

**LAKE GEORGE VILLAGE PLANNING BOARD MEETING
JANUARY 16, 2019 – 6:00 PM
VILLAGE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
26 OLD POST ROAD - LAKE GEORGE, NY**

Board members present: Carol Sullivan (Chair Person), Dan Wolfield, Dean Howland, Walt Adams

Board members absent: Patricia Dow

Others present: Dan Barusch (Director of Planning and Zoning), Stephanie Fregoe (Clerk), Tim Barber, Devin Dickinson, Dennis Quirk, Jennifer Juzaitis, Terri Jamison, Claudia Braymer, Heath Mundell, Kris Johnson, Dina Viola

Carol Sullivan called the meeting to order at 6:00pm.

**TAX MAP: 264.06-2-5
APPLICANT: JAMES D. QUIRK
ADDRESS: 21 SEWELL STREET
ZONE: COMMERCIAL MIXED USE
APPLICATION: SITE PLAN #1845**

Continuation of public hearing from December 19, 2018 meeting. Applicant is proposing new construction of a boat storage facility with dimensions of 120' x 100' and is requesting a waiver of the following architectural standards:

§ 220-42 Architectural standards and guidelines.

E. (2)(b) Stories shall not exceed 14 feet in height from finished floor to finished ceiling, except for a first floor commercial function, which shall be a minimum of 12 feet.

F. (2) (d) The following materials shall not be used on any portion of the building:[2] Metal siding.

G. (1) Sloped roofs:(b) Shall include eaves which are at least 18 inches in width.
(d) For gable roofs, the pitch shall be between 6:12 and 14:12.

Carol Sullivan: So, the Board members are here. We'll start the meeting. It's January 16th and we're reviewing Dennis Quirk's boat storage building on Sewell Street. I'll remind everyone that the public hearing is open, and we will allow the public to speak after we've had a chance to go through the new materials we've received. Did everyone have a chance to review this?

Dean Howland: Yes.

Carol Sullivan: We'll just take a minute. We have an email from John Carr that came in late today and some of the members haven't had the opportunity to review it, so they will now.

Dean Howland: What's the district on Sewell Street?

Dan Barusch: CMU.

Dean Howland: So that is CMU?

Dan Barusch: Yup.

Carol Sullivan: So, start by reviewing the last set of landscaping that was presented to us. Does the Board have any questions or comments? Thank you for putting the height of the trees in.

Dan Wolfield: I guess I have two thoughts to comment on as far as the plan for the trees. On the Sewell Street side, I see they're all deciduous trees. Is it possible to mix in evergreens over there or is there a reason we don't want evergreens over there?

Devin Dickinson: No, I think the hemlock is hardy enough that you could mix some hemlock in with that. You get some partial shade, salt is always going to be an issue over there but.

Dan Wolfield: With the hemlocks?

Devin Dickinson: Well with any tree. With any tree but you could, you could mix in some hemlocks. Give you some year-round buffer.

Dan Wolfield: That's kind of what I was thinking of because otherwise six months of the year you're seeing the whole blue building.

Dean Howland: Or maybe cut the bottom, just trim the bottom up a little bit. It's the salt that kills the hemlocks.

(Inaudible)

Devin Dickinson: So, right now we have seven trees. How many hemlocks do you want to see? Three? Four?

Dan Wolfield: Three or four. I don't know if anybody has a thought, it could be every other tree, right?

Carol Sullivan: Yeah it could be every other one.

Dean Howland: Yeah let's do it every other one.

(Inaudible)

Devin Dickinson: You mean like three?

Carol Sullivan: Is everyone in agreement with that?

Dan Wolfield: Yes, those three middle ones. Yeah, I think it would look good because then you'd have deciduous at the two ends. And they would grow out and look nice too. That also lets him on the tight corner coming in, if it's a deciduous tree, you can trim the lower branches to get in, to clear anything there, verses with an evergreen.

Devin Dickinson: The hemlocks, it's pretty full.

Dan Wolfield: Right so on the corner I think that helps. Ok. So these three will become evergreens.

Carol Sullivan: Three will be evergreens.

Dan Wolfield: Three will be evergreens, ok. Then I guess my follow up question is, we did receive feedback from John Carr today. One of his requests was talking about something on the south side. Is there a chance of putting any type of shrubbery or bushes on that south side of the building?

