



PLANNING BOARD

MINUTES (FINAL)

THURSDAY, JUNE 9, 2022

6:00 P.M.

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

CALL TO ORDER : Mark Torpey, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:00 P.M.

SALUTE TO THE FLAG:

PRESENT : Mark Torpey, Chair; Todd Fabozzi; Jason Doty; Chuck Marshall; Mark Pingel;
Bill McTygue, Alternate

ABSENT : Kerry Mayo, Ruth Horton

STAFF : Susan Barden, Principal Planner, City of Saratoga Springs
Leah Everhart, Counsel to the Land Use Boards

ANNOUNCEMENT OF RECORDING OF PROCEEDING:

The proceedings of this meeting are being recorded for the benefit of the secretary. Because the minutes are not a verbatim record of the proceedings, the minutes are not a word-for-word transcript of the recording.

A. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:

Approval of meeting minutes was deferred to the end of the meeting.

B. POSSIBLE CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS:

NOTE: The intent of a consent agenda is to identify any application that appear to be “approvable” without need

for further evaluation or discussion. If anyone wished to further discuss any proposed consent agenda

item, then that item would be pulled from the “consent agenda” and dealt with individually.

NONE AT THIS TIME.

C. APPLICATIONS UNDER CONSIDERATION:

1. **#20220087 126 WEST AVENUE AREA VARIANCE,** 126 West Avenue, Coordinated SEQRA Review of a proposed mixed-use project including office use and 4 residential units in the Transect-4 (T-4) District.
ZBA request for an Advisory Opinion.

Mark Torpey, Chair, stated what is before the Board is acceptance of Lead Agency Status for SEQRA, as well as SEQRA review and an Advisory Opinion to the ZBA. We discussed the possibility of a parking waiver based on calculations. We spoke about the civic space. The

Planning Board will review this for Special Use Permit and Site Plan Review. The DRC has jurisdiction over the project for Architectural Review.

Applicant: B&D Properties

Agent: Joe Hens, Ingalls & Associates LLP

Mr. Hens stated this is a mixed-use development with a two-story office building, a third-floor studio apartment, and four townhomes. The townhomes will wraparound Grand and West Avenue. A visual of the site plan was provided, noting the location of the two-story office space and townhomes. Access to the site will be from Grand Avenue with parking behind the structure. We are proposing 21 parking spaces, the requirement per the code is 20. We will require area variances from the ZBA. The property provides a unique right of way situation. There is a large area of greenspace at the front of the building which provides an opportunity for civic space. This will be designed in conjunction with DPW. Currently shown is a bench and flower beds which will be enhanced following ZBA variance approvals.

This area provides a nice pedestrian corridor through West and Grand Avenues. We are also proposing a sidewalk extension that runs along the edge of the intersection to the end of the property line.

Todd Fabozzi questioned the applicant regarding this triangular ROW and if using this area for civic space is still being discussed.

Mr. Hens stated providing civic space in this area is still under discussion. DPW will not be responsible for maintenance.

The applicant stated property owners will need a maintenance agreement with DPW as well as an easement with the city.

Bill McTygue, Alternate spoke regarding this ROW greenspace area and maintenance.

Mark Torpey, Chair, stated we will see this project again for Site Plan and Special Use Permit. At that time, we will perform a complete review of the project along with the landscaping component.

Chuck Marshall made a motion in the matter of the 126 West Avenue Area Variance, 126 West Avenue, for a proposed mixed-use project including office use and 4 residential units in the Transect-4 (T-4) District, the Planning Board issues a Favorable Advisory Opinion for this project. Jason Doty seconded the motion.

Mark Torpey, Chair, asked if there was any further discussion. None heard.

VOTE:

Mark Torpey, Chair, in favor; Todd Fabozzi, in favor; Jason Doty, in favor; Chuck Marshall, in favor; Mark Pingel, in favor; Bill McTygue, Alternate, in favor

MOTION PASSES : 6-0

SEQRA ANALYSIS AND DETERMINATION

SEQRA:

- Action appears to be an Unlisted Action.

- Coordinated review was initiated by the ZBA and proactively deferred Lead Agency to the Planning Board.
- The DRC deferred Lead Agency to the Planning Board on March 23, 2022.
- Part 1 of the short EAF was provided by the applicant, has been reviewed and is accurate.

Mark Torpey, Chair, reviewed Part II of the Short EAF.

No large or important areas of concern were noted.

