission of an as-built survey once all the work was done and before obtaining a Certificate of Occupancy for the project.

T. Clarke asked, if a dumpster were used, if it would be covered.

M. Davis said it would not.

R. Ridler believed the Applicants were choosing to use the bunker-pad option.

B. Davis and M. Davis both agreed the 3-sided pad was the better option.

J. Langey led the Board through the Short Environmental Assessment Form (SEAF) to do the State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR) finding all impacts would be small if any at all. He said he would note the Applicants will be using a 3-sided concrete space for manure containment.

M. Davis explained the 3-sided container would have wooden sides.

D. Bowers asked the plan for manure removal, wondering if it would remain on site or be removed.

B. Davis answered they would be removing it off site.

D. Bowers noted the neighbor had expressed concern about manure run-off being washed onto their property, so removing it off site would prevent that.

Motion by A. Ferguson, seconded by D. Bowers, to appoint the Planning Board as Lead Agency for the purposes of the SEQR, to affirm the matter an Unlisted Action and make a Negative Declaration based upon the review of the SEAF, and to approve the site plan for a 34' X 36' horse barn and associated pastureland as most recently submitted was carried unanimously.

-----

*Dixon, Riley & Allison — Site Plan Review – 5701 East Lake Road, Cazenovia  
File # 23-1513 (Linda Cushman)*

Riley and Thomas Dixon were present to represent the file.

R. Ridler explained this was a site plan review for a structure and asked the Applicants to explain their proposal.

T. Dixon said Riley and Alison Dixon were proposing to build a single-family house. He brought a full-scale set of drawings created by Holmes King Kallquist & Associates, Architects-LLP entitled *New Residence and Garage Dixon Ranch 5701 E Lake Road, Cazenovia NY* dated 12-18-23, as well as the site plan created by SeGuin Land Surveying, PLLC entitled *Lands of Dixon Part of Lot 24 of the One Mile Strip In the Town of Cazenovia Madison County, New York* dated 03/29/2024, and the *Septic System Layout Plan* dated April 2024 by MBL Engineering, PLLC.

The Board reviewed the elevations found on pages A2.1, A2.2, and A2.3 which included the view from East Lake Road which was the front, as well as views from the back.

R. Ridler asked the square footage.

T. Dixon said it would be about 7000 square feet.

T. Clarke asked the height.

A. Ferguson saw that it would be 31 feet. She asked about the siding and roof material.

T. Dixon answered the siding would be LP SmartSide Trim with a stone foundation. The roof would be asphalt shingles with some standing seam metal roofing over the porches.

R. Ridler asked if the garage would be attached.

T. Dixon said it would.

R. Ridler noted it would be a 3-car garage.

A. Ferguson asked if the house would be connected to the garage with a covered breezeway.

T. Dixon answered it would.

The Board then looked at the site plan which showed the location of the proposed house and the grade where it would be situated, as well as the driveway.

M. Koppers asked to see the elevations of the proposed house from the north to get a better understanding of how it would look traveling south on East Lake Road, since the house would be located at the top of a hill.

It was noted that three (3) stories would be seen from that vantage point.

T. Dixon said they have a 3-dimensional model that he can provide as well.

A. Ferguson indicated that would be worthwhile to have.

T. Dixon had several copies of the septic design for the Board.

A. Ferguson asked if the septic design had been submitted to the Madison County Department of Health (DOH).

T. Dixon answered it had not.

R. Ridler asked if Mr. Dixon would be submitting it to the DOH.

T. Dixon replied, "Absolutely."

A. Ferguson asked if the septic and well were located on the lot.

T. Dixon responded, "It is."

Motion by D. Bowers, seconded by T. Clarke, to approve the site plan for the construction of a new home as most recently submitted was carried unanimously.

-----

*Howe, Jeffrey & Cara – Site Plan Review – 5611 East Lake Road, Cazenovia  
File # 24-1521 (Dale Bowers)*

Jeffrey Howe was present to represent the file.

D. Bowers explained this was a site plan review that had ZBA approval for a second accessory structure. He explained where the property was located along East Lake Road in relation to Peth Road. He displayed a photograph of the existing house which was included with the site plan application.

It was clarified that the house was on the west side of East Lake Road.

D. Bowers said the Applicants have an existing accessory structure which was described as a gazebo. He elaborated that the Owners would like to build a one-story garage opposite the existing attached garage. The proposed structure would be used for storage. The garage doors would be facing each other. The proposed structure would be a considerable distance from the road; and the proposed siding of the new garage would be similar to the existing. He concluded he would endorse the same conditions imposed by the ZBA.