Carol Sullivan: Well, there's a fence there isn't there?

Devin Dickinson: Yeah, there is a fence there now.

Carol Sullivan: How high is that fence?

Devin Dickinson: I think it's a six-foot fence.

Dan Wolfield: And that's also off the retaining wall, right? So, you're not going to see?

Dean Howland: No, he's on a mound there. His probably comes up.

Dennis Quirk: It's probably around three feet.

(Inaudible)

Tim Barber: It's like nine foot high.

Dan Wolfield: So, you're not going to see anything back there anyway.

Dennis Quirk: No.

Dan Barusch: The storm water basin takes up a lot of that space back there too.

Dean Howland: Yeah and there's not a lot of tall growing trees that I know can fit in a storm water and survive, there're more plants.

Dan Barusch: It's really not, unless you're doing a rain garden.

Dean Howland: That's what I meant, that it's not, just from past experience you can't.

Dan Barusch: No, it's not good practice.

Dean Howland: You can't do trees and the ones that do look like weeds.

Dan Wolfield: So, you're saying nothing is going to grow? Is that what you're saying?

(Inaudible)

Devin Dickinson: Well you won't be able to see can grow adequately.

Dan Barusch: Based on certain designs on storm water controls, you actually don't want heavy vegetation like trees growing in them.

Dean Howland: Yup.

Dan Barusch: You know rain gardens is a, that's a different story. Take a couple small plants or shrubs, but something like that infiltration basin, the tree and the roots is gonna screw that, basically the way it infiltrates.

Dan Wolfield: Now that's this portion, right? So over in that other corner, I mean, if you were to put one tree back in that corner? That would, just a thought.

Devin Dickinson: Yeah. You could put a tree in. It would be pretty heavily shaded there.

(Inaudible)

Carol Sullivan: But how high would that tree have to be?

Dan Barusch: Ten. It would have to be ten feet.

Devin Dickinson: If it was about ten feet, you'd see about a foot of the top of it.

Dan Wolfield: That's to start though. Later it will be 20 feet tall and you'll have something that would bush out over the fence at some point in that back corner. And that's, I thought it was a fair request, that's all. What I think about the back side of the building, I mean granted.

Dennis Quirk: He has some hemlocks there right now currently.

Devin Dickinson: Yeah, we could put.

(Inaudible)

Devin Dickinson: Yeah, because the problem is it needs to be tall enough so it needs that space to spread out.

(Inaudible)

Devin Dickinson: Yeah so you could probably get one tree in that back corner.

Dan Wolfield: This?

Devin Dickinson: Correct.

Dan Wolfield: That triangle, right?

Devin Dickinson: Correct.

Dan Wolfield: In that triangle there, I guess a tree of your choice.

Carol Sullivan: Ok, anything else? Dean on this?

Dean Howland: Nope.

Dan Wolfield: Nope, that was it.

Walt Adams: Nope.

Carol Sullivan: Ok, so are we all in agreeance with the landscaping plan with the additional tree in the back corner and the three trees on Sewell Street being changed to, what did we say? Evergreens.

Dean Howland: Just an evergreen.

Carol Sullivan: And that's it?

Dan Wolfield: Yup.

Dean Howland: Yup.

Carol Sullivan: Ok. So next we're going to discuss John's email that he sent in today. Did everyone have a chance to read it? Before we do that, Dennis I have a question for you. I was reading through the minutes and I forget the gentleman's name, but he's from the Hall Boat.

Dennis Quirk: Hubbard.

Carol Sullivan: Yeah.

Dennis Quirk: Nash.

Carol Sullivan: Yeah, he made a comment about the plastic wrap, the shrink wrap on the boats.

Dennis Quirk: Right.

Carol Sullivan: He said all of that goes into the landfills. The shrink wrap. So, in other words what you're taking and won't be shrink wrapping, will go into your boat storage building? Correct?

Dennis Quirk: Right. So, it does.

Carol Sullivan: It just goes into the landfills?

Dennis Quirk: Yeah so it has been going into the landfills. Sometimes it gets recycled, they recycle some of the plastics but ultimately, yeah some of it goes into landfills.

Dean Howland: You know 100 boats times.

Carol Sullivan: Yeah how much would you say in square footage would they use?