SEQRA DECISION:

Todd Fabozzi stated based upon the information provided by the applicant in Part I of the SEQR Short Environmental Assessment Form, and analysis of the information provided and presented in Part II of the SEQR Short Environmental Assessment Form, I make a motion for a SEQR negative declaration since the project will not result in any large and important impacts and, therefore, is one that will not have a significant adverse impact on the environment.

Jason Doty seconded the motion.

Mark Torpey, Chair, asked if there was any further discussion.

VOTE:

Mark Torpey, Chair, in favor; Todd Fabozzi, in favor; Jason Doty, in favor; Chuck Marshall, in favor; Mark Pingel, in favor; Bill McTygue, Alternate, in favor

MOTION PASSES : 6-0

2. **#20220240 110-114 NELSON FINAL SUBDIVISION,** 110-114 Nelson Avenue, Subdivision review (final plat) of a proposed 4-lot subdivision in the Urban Residential-2 (UR-2) District.

Mark Torpey, Chair, stated the Planning Board had reviewed this project in March of 2021 for a much larger project.

What is being proposed is a 4-lot subdivision This review will be segmented due to a future subdivision of lot 4. This will change the SEQRA review to a Type 1 action. Part 1 of the SEQRA Full Environmental Assessment Form has been submitted, reviewed and is accurate.

Applicant: JW Hemmingway, LLC

Agent: Doug Heller, LA Group, PC

Mr. Heller provided an aerial view of the 2.16-acre project located on Nelson Avenue in the UR-2 District with Nelson Avenue on one side and Frank Sullivan Place on the east side. Along Nelson Avenue there are primarily residential homes and along Frank Sullivan Place you get into the NYRA properties abutting it on the rear. The applicant is proposing a three-lot subdivision along Nelson Avenue. All three lots will be zoning compliant at 6600 sq. ft. in size. All setbacks will also be zoning compliant. There is an existing sidewalk and curbing. We are proposing to replace the sidewalk along all three lots with new sidewalk and curbing, two streetlights and three street trees. The lots will be serviced with municipal water and sewer on Nelson Avenue. Along lot #3 there is a proposed easement for pedestrian access as well as bringing municipal services to lot #4. A visual of the full build-out was provided.

Mark Torpey, Chair, stated he reviewed the Comprehensive Plan. On lot #4 at 1.7 acres in the RN-2 district, is allowed five units per acre. It comports with the RN-2 designation and Comprehensive Plan for build-out in this area.

Mr. Heller stated the Board was curious regarding the design of the potential homes. Very preliminary sketches were provided noting the presence of front porches along Nelson Avenue.

Mark Torpey, Chair, stated the Planning Board in reviewing subdivisions does not have purview over architectural design. It is important for continuity and flow with the homes across the street. Could the Board issue a condition noting the garages would not be proud of the house, and the homes should contain a porch to draw pedestrians in. Is this something which would be legally acceptable in a notice as a condition?

Leah Everhart, Counsel for the Land Use Boards, stated the purposes of applying appropriate conditions to any approval, is to mitigate any harm that might occur from the approval itself. The answer is it depends on what is in your record and what you find. If this concern is that it will affect aesthetics, character of the community or neighborhood then such a condition would be appropriate and reasonable. It is difficult in SEQRA review because it is not a site plan, you do not have engineered designs or know all the details or development. The best you can do is evaluate based on your understanding of the build-out. If the build-out does not comply with your conditions, then the applicant would need to return with future SEQRA review if what is constructed is not what you had in mind when initial SEQRA review was completed. This should be memorialized in the conditions of approval.

John Witt, Developer, stated for the three lots on Nelson Avenue they are proposing to place garages in the rear of the lot. These are for two clients, and we are anticipating three stories which fits in with the Victorians on the street. We are looking for approvals to get the project started with utilities and design. Mr. Witt stated he is hoping to predesign the entire project prior to their return before the Board. He wants it to fit in with the vernacular of the street and the neighborhood.

Discussion ensued among the Board regarding the easement proposed adjacent to Lot #3, use, placement and bringing sewer utilities to Lot#4 as well as pedestrian traffic.

Chuck Marshall questioned the shared driveways for lots 2 & 3 is there to be something in place between the homeowners for maintenance purposes?

Mr. Heller stated they are two separate driveways. There is a small strip shown between the two.

Mark Torpey, Chair, questioned if lot #4 would continue to be used for track parking before it is developed?

