

# Town of Cazenovia Planning Board

## Meeting Minutes

February 1, 2024

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

Members Absent: Roger Cook, Alternate Member

Others Present: John Langey; John Dunkle; Chuck Ladd; Adam McAllister; Paul Curtin; James Golub; Jennifer Wong; Andrew Dwyer; Jason Stumbo; Johanna Stumbo; Vincent Ryan; Jeffrey Rubin; Jennifer Rubin; John Watson; Dennis Gregg; Laurie Cornell; Alayne Cornell

-----

R. Ridler called the meeting to order at 7:30 P.M. and asked that attendees sign in.

Roll was taken; all were present except for Roger Cook.

The next regularly scheduled meeting will be Thursday, March 7, 2024.

The next deadline day will be Wednesday, February 21, 2024.

The next regularly scheduled work session will be Thursday, February 29, 2024.

Motion by A. Ferguson, seconded by T. Clarke, to approve the January 4, 2024 meeting minutes was carried unanimously.

### **HEARINGS**

*Mc Allister, Adam – Line Change – 1875 Route 80 with 1905 Route 80, New Woodstock File # 23-1512 (Dale Bowers)*

Adam McAllister was present to represent the file with Paul Curin, Esq. the attorney for Stephen Evans, the potential buyer.

D. Bowers explained the proposal was the reconfiguration of two (2) existing lots wherein one lot would be reduced to 15 acres and the other lot (having Mr. McAllister's home) would be enlarged by the remaining acreage. He said the outstanding issue was that the lot having 15 acres has an existing accessory structure with no private residence. He asked how would that be handled.

P. Curtin said his client, Stephen Evans, would be acquiring that piece of property, and it was his client's intention to convert the barn into a residence. He said his client would begin working to that end in the spring or when time, weather, and contractors allowed, (once the line change was approved and his client acquired the parcel). He elaborated that the exterior of the building would remain the same, but the interior would be converted to habitable space.

When asked about the well and septic arrangements, Mr. Curtin said those features would be independent of the well and septic for Mr. McAllister's home lot.

D. Bowers asked about the timeframe that should be established for the conversion.

J. Langey answered a condition for the approval of the line change could be the conversion of the existing structure into a residence within a year. He mentioned that in other instances that condition had been mandated, and the conversion had not taken place within the prescribed period of time. He advised the conversion be definite. He asked Mr. Curtin how much time he felt was necessary.

P. Curtin had spoken with Dr. Evans and was told work would begin in 2024 and would be completed within 12 months. He added his client has sufficient funding and a good outline of plans to move forward. He stated, "They're not handicapped by resources at this point in time."

A. Ferguson asked if the conversion would be completed by the end of 2025.

P. Curtin answered if consent were given in February of 2024, he would expect the work to be completed by February of 2025. He stated his client feels very confident that they will be able to complete this within the timeframe of a year.

J. Langey said he and Mr. Ladd feel the permit for the work should be pulled within the next few months with another condition being the posting of a security deposit that will be returned to the Owner when the work is finished. He added that has been done in other municipalities.

D. Bowers expressed his approval of the suggestion and felt \$5000.00 was a reasonable security deposit amount.

P. Curtin responded that he thought his client would understand the Board's concern and he expected the amount of \$5000.00 would be acceptable.

Motion by D. Bowers, seconded by G. Rasmussen, to open the public hearing was carried unanimously.

R. Ridler invited comments at this time.

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

Motion by D. Bowers, seconded by M. Koppers, to approve the line change as most recently submitted and conditioned upon the building permit for the conversion of the accessory structure into living space be established within the next three (3) months and a \$5000.00 security deposit to be given to the Town to ensure the work is completed in one (1) year was carried unanimously.

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

*Golub, James & Janine – Line Change – 1590 Peth Road & West Lake Road  
With Rubenstein, Elaine*

*Our Farm the Golubs, LLC – Minor (1) Subdivision – 3360 Peth Road  
File # 23-1510 (Mary Margaret Koppers)*

James Golub was present to represent the file, accompanied by Jennifer Wong of the Cazenovia Preservation Foundation (CPF).