Dennis Quirk: That's hard to say, so you know, my waste treatment service, they pick it up and, you know, they. It's up to them what they do. Then they put it in their piles and I don't know what the County laws are, but I would think they have some sort of standards.

Dean Howland: There's a point to where recycling isn't a profitable item for like, anybody anymore, because no one is taking it.

Carol Sullivan: Right our recycling was too dirty for them.

Dennis Quirk: It's better than not having the plastic.

Carol Sullivan: So, would you say it's about 1000 square feet of plastic on each boat? In total?

Devin Dickinson: I would say you're probably three or four hundred square feet.

(Inaudible)

Dan Wolfield: I'm just picturing the bundle when it's rolled. You take it down and they're big.

Carol Sullivan: Right.

Dennis Quirk: They're big.

Dan Wolfield: They're big, like by five feet.

Dennis Quirk: You compress them down and they're still quite large.

Dan Wolfield: They're still quite large. And that's, I'm looking at, so if that was five square feet, or five, yeah, five square feet, times 100 boats, that's 500, 500 square feet of just plastic.

Carol Sullivan: Ok, thanks for the clarification. Onto John's email. One of the things John mentioned in his email is that if this project was presented as a different build design that perhaps two smaller buildings, didn't we ask that question about whether or not? I mean, I know we asked for the overlay of why the buildings couldn't be placed in other areas and you addressed that Devin, but I.

Devin Dickinson: Yes.

Carol Sullivan: We also asked, I believe Patricia asked, about.

Devin Dickinson: So, we did discuss two buildings. That might have come at the Variance Board so you guys would not have been part of that so, the issue with the two buildings, aside from how bad it would look, is you still need (in audible) between the buildings to maneuver the boats and get in the racks. You're really not, you know, the overall outline and footprint, the proximity to the property lines, and all the issues John brings up are still relevant to two buildings. You need the room to maneuver. The serious downside of two buildings, have you ever seen George's boat storage on the corner of 149, you know, in order to keep those boats clean, you've got tarps and all sorts of things trying to cover them up. It would look terrible.

Dean Howland: There's no center part that they could turn in?

Carol Sullivan: Right.

Dean Howland: They'd have to come in like Fisher's Marina when you go by you see the boats all stacked there. And they still shrink wrap them in the winter time because they have too.

Dan Wolfield: Right.

Devin Dickinson: You can't keep those buildings clean and dry.

Tim Barber: They'd be more like open sheds. Kind of like Fisher's.
Planning Board

Dean Howland: Yup.

Dan Wolfield: That's really just space, not storage and then you still have to shrinky-dink them.

Devin Dickinson: Yeah cause they're not protected well enough there. They're still exposed to the elements.

Dan Wolfield: Right, yeah, absolutely.

Dean Howland: So, it would be just missing the center of the building?

(inaudible)

Devin Dickinson: So, you'd still have that same line of sight, you still have the same perimeter.

Carol Sullivan: So, anyone else have any comments on that, those first couple of paragraphs before we go onto building location and proximity?

Dan Wolfield: No, I thought that was covered fairly well with the plan that showed the other options.

Carol Sullivan: Again, John mentions the intensity and often refers to the laundry. Again, I just want to make reference that we are looking at the Shoreline Boat Sales parcel for the purposes of this site plan review. Ok, building location and proximity. The boundaries. One of the things John mentions is it doesn't provide adequate landscaping or buffer areas. I'm not sure what more could be done but do you guys have any more comments?

Dean Howland: The only thing is there is a buffer and you got a variance to be closer to the property line correct?

Dan Barusch: The setback variance, yes.

Dean Howland: The setback for the back, the south side. Has Chazen group got back on the stormwater management?

Dan Barusch: They have. We got a response back today. They're down to nine comments. Nothing that is going to material, materially change the proposal.

Dean Howland: Ok.

Dan Barusch: It's all minor things that are changes to hydro-cad and numbers in that modeling.

Dean Howland: See that, those are the people that have to tell us whether it's correct or not.

(inaudible)

Carol Sullivan: Right, but say there's not adequate landscaping and, you know, John didn't say what he had in mind but, are we all in agreeing that there is adequate landscaping and the fence is the buffer?

Dan Wolfield: I think we addressed some of that just before.

Carol Sullivan: Yeah. Right.

Dan Wolfeld: Just switching a couple of trees around.