A. Ferguson asked if the siding material would be consistent with the house.

J. Howe affirmed it would.

M. Koppers asked about lighting for the proposed structure.

D. Bowers answered the lighting would have to be dark-sky compliant, low-level, and downcast according to the ZBA approval. He also believed the ZBA required any wiring would have to be underground.

J. Howe replied that was their plan.

D. Bowers explained the structure would be pre-fabricated and delivered to the site.

T. Clarke asked if the siding would match the house.

J. Howe answered the siding, the shingles, and the windows would match.

R. Ridler asked the square footage of the proposed garage.

J. Howe answered it would be approximately 14' X 28'.

J. Langey suggested a Negative Declaration for the Unlisted Action using the SEAF for the SEQR.

D. Bowers mentioned the General Municipal Recommendation Report (GML) from the Madison County Planning Department raised no issues.

Motion by D. Bowers, seconded by T. Clarke, to make a Negative Declaration based upon the review of the SEAF and to approve the site plan for a 14' X 28' garage as most recently submitted was carried unanimously.

-----

*Johnson, Peter – Line Changes – 2539 Ballina Road with 2551 Ballina Road, and  
And Johnson, Eleanor 2597 Ballina Road  
File # 23-1526 (Anne Ferguson)*

No one was present to represent the file.

A. Ferguson explained the application was for line changes and in the representative's absence, she recommended the file be kept open and moved to a public hearing.

J. Langey led the Board through the SEAF for this Unlisted Action finding there would be no environmental impacts except for Item #2 *Will the proposed action result in a change in the use or the intensity of use of land* which was found to be a small impact.

Motion by A. Ferguson, seconded by J. Munger to appoint the Planning Board as Lead Agency for the purposes of the SEQR, to move the file to a public hearing, and to continue the file was approved unanimously.

-----

*EBAC, LLC/ Owera Vineyards – Site Plan Review – 5276 East Lake Road, Cazenovia  
File # 22-1428 (Robert Ridler)*

No one was present to represent the file.

Motion by D. Bowers, seconded by A. Ferguson, to continue the file was carried unanimously.

-----

*Love Frazee Assoc with Pushlar, Paul — Site Plan Review – Route 20 with Route 20 &  
File # 23-1497 (Robert Ridler) Fenner Road, Cazenovia*

John Watson, Lluís Torrent, Adrian Arias, and Roberto Cebrian were present to represent the file accompanied by Michael Frazee.

L. Torrent said he would like to discuss what they have done since the work session last Thursday, what they would be proposing this evening, and what they would be proposing for future meetings.

L. Torrent said one topic discussed last week was the sale of the Frazee business (Cazenovia Equipment). He said there had been questions regarding if the property would be sold with the business, when the sale would take place, and whether a new owner of the property would honor the conditions imposed by the Planning Board. He said they asked Bob Frazee if his son, Michael, could attend to attest that the conditions would be honored, so Michael was with them tonight. He added the transaction would probably take place in 2025. He wondered if Mr. Langey needed to take any actions for that ongoing transaction.

R. Ridler asked Mr. Langey if he was comfortable with the situation.

J. Langey answered the current owner has authorized the application, and at this time the Board cannot know if the sale will close, so the Board will proceed.

L. Torrent said the second topic discussed at the work session was two (2) options involving National Grid and the Planning Board had been kind enough to accept Option #2.

R. Ridler interjected that the Board had not approved Option#2, but they preferred that option. He asked that Mr. Torrent repeat the explanation for both options for the benefit of Mr. Langey and Mr. Dunkle who had not been present at the work session.

A. Ferguson also invited Jennifer Wong of the Cazenovia Preservation Foundation (CPF) to come forward to view the material.

J. Watson explained the options were regarding the interconnection and the pad mount, and the discussions they have been having with National Grid to make sure they can get a pad mount with the fewest poles necessary.

L. Torrent said National Grid's initial plan was to connect an existing pole with overhead lines to the point of interconnection. They told National Grid that plan was unacceptable and asked National Grid to devise a plan to replace the overhead lines. National Grid responded they could not do the connection underground in a section near the existing pole because there were too many existing utility and communication lines already in place for the structures in the area. The Applicants then asked National Grid to tell them what physical options would be possible.

L. Torrent said Option #1 from National Grid was to connect from the existing pole to a new pole on the west side of Remington Park then going underground to the inverter center – existing pole to new pole - to pad mounted system - then underground to the inverter center.