J. Golub explained that for many years they have wanted to have their farm included in Farmland Protection Policy Act. He said four (4) years ago they purchased the Jones' property on West Lake Road. In order to qualify for the Farmland Protection program,

they needed to acquire “a few more acres.” He said they have a handshake agreement with the Rubensteins to acquire some acreage from them. He displayed the drawing by Michael J. McCully Land Surveying PLLC dated 01-25-24 entitled *Lot line Adjustment Map on Part of Lots 26 & 29 of the 4<sup>th</sup> Allotment of the New Petersburg Tract – Known as No. 3360 West Lake Road, No. North Lake Road, Town of Cazenovia, County of Madison, State of New York*. He showed on the map the Rubenstein piece he would acquire which would be approximately eight (8) acres and would be transferred via a line change. He said in addition to that line change, they would also like to do a minor subdivision for the home on West Lake Road.

R. Ridler asked if that was Mr. Golub's home.

J. Golub responded that parcel was not their home parcel which is on Peth Road, but a property they bought on West Lake Road. He explained they wanted to separate the West Lake house from the farm and their Peth Road home property so in the future it could be sold apart from those lands.

J. Golub showed on the map the configuration of the subdivision lines. He said he had wanted the house parcel to be smaller but New York State had required a larger buffer between the home and the fields.

R. Ridler asked if any of Mr. Golub's proposal involved his personal residence at this time.

J. Golub answered, “No.”

A. Ferguson asked if Farmland Protection required the plot to be contiguous or just an aggregate by one owner.

J. Wong answered the parcels need to be aggregate by one owner; there were provisions for separate owners, but CPF tried not “to go there.” She said for this property, the parcels that will be included in the Farmland Protection Limitation Project would be contiguous parcels.

J. Golub added his home would be contiguous to the parcels being realigned, and showed where his home property was in relation to the parcels shown on the map.

J. Wong answered there would be additional parcels included as well.

J. Golub helped orient the Board regarding the properties represented on the drawing.

R. Ridler asked if Mr. Golub intended to keep the lot (on West Lake Road) at this time which was depicted as having 17 acres once the subdivision was approved.

J. Golub answered they had no plans to sell at this time, but he wanted the option for the future.

Motion by M. Koppers, seconded by D. Bowers, to move the file to a public hearing at the next Planning Board meeting in March was carried unanimously.

J. Langey then led the Board through the Short Environmental Assessment Form (SEAF), finding all answers for Part 2 as having no potential impacts.

Motion by T. Clarke, seconded by M. Koppers, to appoint the Planning Board as Lead Agency for the purposes of the SEQR, and to continue the file was approved unanimously.

-----

*Dwyer, Andrew & Crystal – Site Plan Review – 2960 West Lake Road, Cazenovia  
File # 23-1511 (Anne Ferguson)*

Andrew Dwyer was present to represent the file.

A. Ferguson explained that the Board discovered after the last meeting that the addition for the house had not been discussed since the Board had focused all their attention on the construction of the new accessory building. She apologized for the oversight and asked Mr. Dwyer to describe the addition being proposed.

A. Dwyer said it would be a small, 10' X 12' addition. He said they currently have a trapezoid-shaped, 2-story deck which they have not used since moving there in 2007. He said the deck was unsightly and in need of repair, so they would like to remove it and replace it with an office space. He showed on the drawing created by D.W. Hannig and Associates dated 1/10/86 entitled *Pt. of Lot 35 – 4 Allotment New Petersburg Tr. Town of Cazenovia, Madison County* where on the house the addition was proposed which he described as being toward the north property line. He said there was a foundation/frost wall on the edge, and said they would reuse that and “fill in the rest of it.” He said it would be a 1-story addition with a 6/12 slope roof like the garage roof. He said it would have the same siding, the same color, and the same windows to match.

A. Ferguson asked if the placement of the accessory structure had been finalized since the last meeting.

A. Dwyer said the drawing he submitted at the last meeting dated 12/18/2013 entitled *Dwyer Property Drawn from Survey 1/10/1986* showed the shed. He said the new structure would be four (4) feet off the shed and slightly canted. He said where he

sketched the barn was approximately where the barn would be “give or take 10 feet.” He said the driveway was 151 feet long to the gravel roadway, so he will add gravel for access to the barn

A. Ferguson asked if the impervious calculations included the driveway, the new building, and the addition to the house.

A. Dwyer answered, “Yes.”

Motion by A. Ferguson, seconded by G. Rasmussen, to reappoint the Planning Board as Lead Agency for the purposes of the SEQR, to reaffirm the matter an Unlisted Action and make a Negative Declaration based upon the initial review of the SEAF and to reapprove the site plan to include a first-floor addition as most recently submitted was carried unanimously.