Mr. Heller stated the plans are to continue using Lot #4 for track parking until it is developed. There are two access points off Frank Sullivan Place. Mr. Heller provided an example of a home Mr. Witt developed in this area several years ago.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Mark Torpey, Chair, opened the public hearing at 7:47 P.M.

Mark Torpey, Chair, asked if anyone in the audience wished to comment on this application.

Christal Molvin, 119 Nelson, directly across the street from the project. She questioned construction times listed 7AM - 10 PM, as well as if the sidewalks and curbing in front of the homes is to remain. What is being done to mitigate dust. What is the height of the new structures?

Mark Torpey, Chair, discussed construction times. Sidewalks and curbing will be replaced in the existing location in front of the three new homes proposed on Nelson. Height of the proposed new homes can be no higher than 40 ft. in the UR-2 zone. All construction information and hours of operation will be to city standards.

Mr. Witt project developer stated no construction operation will occur after 7 P.M.

Mark Torpey, Chair, closed the public hearing at 6:52 P.M.

SEQRA ANALYSIS AND DETERMINATION

Leah Everhart, Counsel to the Land Use Board stated because this is an Unlisted Action and there is no coordinated review, there is no reason to use the Long Form. SEQRA requires the reviewing agency to consider all the component parts of the project at once. When you have a project built in phases, it would require all phases be considered at once to capture all cumulative impacts that might occur. There is an exception when development is purely speculative and there is potential for future buildout. We have heard from the applicant that is an avenue they are not pursuing. That it is what they propose for the future would be different. There is no actual plan in place now. There will be future development, we are unsure what it would be. If the Board would prefer to review this as a four-lot subdivision, the Board should consider the potential environmental impacts of a four-lot subdivision with three lot development. Understanding that in the future if the applicant were to consider development of lot #4 there would be an amendment to the subdivision and will also re-open SEQRA Review.

SEQRA:

- Action appears to be an Unlisted Action.
- Coordinated review was initiated by the ZBA and proactively deferred Lead Agency to the Planning Board.
- The DRC deferred Lead Agency to the Planning Board on March 23, 2022.
- Part 1 of the short EAF was provided by the applicant, has been reviewed and is accurate.

Mark Torpey, Chair, reviewed Part II of the Short EAF.

No large or important areas of concern were noted.

SEQRA DECISION:

Todd Fabozzi stated based upon the information provided by the applicant in Part I of the SEQR Short Environmental Assessment Form, and analysis of the information provided and presented in Part II of the SEQR Short Environmental Assessment Form, I make a motion for a SEQR negative declaration since the project will not result in any large and important impacts and, therefore, is one that will not have a significant adverse impact on the environment. Jason Doty seconded the motion.

Mark Torpey, Chair, asked if there was any further discussion. None heard.

VOTE:

Mark Torpey, Chair, in favor; Todd Fabozzi, in favor; Jason Doty, in favor; Chuck Marshall, in favor; Mark Pingel, in favor; Bill McTygue, Alternate, in favor

MOTION PASSES : 6-0

Mark Torpey, Chair stated we will now move onto subdivision review and conditions.

1. All comments by Laberge, Contract Engineer for the city to review and provide comments approved by the City Engineer.
2. Construction window allowing construction up to 8 P.M. out of respect for the neighbors.
3. Staggered garages to the rear prominent to the front porch to reflect the vernacular of the neighborhood.
4. Easement on Lot #3.
5. Three street trees to be added approved by the City Arborist.
6. Streetlights LED - historic Sternberg Lighting according to City Standards.
7. Dedicated fee in lieu of for each residential unit.
8. Plans to the satisfaction of DPW.

Chuck Marshall made a motion in the matter of the application of 110-114 Nelson Avenue Subdivision, 110-114 Nelson Avenue, be approved with the conditions as noted by the Chair. Bill McTygue seconded the motion.

Mark Torpey, Chair, asked if there was any further discussion. None heard.

VOTE:

Mark Torpey, Chair, in favor; Todd Fabozzi, in favor; Jason Doty, in favor; Chuck Marshall, in favor; Mark Pingel, in favor; Bill McTygue, Alternate, in favor

MOTION PASSES : 6-0

7:10 P.M. The Board recessed.

7:15 P.M. The Board reconvened.

3. **#20210564 WEIBEL PLAZA PUD ZONING AMENDMENT,** Weibel Avenue, consideration of an Advisory Opinion to the City Council for a text amendment to the Weibel Plaza PUD.