R. Ridler asked if the new pole would be on the north side of US Route 20 East.

L. Torrent said it would. He explained that National Grid was still hesitant to install this option, whether it was done by National Grid or by the Applicants, with underground lines because the west side of Remington Park was so populated with utilities and communications.

L. Torrent said Option #2, National Grid's preferred option, was to use a pole across Route 20 on the south and crossing overhead to a new pole on the north side of Route 20 – existing pole to a new pole - to a pad mounted system - then underground to the inverter center.

R. Ridler asked which poles would be new and which were existing according to the drawing entitled *Remington Park Solar Farm 2 Remington Park Drive, Cazenovia, NY 13035 NY-LAY-006 Layout and Plan Material Sheet 6 of 22* last revised March 15, 2024.

L. Torrent answered the new pole would be on the north side of Route 20. He said both solutions proposed by National Grid would involve one (1) new pole. When asked if there was a way to connect without installing a new pole, National Grid had stated there was not.

R. Ridler asked if Option #2 was the preferred design the Applicants wanted to use.

L. Torrent affirmed it was so, based upon Board comments, they had revised their plans to incorporate that connection.

M. Koppers asked if once the line was dug for Option #2, if the area would need to remain cleared for future maintenance or if it could revert to overgrowth.

L. Torrent displayed a satellite picture showing where there were trees in the area and where the underground line would be installed just behind the trees, requiring no tree

removal. He explained National Grid's responsibility and their responsibility borders at the pad mount, so the Applicants would fill the underground burial and reseed with grass for maintenance; he repeated no trees would need to be cut for the installation or for maintenance.

A. Ferguson asked if the connection would all be underground (from the pad to the inverter).

L. Torrent affirmed it would.

R. Ridler believed the area for the pole and the pad would be located on the existing Cazenovia Equipment property where the parking/display area was.

L. Torrent answered, "That's right."

J. Langey felt the Applicants could not "do any better than that."

J. Dunkle remarked the poles used would be along Route 20 where one more pole would not be noticed.

J. Langey asked if the new pole would be approximately the same height as the other poles.

J. Watson replied, "Exactly."

L. Torrent said they were notified that the drawings and the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) resolved the pending questions (by Mr. Dunkle) so their next step was to check the Solar Application Review Documents List with the documents that have been submitted in the past and compiling the documents into a new binder which they brought in four (4) copies to represent their most updated application.

A. Ferguson asked if National Grid's Option #2 has become the basis of the new site plan.

L. Torrent answered, "Yes."

L. Torrent said the binders, being submitted this evening, with the exception of three (3) new documents, contained material which was submitted previously. He explained it was a compilation of the documents for the next step.

R. Ridler asked if the new binders should replace the all the previous binders.

L. Torrent answered, "That's correct."

A. Ferguson asked if the spreadsheet that the Applicants were maintaining/tracking the various versions and submissions of documents, or if somewhere in the new binder, was there a unique number or date on each document that could be referenced to identify final versions.

L. Torrent displayed a sheet that was created to track the submission of document using the date when the package was submitted and with each document having a date.

A. Ferguson explained that at the end of the review, she would like a list of the documents with date of the approved final document.

L. Torrent showed the list of 21 documents and the dates they were “opened.”

L. Torrent continued saying there were three (3) documents, one of which was the equipment brochure from the manufacturer, that had no date.

A. Ferguson replied the date submitted to the Board could be used for that.

J. Langey interjected that Mr. Dunkle made the point that to the extent that there were certain documents, including the decommissioning plan, decommissioning bond, etc..., the Board would not be approving those items. There were still items that needed future review.

A. Ferguson expressed understanding and explained she was only talking about the items the Board has looked at and accepted.

L. Torrent stated that was also their understanding; the new compellation of documents was for a public hearing, realizing there would be modifications.

J. Langey elaborated saying the public hearing could produce public comments.

L. Torrent anticipated having to make modifications and did not assume any of the documents were approved.

L. Torrent asked to review the punch list point by point or said he could display the three pictures that have changed since the last submission first.

The new material was discussed first.

L. Torrent said the first new picture was found in section#03 the visual (Photo Simulations) # 8. He said the submitted picture in February showed four (4) poles, now there are none. He said #9 was the same. He said the last picture shows how the simulation would look with the point of interconnection to the overhead pole and the location of the pad mount at Observer Point 20 (Photo simulation) page 42/April 2024.

R. Ridler expressed his approval of the new compellation.

L. Torrent reviewed items on the punch list, Item # 1 Site Plans - they now have a complete set of drawings using National Grid Option #2 Version #5 dated March 15, 2024.