-----

*Dixon, Riley & Allison — Reapply - Minor (1) Subdivision – 5701 East Lake Road, Cazenovia*

*File # 23-1456*

*Dixon, Riley & Allison — Site Plan Review – 5701 East Lake Road, Cazenovia*

*File # 23-1513*

*(Linda Cushman)*

No one was present to represent the file.

Motion by L. Cushman, seconded by G. Rasmussen, to continue the files was carried unanimously.

-----

*Stumbo, Jason — Site Plan Review – Michigan Road, Cazenovia*

*File # 24-1514*

*(Gerald Rasmussen)*

Jason Stumbo and Johanna Stumbo were present to represent the file.

R. Ridler said the file was for a new home construction.

G. Rasmussen explained the Applicants were proposing the construction of a 3-bedroom house on their 19-acre parcel. They recently were assigned the 911 address which was 4740 Michigan Road. He said they have submitted the septic and well locations. He said the septic system had been assessed and approved by Madison County, and the Town Planning Board would incorporate the conditions found in the approval letter from Madison County dated January 30, 2024 as part of the Planning Board's approval. He said Madison County Planning Department had also given a General Municipal Recommendation Report (GML). The Town Highway Superintendent had approved the driveway location. He said he review the sight with Mrs. Stumbo earlier today and he remarked on their beautiful view. He concluded it was a well-developed proposal.

A. Ferguson asked about elevations for the proposed structure.

The site plan created by PLS Engineering, PC dated December 2023 entitled *Stumbo Residence Michigan Road Cazenovia, New York* was reviewed as well as the elevations that had been submitted January 24, 2024.

T. Clarke asked if the brook that ran in that locality was near the area being developed.

Jason Stumbo answered the brook was not located on their parcel.

R. Ridler asked the measurement to the closest property line.

Jason Stumbo answered the side yard measurement was shown on the drawing.

It was noted that dimension was 96 feet.

A. Ferguson asked about the siding for the house.

Jason Stumbo responded it would be white SmartSide 4-inch lap siding.

A. Ferguson asked about the roof.

Jason Stumbo answered it would be black metal.

J. Langey said this would be a Type II Action in regard to SEQR.

Motion by G. Rasmussen, seconded by A. Ferguson to approve the site plan for a new house as most recently submitted was carried unanimously conditioned upon:

1) all roof and surface drainage shall be diverted away from the system area. Drainage swales should be provided and maintained in a manner that

satisfactorily intercepts and diverts surface water from the system area and rear of the residence;

2) no building above ground pool, vehicles or similar heavy objects shall be placed on the absorption system after construction has been completed; no deck or patio shall be installed over the septic tank;

3) a Certificate of Construction Compliance shall be submitted to the Madison County Health Department and the local codes enforcement office by the design engineer within thirty days of construction completion; and

4) this approval may be revoked by the issuing official for any change in the conditions under which this approval was granted; connection to municipal sewer service is required within one year of these services being available to the property,

was carried unanimously.

-----

*Living on Lake Time, LLC / Rubin, Jennifer & Jeffrey – Site Plan Review Revision –  
File # 24-1516 1657 Hedge Lane  
(Linda Cushman)*

Vincent Ryan of Keplinger Freeman Associates, and Jeffrey and Jennifer Rubin were present to represent the file

L. Cushman said she had visited the site and she believed the Applicants were returning to the Board to talk about storm drainage, the height of the house (and other outside improvements).

V. Ryan explained they were looking for a site plan amendment. He said there had been an issue with some of the (original) contractor work and some plans had been changed unbeknownst to the architects, the Owner, and the Town, so they returned to the Board to correct that issue. He displayed the drawing created by his firm revised 2024.01.17 entitled *L-200 For Construction Rubin Residence 1657 Hedge Lane, Cazenovia, NY* as the plan they would like to move forward with as the amended site plan. He said at the work session they were instructed to contact John Dunkle about the stormwater engineering, which they did. He reported Mr. Dunkle was satisfied with the stormwater plan. He said Mr. Dunkle pointed out an error in the impervious surface calculations for which Mr. Ryan took responsibility. He explained he had not included the garage in the 100–500-foot area, and he counted the deck area twice in the total calculation.