Mark Torpey, Chair, stated what is before the Board this evening is an Advisory Opinion to the City Council on a text amendment to the Weibel Avenue PUD. This PUD has been in place for some time. The City Council does have purview over SEQRA for this project. This area from a comprehensive standpoint is listed as Commercial Mixed-Use (CMU) District. The surrounding properties are listed as Transect-5 (T-5) District.

Applicant: Baruch Aronson

Agent: Justin Grassi, Attorney - Jones Steves Firm

Mr. Grassi provided a history of the PUD which was approved in 1992 and amended in 1998. Under the 1992 PUD there are two areas - Zone A & Zone B. The PUD language states if a site plan approval had not been granted by 2012 for either zone that the zoning district would revert to the zoning at the time the PUD was enacted which is RR-1. Zone A encompasses, Denny's, Hannaford, Kohl's, and Tractor Supply. No site plan approval was ever issued for Zone B. This area should no longer be a portion of the PUD but revert to RR-1. RR-1 no longer exists so there

are no permitted uses in the zone. We appeared before the Board eight months ago with a PUD amendment which changed the expiration date of the PUD from 2012 to 2026. One reason a site plan was never issued for the Zone B parcel is this is more difficult to develop, and we requested additional uses which would work well in this area. Eight months ago, this Board provided a referral to the City Council stating we do not have an issue with the expiration date extension.

Mr. Grassi stated this Board is tasked with two questions: Whether the proposed revision is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Whether the proposed revision is not contrary to the general purposes and intent of this Chapter.

This Board noted the expiration date extension is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and is not contrary to the purposes and intent of this Chapter. At that time, we proposed the additional use of a warehouse and distribution plant. The Board found that the current PUD language does not comport with the Community Mixed Use Designation and Comprehensive Plan and therefore additional language would need to be included in the PUD to reflect the Transect-4 Urban Neighborhood or T-5 Neighborhood Center design standards. Mr. Grassi stated he took those design standards and mirrored them in the PUD. A visual of the 16-acre zoning area which has expired was provided to the Board. We are now requesting an extension of the expiration from 2012 to 2035. This allows the application to compile a more comprehensive package as to what they are seeking. This is simply a zoning legislation currently. The Planning Board will still have purview over this in Site Plan Review no matter what is built. This is a unique area of the city. Zone A of the PUD was built out in 1992. This did not include what was included in the 2015 Comprehensive Plan update as far as the pedestrian access. What is being proposed for the Zone B area is warehouses, marijuana dispensary, marijuana processing. It will be under this Board's purview to determine if is appropriate, necessary, or helpful to have additional pedestrian access in this area. It is our position that there is not a significant amount of pedestrian access occurring in Zone A. With a warehouse in the rear would we in fact want pedestrian access to this portion of the site at all. Keeping in mind where we are located by the off ramp of the Northway, an easement with National Grid in this area, and the Department of Transportation site. There is no place else to go. There are 41 permitted uses in this area, and we did add warehouse distribution plant and wholesale establishment and marijuana dispensary, which will be under the auspices of NY State.

Todd Fabozzi questioned the applicant's agent if a warehouse were constructed in this area what would the truck traffic circulation entail.

Mr. Grassi stated there are site limitations and that has not been fully evaluated. We do only have an easement for entry and exit from the site.

Discussion ensued among the Board regarding truck maneuvering of the site, access to traffic signals, routing of truck traffic, pedestrian element on the opposite side of Weibel Avenue, enhancing the pedestrian elements on the opposite side of Weibel Avenue since this site is landlocked.

Mark Pingel questioned if the PUD ownership must be a single owner. Or that all owners must be included in the PUD. If this true, then there is a different game here.

Leah Everhart, Counsel to the Land Use Board stated they reviewed the legislation the applicant provided with their application and it appears different than what you are looking at. It did not seem to have that provision in it. We are not sure what the applicable provisions were.

Mark Pingel stated this was noted in the UDO.

Susan Barden, Principal Planner, stated the UDO is not in effect at this time.

Justin Grassi provided information regarding the provisions set forth in this PUD and there was an ownership provision in this PUD. Certain elements proposed which note if the ownership is transferred to someone else, they could funding the letter of credit or bond to complete what is being proposed as a comprehensive project.

Todd Fabozzi questioned if there is interest in the site development with the addition of the two new uses versus the 41 previous uses where there was no interest. Has residential development been considered?