A. Ferguson asked if the Board had reviewed the most recent version of the site plan with Option #2.

L. Torrent said that had been submitted March 29, 2024 and Mr. Dunkle reviewed it with the Agricultural Statements in layout #5.

R. Ridler said the Board received Mr. Dunkle's approval of that submission.

L. Torrent said the Aerial Site Plan was Document #6.

A. Ferguson clarified that Document #6 reflected Option #2.

L. Torrent said the Site Survey with Existing Topographical Conditions was Document #3 and was done with a land surveyor measuring on site.

L. Torrent said regarding Item c - Site Survey with New Topographical Conditions, they would not be changing any topographical conditions; they would not be grading except for the smoothing of the access road. Drawing #21 and #22 address the land movement and with cross-sections for the Board to see that minimum disturbance proposed. The rest of the solar farm area would be untouched.

L. Torrent said regarding Item d – Landscaping/Planting, he recalled information that was requested so he displayed a full-sized drawing entitled *Remington Park Solar Farm 2 Remington Park Drive Cazenovia, NY 13035 Sheet 17 of 22 NY-Lay-017 Landscape Plan* dated Mar 15, 2024 which showed the species, locations, and quantities proposed. He said they replicated their proposal after the approved Barrett Road solar project planting plan.

A. Ferguson noted 44 gray dogwood, 64 Eastern red cedar, 58 Fat Albert blue spruce, 76 elderberry, and 130 viburnums were proposed. She expressed approval of the proposed species. She said one other item was whether pollinator friendly seed versus grass seed would be used under the panels; she recalled the pollinator friendly mix was the Board's preferred choice.

L. Torrent responded that under the panels they propose meadow grass and that around the perimeters they would use the pollinator friendly mix. He explained if pollinator friendly species were planted among the rows, any intervention would disturb the plants.

A. Ferguson asked if the grass would be unmowed.

L. Torrent affirmed it would.

A. Ferguson also believed the spacing of the trees and shrubs would be randomized to avoid creating a hedgerow of plantings.

J. Watson replied the plantings would “be extremely randomized as much as possible,” with mixed species.

A. Ferguson encouraged the Applicants to replicate natural groupings rather than rows.

R. Ridler stated the landscaping and planting plan was acceptable. He said the next item was Item e – Grading Plan in conjunction with the SWPPP.

A. Ferguson commented there would be no grading.

R. Ridler noted Items f & g related to Erosion Control and Sediment Control (regarding the SWPPP) and asked if that was good.

J. Dunkle indicated it was.

R. Ridler said the next item was the Geo-Technical Report.

A. Ferguson noted that report included the Soil Analysis and believed that item was closed in January.

L. Torrent stated that was correct. He said Item #3 was the Photo Simulations which was mostly satisfied in March and now, with the new material this month, could be considered closed.

L. Torrent said Item #4 was the Panel/Racking Specifications and that was closed in February. He explained that document did not have a specific date because it was the brochure from the manufacturer, which they had discussed.

L. Torrent continued saying Item #5 was the Plant Selections – species, photos, and revegetation – which they just proposed, so now that was closed.

L. Torrent said Item #6 – the Fence and Gate – was closed in December.

L. Torrent said Item #7 – Signage Details – was also closed in December.

Item #8 was the SWPPP which L. Torrent said was now closed.

L. Torrent believed Items #9 – the Sun Chart and #10 – the Glare Analysis were closed in January.

L. Torrent said Item #11 – the Utility Notification was completed with National Grid using Form K, which was the formal agreement between the Applicants and National Grid.

A. Ferguson noted the agreement was signed in January.

L. Torrent said Item #12 was the Construction Schedule, and he said they created a timeline showing what would be done in months 1-6.

R. Ridler observed that was the timeline that would be used whenever the project was started.

L. Torrent described it as a generic timeline.

A. Ferguson asked how long the overall project was expected to take.

L. Torrent responded, “26 weeks.”

A. Ferguson thought that was fast.

L. Torrent indicated the project was a small one.

R. Cebrian added having very little land movement made it “quite fast.”

A. Ferguson stated Item #12 was then done.

L. Torrent continued saying Item #13 was the Report to New York Department of Agriculture and Markets (Ag & Markets).

A. Ferguson asked if the Applicants had heard from Ag & Markets.

L. Torrent answered they had not. He believed in his discussions with Mr. Dunkle that the property was outside the wellhead area, but they had not heard from Ag & Markets.