R. Ridler asked the correct total impervious surface area.

V. Ryan answered it was 15,144 SF (not 14,557.58 as reported on the drawing). He said that amounted to 11% which was reduced from the initial proposal of 12%. He offered to refile the corrected drawing.

R. Ridler thanked Mr. Dunkle for identifying that discrepancy.

A. Ferguson confirmed that the corrected calculations should be submitted on an updated drawing.

V. Ryan responded that would not be a problem.

V. Ryan said the height of the house was below the maximum of 35-feet, with the average (along the lakeside) being 32-feet.

R. Ridler asked Mr. Dunkle if he was good with the drainage issues.

J. Dunkle answered it had been reviewed before and the changes were relatively insignificant in terms of stormwater management, saying, "I'm fine with it."

J. Langey said this was a Type II Action in regard to SEQR.

Motion by L. Cushman, seconded by T. Clarke, reapprove the site plan as amended for alterations to the rear yard patio area, with the condition that the final impervious surface calculation will be submitted was carried 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 T. Clarke, seconded by L. Cushman, 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 was present to represent the file.

R. Ridler noted the name of the project has been changed to the Remington Solar Project.

J. Watson responded that was correct, the name is now the Remington Park Solar Farm.

R. Ridler asked that Mr. Watson review the accomplishments since the work session.

J. Watson responded they have created a correspondence tracker which he believed was very helpful (and which was emailed to the Board 1/25/2024). He said since the last meeting on January 9<sup>th</sup> they had received Mr. Langey's letter regarding the Full EAF and Geotechnical Report which they responded to January 11<sup>th</sup>. The last correspondence had been received today from Mr. Dunkle, and Mr. Watson said they have some answers for that. He relayed prior to that they had received correspondence from Mr. Dunkle and Mr. Langey on January 23<sup>rd</sup> regarding comments on the EAF. They also researched the interconnection poles and talked to National Grid about a solution to using those poles.

A. Ferguson asked if the solution was using a pad rather than the poles.

J. Watson answered that was correct.

A. Ferguson asked if the pad design had been indicated on an updated, current version of the site plan.

J. Watson answered they had not yet updated the site plan because they were awaiting the final approval from National Grid and the final specs. He showed material illustrating the pad design and explained two (2) companies provide that option.

A. Ferguson noted the new site survey with the new topographical conditions was still an open item.

J. Watson indicated it was. He said they would submit a new site plan with the pad mount solution once they had the approval from National Grid.

R. Ridler asked how likely National Grid would be to approve the pad mount solution.

J. Watson answered, "90%."

J. Langey asked Mr. Watson to summarize the solution for the record.

J. Watson responded they currently have 4 overhead poles proposed with each pole having a separate apparatus – one would have a breaker that would disconnect the solar farm completely; another would be a recloser that would automatically

disconnect and automatically try to reconnect, using timers; another would be a meter for National Grid; and there would be a riser pole “where we go from underground to above.” He explained the pad would replace all of that.

R. Ridler asked if one (1) pad would replace the four (4) poles.

J. Watson answered it would be one (1) 6’ length X 4’ width and it would be 3’ -4’ feet high. He said National Grid ordinarily would have two (2) poles – a recloser and a breaker, so they would have a pad mount to replace those as well.

T. Clarke asked if the pads would be fenced.

J. Watson responded it could be fenced. He said they were at the conceptual stage of designing it. He stated it would be locked. He said currently, where they would be connecting, there would be a ground-mount transformer which was not currently designed to be fenced. He said they could put bushes around it if the Board wanted them to shield it with fencing.

R. Ridler asked if National Grid required fencing.

J. Watson answered, “No.”

J. Langey asked if the Board wanted screening.

T. Clarke clarified he was wondering if National Grid required fencing/screening.

J. Watson said they will update the site plan to show the pad.

A. Ferguson asked that it be shown on all the Site Plan drawings, including the Overall Site Plan and the new Topographical Site Plan.

A. Ferguson saw that Mr. Dunkle had pointed out that the Erosion and Sediment Control Plan should show the temporary driveway. She thought the temporary driveway should be shown on all the plans as well.