Mr. Grassi stated he believes there is interest in site development with the additional two uses included. They were looking for a warehousing distribution center, and the marijuana dispensary moving it from the downtown area. Residential uses were considered with commercial on the first floor. A big consideration was access to the site and the site desirability.

Mark Torpey, Chair, questioned the applicant's agent why not seek a map amendment add more uses and that would convert this area into a Transect zone which has no limitations at all, and is open to everything and you have full flexibility.

Mr. Grassi stated it was more of a legal strategy and the thought was that it would be a smoother process to modify the zoning legislation. Also, a view of the Comprehensive Plan Map was provided to show how the warehouse is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, as well as the Zoning Map which shows the warehouse district and where it lies.

Mark Torpey, Chair, questioned if a map amendment would facilitate the redevelopment or conversion of these parcels over time to something we are looking to get in place. Folks that live in the Springs across the street cannot walk and get their groceries and come back safely. It is a missed opportunity.

Mr. Grassi stated if the PUD exists and there are no further expiration provisions beyond what we are subject to in Zone B. Zone A is locked in.

Leah Everhart stated nobody has a vested right in zoning. We have grandfathered uses. The City Council can modify a PUD without any sort of application just like it can change any other zoning. While nobody is entitled to their zoning classification, they do have grandfathering. If the A Zoning were changed to residential that would be the zoning, but nobody could prevent Hannaford for continuing. It would become a legal nonconforming use.

Discussion ensued regarding a PUD, versus a map amendment, versus a zoning amendment.

Mark Torpey, Chair stated he is wrestling with this - considering whether this is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, or whether the proposed revision is not contrary to the general purposes and intent of this Chapter.

Bill McTygue, Alternate questioned if the applicant is looking to keep the property or sell it to match the desire of the city in this area.

Mr. Grassi stated he cannot say.

Bill McTygue questioned if this property were marketed to firms compatible with the location along the Northway.

Mr. Grassi stated there have been discussions with development and what uses would be attractive. Simply there are no permitted uses if this is not extended.

Bill McTygue stated then the city is left with an undeveloped outparcel.

Mr. Grassi stated what we are requesting is a PUD zoning amendment. Getting the zoning in place. The City Council will determine if these uses are appropriate. Planning Board will perform the site plan review.

Mark Pingel stated we need to take this stepwise which is what the applicant is proposing. If the PUD is still the appropriate vehicle to provide the foundation for development, then we should recommend to the council that we expand its uses.

Mark Torpey, Chair, stated he is struggling if the proposed revision is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. He feels what is being proposed does not comport. If the Board feels this does not comport with the CMU designation and provide all the suggestions and salient points discussed by the Board to the City Council, it remains a decision made by the Council.

Leah Everhart, Counsel to the Land Use Boards stated the City Council does make the final determination. Whether it disagrees with your opinion, agrees with your opinion, or decides to amend the Comprehensive Plan. That can be done prior to approval of this application.

Discussion ensued among the Board regarding the Comprehensive Plan, the new UDO, zoning, and the Advisory Opinion.

Mark Torpey, Chair, stated what he is hearing from the Board is a positive Advisory Opinion to the City Council for the PUD text amendment with additional information the Board can provide to the Council. An update to the Comprehensive Plan may be in order considering this unique area of the city with unique circumstances.

Susan Barden, Principal Planner questioned the Chair if he wished to amend his previous Advisory Opinion to the City Council and build on that.

Mark Torpey, Chair, stated he is getting the impression from the Board that a map amendment change may not be the way to proceed.

Mark Pingel stated he wants to be assured that the PUD remains viable.

Leah Everhart, Counsel to the Land Use Boards provided information to the Board regarding the lapse of the PUD, Zoning and the new UDO.

Discussion continued among the Board regarding the PUD, inception of the UDO, zoning and how to proceed with the Advisory Opinion.

Mark Torpey, Chair, stated a draft Advisory Opinion will be circulated to the Board for their review. A final vote on the Advisory Opinion will be voted on at a subsequent meeting.

**4. #20220502 ADVISORY OPINION TO THE CITY COUNCIL - UDO AMENDMENTS,
Consideration**

of an Advisory Opinion to the City Council for proposed amendments to the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO).

Mark Torpey, Chair, stated the Board has four Amendments which were provided for review. We have 60 days

to compile and provide our thoughts to the City Council if needed. We did today we receive an email from Patrick Cogan, Building Inspector, Zoning Officer, which provided more background on the City's desires for these amendments.