R. Ridler asked if the Board needed any statement from Ag & Markets.

J. Langey thought there would be no impact.

A. Ferguson saw the Applicants had filed with Ag & Markets January 10, 2024. She commented this item would be open until a response was received from Ag & Markets.

R. Ridler asked the Applicants to follow up on that communication.

A. Ferguson was unsure what the typical response time was from Ag & Markets.

L. Torrent remarked one (1) month was typical.

A. Ferguson said Item #14 – Wetlands, was closed.

L. Torrent explained Item #15 – Business Operation Plan had been open because there was a reference to herbicides which was subsequently corrected. He explained on the Environmental Assessment Form they stated they would not be using herbicides, but the Operation Plan referred to its use as a secondary measurement. That statement had been removed so that was now consistent.

A. Ferguson asked if the other operational aspects such as hours, lights, water, deicing, etc... were submitted.

L. Torrent replied, "That's correct."

L. Torrent said Item #16 regarding the Federal Aviation Agency (FAA) was closed.

A. Ferguson noted the letter from the FAA was received in October of 2023.

A. Ferguson asked if Item #17 – Notification to and Confirmation from the Local Emergency Services had been completed. She asked if they had heard from the Cazenovia Fire Department.

L. Torrent answered they had not, but recalled this item was open due to a previous comment.

A. Ferguson remembered the emergency phone number on the sign had not been determined.

L. Torrent replied, "That's correct."

A. Ferguson asked if that phone number had been determined.

L. Torrent answered it would be determined prior to construction.

A. Ferguson remarked the Applicants also needed a letter from the local fire department.

T. Clarke believed Sam Usborne was the Fire Chief.

J. Watson asked if it would be the Cazenovia Village Fire Department.

He was told it was.

T. Clarke instructed the Applicants to call the Village Office to get the contact information for the Fire Department.

A. Ferguson noted that item was still open.

L. Torrent said Item #18 – the Road Maintenance Agreement would also be considered open because it would be handled by the Town Board rather than the Planning Board. He said it would be the same with Item #19 – Payment In Lieu of Taxes (PILOT) Agreement, and Item #20 – the Decommissioning Plan.

L. Torrent said Item #21 was a Noise Study that was requested by the Planning Board, and that was submitted January 10, 2024. He conveyed that the conclusion of the study was that noise would not be an impact.

L. Torrent stated the Full Environmental Assessment Form (FEAF) which was submitted with the application has not changed, so they considered that a closed item as well.

L. Torrent asked the Board what the next step would be, and if the Board needed time to review the documents or if the Board felt a public hearing for the May meeting would be appropriate.

R. Ridler asked Mr. Langey about the SEQR.

J. Langey said he and Mr. Dunkle felt the SEQR would be an ongoing process; he advised the Board to leave that open until public comment had been heard. He said he and Mr. Dunkle would be preparing potential findings for the Board's consideration, but the Board would not complete the SEQR process until a future meeting. He reminded the Board they will have to review Part 2 of the FEAF in great detail.

R. Ridler asked if the Board was comfortable moving the application to a public hearing for May.

J. Langey reminded the Board the public hearing can be left open for a few months.

Motion by J. Munger, seconded by A. Ferguson, to move the application to a public hearing at the next meeting was carried unanimously.

J. Langey asked if the Board felt the Town Hall was adequate to accommodate the public hearing. He was unsure how many people would attend. He said the Board would have to hear all May agenda items wherever the chosen venue was.

The Board decided to hold the meeting and the public hearing in the Town Hall.

J. Watson asked about the notification requirements.

He was told a mailing list would be created for all the neighbors within 500 feet of all property lines.

L. Torrent asked if additional copies of the April 4, 2024 submission were needed.

He was told no additional copies were needed.

J. Langey asked if the Applicants could provide the best representations of how the project would look for the public hearing. He suggested that rendering would be available for the back of the seating area as well as the front so attendees could view the proposal more easily.

L. Torrent asked if the Board would allow them to bring a 100-inch screen and a projector so they can zoom in clearer than a 24" x 36" drawing would show.

J. Watson asked where the screen should be placed.

J. Langey suggested the alcove. He asked the Applicants to set up the display in advance of the meeting so the public can see it as they take their seats.

L. Torrent said if the Board was agreeable, they would arrive at 7:00PM that evening.

Motion by A. Ferguson, seconded by T. Clarke, to continue the file was carried unanimously.

-----

Motion by D. Bowers, seconded by T. Clarke, to adjourn the meeting at 8:38 P.M. was carried unanimously.

Sue Wightman, Planning Board Secretary – April 5, 2024