J. Watson expressed understanding and said most of the comments from Mr. Dunkle’s comments received today would be addressed in the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) which he expected to receive from Barton & Loguidice shortly which he would provide to Mr. Dunkle next week. He repeated many of the comments regarding hydrology and the analysis would be addressed in the SWPPP.

J. Watson continued saying they were working on updating the Topography Map to include any cut and fills. He said they prefer not to grade but acknowledged doing the

driveway would require slight grading, so h said they will upgrade that information. He explained they would produce a color gradient map.

R. Ridler asked about level spreaders.

J. Watson said they would use level spreaders if needed, but the site was “pretty flat.” He explained level spreaders would be used for anything over 5%. He said if they were needed, they would also be shown on the gradient map.

J. Watson said one comment from the email from Mr. Dunkle today was about a temporary construction entrance to be provided on the E & S Plan. He asked if the E & S Plan was the Erosion and Sedimentary Control Plan.

J. Dunkle answered, “Yes.”

J. Watson remarked he wanted to be sure it was not to be on the Emergency Plan as was thought by one of his collogues.

J. Watson repeated they would provide “a proper response” to the comments today, but regarding the Planting Plan, he said they would adopt a similar Landscape Plan approved for the other commercial solar project in the Town. Mr. Dunkle was recommending 6-foot trees be installed and they were happy to install 6-foot conifers.

R. Ridler asked if they would use white pines.

J. Watson answered “Yes.” Eastern white pines were recommended.

J. Dunkle explained he liked that species because of their fast growth, so the benefit of screening would be achieved sooner, and then they could be supplemented with other trees.

J. Watson mentioned Norway spruce as another species.

R. Ridler asked about visual simulations.

J. Watson displayed the site in relation to Cazenovia Equipment, One Remington LLC, Marquardt, the health clinic, Caz Carwash, and what was formerly known as Red Barn 20. His drawing showed where various points of viewing were photographed, commenting that the vantage point from Red Barn 20 had been impassable at the time they shot the photographs, so that was taken at a different location in the general vicinity.

J. Watson stated the car wash was fully screened. He said they also took photos from both sides of the highway. He said heading eastbound on Route 20, the area “starts to

disappear over a hump.” He said some areas were not visible at all because of topography. He recommended that a perfect hedge was not needed for the entire length along the western boundary, which was a comment made by the Board previously. He suggested creating a natural hedge at the southwestern corner and extending partially north at the very start of construction and once the fence was installed, visiting the site with the Codes Enforcement Officer to see where the fence line was visible and then mitigating the views in those areas.

R. Ridler asked about the ownership of the property to the west of the fence line. He explained he was thinking about future development, and he thought the entire fence line should be screened now for that reason.

J. Watson remarked that had been their original plan.

A. Ferguson asked that they superimpose the proposed vegetation over each of the vantage points so the Board could see what the landscape plan would look like (in relation to the finalized project).

J. Watson displayed a simulation he had created showing how the trees would look at year one and another at year ten.

R. Ridler asked if the simulation represented the western border.

J. Watson answered, “Correct.”

A. Ferguson asked if the land with the planting plan was part of the project.

J. Watson affirmed it was.

A. Ferguson said it appeared to be a line of plantings.

J. Watson responded the row looked straight being zoomed out as far as it showed, but the actual pattern was randomized and staggered. He added the species were also randomized and staggered.

R. Ridler asked if that portion of the property was under the Applicants’ control.

J. Watson answered they have a lease with the Pushlars for that buffer area. He said the lease was extremely restricted and was strictly for setback purposes. He reported Mr. Pushlar farms the land.

R. Ridler asked Ms. Wong if the same property was under easement with CPF.

J. Wong explained Mr. Pushlar has an option which has not yet been approved by CPF but will be discussed at the next meeting of CPF.

R. Ridler repeated the point was that the array should be shielded upon inception from that side.

J. Watson expressed their willingness to do that.

A. Ferguson asked if the Board could see the various numbered vantage points with the simulated growth.

J. Watson had photos from those vantage points as they look now, but not simulations showing the panels and the screening from all those vantage points.

A. Ferguson elaborated the Applicants did not need to create simulations from all 18 vantage points, but the Board would like to see them from key points.

T. Clarke asked if one of the vantage points was from the parking area at Red Barn 20.

It was repeated they had not been able to enter that property the day they photographed the vantage points.