Especially the wetland protections and buffers and stream protections. He noted there may be legal challenges regarding incorporating these and being consistent with the ACOE. That is not necessarily the same thing as the Planning Board reviewing these and determining if they comport with the Comprehensive Plan.

Susan Barden, Principal Planner stated the new City Council prior to acting on the adoption of the UDO, the Council opened the UDO for further considerations. The City Council has determined that these four amendments be reviewed by the Planning Board and the DRC for an Advisory Opinion. Some of these are from Sustainable Saratoga and some of these we have reviewed previously. The Board has been provided with our initial Advisory Opinion to the City Council.

Susan Barden, Principal Planner reviewed the Amendments with the Board, provided information which was

Submitted by Sustainable Saratoga and what the Board initially provided to the City Council. The Board may hold a public hearing at their discretion. The scope of the Board review shall include but not limited to:

- Whether the proposed revision is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.
- Whether the proposed revision is not contrary to the general purposes and intent of this chapter.

AMENDMENT 1:

RR USES:

"Country Club" and "Educational Facility - Primary and Secondary" permitted in RR with SUP and SPR.

Country Club definition has been revised (per the Planning Board recommendation)

An establishment open to members, their families and invited guests organized and operated for Social and recreational purposes and which has indoor and/or outdoor recreation facilities. A Country

Club may include ancillary uses such as eating and drinking establishments, meeting rooms and Maintenance facilities.

Educational Facility - Primary or Secondary defined:

A public, private, or parochial facility that offers instruction at the elementary, junior high and/or high school

Levels. A pre-school may also be included as part of an elementary school.

Gateway Commercial - Rural (GCR) Uses:

The areas to be GCR are currently either Office Medical Business 1 or 2 (OMB-1, OMB-2) or Tourist Related Business (TRB).

Many uses requested to be removed are currently permitted with SPR or SUP and SPR-Medical/Dental

Office, Office, Residential Uses (second story and above), eating and drinking establishment,

Hotel/motel.
These uses and other would require SPR or SUP and SPR and architectural Review by the DRC.

AMENDMENT 2:

Request is for formal justification for the Planning Board or DRC to grant a waiver from the Commercial District Design

Standards for developments within the GC-R.

Request is for a formal justification for PB or DRC to grant a waiver from the design standards for Conservation Subdivisions in RR and SR Districts.

There is listed in 16.7 an exemption from conservation design that requires a determination by the Planning Board.

AMENDMENT 3:

Stream protections : Regulations were expanded from 50ft. from the centerline of the stream to 100ft. (UDO)

for streams with a width between 10 and 50ft.

Planning Board can request an additional buffer or requirements to further preserve specific streams when

Necessary through site plan review.

Wetlands protections: Regulations were expanded to include a 50ft. buffer around federal wetlands where one

Does not exist now.

The 100 ft. buffer around DEC-regulated wetlands remain as-is.

Planning Board can request an additional buffer or requirements to further protect specific wetlands when

Necessary through site plan review.

AMENDMENT 4:

The trigger for a land use disturbance permit in the RR District is from 1.5 acres to 1 acre.

Consideration for requiring a tree survey to be submitted for a land disturbance activity permit - specific

Identification of significant trees - in the area proposed to be disturbed.

Consideration for tree replacement or mitigation for removal of significant trees.

Discussion ensued among the Board regarding the above UDO amendments, and what the Board originally submitted in the initial Advisory Opinion. A draft will be compiled, circulated to the Board for review and consideration with approval at subsequent Board meeting.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:

Jason Doty made a motion to approve the minutes of the April 14, 2022, and May 5, 2022, minutes of the Planning Board Meeting be approved as submitted. Chuck Marshall seconded the motion.

VOTE:

Mark Torpey, Chair, in favor; Todd Fabozzi, in favor; Jason Doty, in favor; Mark Pingel, in favor; Chuck Marshall, in favor; Bill McTygue, Alternate, in favor

MOTION PASSES : 6-0

UPCOMING MEETINGS:

Planning Board Workshop, Thursday, June 16, 2022, at 5:00 P.M.
Planning Board Meeting, Thursday, June 23, 2022, at 6:00 P.M.

MOTION TO ADJOURN:

There being no further business to discuss Mark Torpey, Chair adjourned the meeting at 8:48 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Buzanowski
Recording Secretary

Minutes approved September 15, 2022