J. Watson noted the area was nicely screened with a forest between the two properties. He said he would take shots from that vantage point when it was accessible.

A. Ferguson repeated that the simulations should illustrate how each vantage point would look with construction and with the proposed trees.

R. Ridler did not think the project would be seen from Red Barn 20 at all due to the denseness of the existing trees.

J. Watson asked which vantage points should be shown.

A. Ferguson thought from point #s 4, 6, 8 or 10 (the residential area).

J. Watson spoke about the unsightliness of the current view from the apartment complex which overlooks farm equipment, brush, and marshy, tall grasses, and even a dumpster. He felt the most offended neighbor was from vantage #9.

R. Ridler asked if the array would be visible from Fenner Road.

D. Bowers answered, "Fortunately not."

A. Ferguson asked about vantage point #11.

J. Watson said that was from Marquardt.

A. Ferguson listed #s 1, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13 as views that should be simulated for the record.

A. Ferguson asked if the types and species of plants had been finalized.

J. Watson said they had delivered an updated Landscape Plan, but he said they chose eastern white pine, Norway spruce, and shrubs.

A. Ferguson asked if the quantity of plantings was included.

J. Watson affirmed it was.

J. Dunkle remarked the Planting Plan would now be revised (to reflect plantings along the entire western boundary).

J. Watson said regarding the Wellhead Protection and Buffer Shed Zone, it appears to stop at the end of Remington.

J. Dunkle explained that was a SEQR question. He reported the project was adjacent to the zone, but not in it.

J. Watson noted they would be returning with updated Site Plans showing the pad mounted interconnection, and the updated viewshed simulations.

A. Ferguson asked if the specifications for the panels had been finalized.

J. Dunkle responded that detail was stamped by a professional engineer.

A. Ferguson noted that can be considered a completed item. She asked about the Sun Chart and Glare Analysis.

J. Dunkle said that was provided with the original submittal.

A. Ferguson asked if those had been reviewed and approved by the Board.

R. Ridler answered they had not and those would be items for the next meeting. He asked if they were ready to talk about the construction timetable.

It was felt that would be for a later discussion.

R. Ridler believed Mr. Langey was satisfied with Part One of the Full EAF.

J. Langey felt the application was now complete for the next step which was the Board making themselves Lead Agency. He created a resolution to that affect identifying the various Involved and Interested Agencies, and said the Board can at this time direct him to send out a Lead Agency notice on this action.

Thereafter a motion by A. Ferguson, seconded by T. Clarke, to designate the Planning Board as Lead Agency for the purposes of the SEQR for this Type I Action and to instruct Mr. Langey to send Lead Agency notices to all the Involved and Interested Agencies. The motion was carried unanimously.

J. Langey said he would need to send all the Involved and Interested Agencies identified copies of all the material for this proposal and he would contact the Applicants if he needed help providing that if he did not have digital access to all that information. He said that would start the 30-day notice period.

J. Watson said they have formerly changed the name of the project to Remington Park Solar, LLC.

J. Watson asked if anyone wanted to look at the pad solution.

J. Dunkle remarked he had seen it before, but he took the information Mr. Watson offered.

J. Watson mentioned there was one other company that also specifically does this work for these projects. He remarked the pad would be more expensive for them.

J. Watson asked if the SEQR would then be completed at the March meeting. He wondered if the 30-day notice period started now.

J. Langey answered the 30-day notice period would start when he mails the Lead Agency notifications which would be tomorrow or Monday. He said after hearing from the agencies or after the mandatory 30-day wait, they could move the process forward.

J. Watson thought with the March meeting being the 7<sup>th</sup>, that timing should be complete for the next meeting.

J. Langey responded, "Should be."

J. Watson asked if Mr. Langey had received the (Payment in Lieu of Taxes) PILOT drafts.

J. Langey said he would check, and he would connect with Mr. Watson about that. He asked if it was sent in a separate email.

J. Watson answered it was.

J. Langey said they were asking for a PILOT Agreement and a Host Community Benefit Agreement as well.

J. Watson responded they were front-loading the Caz Community (Agreement).

J. Langey explained the Town Board would oversee those approvals.

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

-----

Motion by D. Bowers, seconded by G. Rasmussen, to adjourn the meeting at 8:25 P.M. was carried unanimously.

-----

Sue Wightman, Planning Board Secretary – February 2, 2024