Dean Howland: You're still within a fenced area there on the eastern boundary. I mean, you're not going to see that landscaping for a while because it's got to be 12 feet higher there but, on top of the fence. So, yeah.

Carol Sullivan: Ok, moving on to reduction in size of the building. We've discussed rotating the building away from the boundaries. We've already asked that question and I think it was adequately answered unless any other member of the Board wants more clarification?

Dean Howland: Nope.

Dan Wolfeld: No. I mean, we just addressed that again. The scope and size of equipment, the scope and the materials that need to be used.

Dan Barusch: We also have maps they developed for November, that show alternative sites of the purposed building, in the same size, when you guys had asked for that the month before.

Carol Sullivan: Right.

Dan Barusch: You guys go through this email. You know one thing I always tell my Boards, over at the Town, it's really important to weed through and pick out the things that have some truth or some actual, you know, substance to it. Some of these things are just basically regurgitations of what we've been hearing for the past four months. We know that they've already been addressed. I think, you know, there's just a point being made that it's maybe not up to John's satisfaction but we know we've been talking about things like landscaping for four months now. So, understand what is more tangible to look at and what is kind of, just false information.

Carol Sullivan: Ok, blue steel siding. Any comments on that?

Dean Howland: I just have a comment and Carol, I spoke to her earlier, because on the original architectural design standards of the Village, if (inaudible). It's in a CMU development it states here, what this started out to be before it got written down, the site development standards to propose renovations and development projects in the.

(inaudible)

Dan Barusch: Yeah, this has come up before and I've told you guys before, maybe a couple months back now. The architectural design guidelines and standards as they are right now, codified in our code, are not specific to any district or any specific local in the Village. In most cases, if you go and look around, especially in the northeast, when they have those standards and guidelines, they are specific to certain areas. Now off, I haven't gotten any formal communication on it but we're working with Elan on a different project over at the Town. I talked one morning on the phone with Lisa Nagle, who assisted with the development of those, and it was the original intent of those guidelines to be specific to an area. I think when the Village Board adopted them, they just, it was just the whole village. But, you know, we're done with the town update to the code so once we get into the village update, one of the things that we'll look at with the Planning Board and maybe even the Village Board, before we go anywhere near adoption is these standard and how they apply to certain areas. I mean, you're not going to go and knock on someone's door that lives in a residential district because they broke the pitch. (Inaudible) It's not

meant for them. It's meant for the commercial businesses on Canada Street, that we don't want to see pointy roofs for.

Dean Howland: Well I guess that's my point.

(Inaudible)

Dan Barusch: Yeah, but because it's in the code now for the whole Village, you know, it does apply and that's why we're here.

Dean Howland: Now, is that, is that a variation that we would give, for metal siding?

Dan Barusch: Metal siding yes, the colors.

Dean Howland: The color doesn't matter, just the metal siding?

Dan Barusch: Yup. The metal siding is something that's in there that's not allowed. You know, we obviously wouldn't want to see that on Canada Street. John may not want to see it here on Sewell but, I mean, we might have other people that are in the same boat. But like I said, the original intention was not for the entire Village. Communities rarely have those for residential areas.

Dean Howland: Well that's what's stated on the original book I had and I just printed it out again.

Dan Barusch: Was CMU and C.

Dean Howland: CMU. That's why I was trying to say. (Inaudible)

Carol Sullivan: We have a member of the audience who.

Dina Viola: Yeah. I have a question. My name is Dina Viola and I live on Sewell Street. I actually live right across from Shoreline and I'm fine with what Shoreline wants to do in regards to building a new building, but from my understanding the zoning was changed on Sewell Street, two years ago from Commercial Use, Commercial Mixed Use to, what were we changed to?

Jennifer Juzaitis: Well it's been a big old mess.

Dina Viola: But what I'm saying, that's why I'm just not sure.

Dan Barusch: That's a little wrong but.

Dina Viola: Ok.

Dan Barusch: I'll give you the correct version of it.

Dina Viola: Ok. Cause I got a notice on my property. Cause when I bought my property it was Commercial Residential and then I got a notice saying that Sewell Street was no longer Commercial Residential. That's why I'm now wondering why you're now, why we're saying it's Commercial?

Carol Sullivan: Commercial Residential was a name that we used in our old Code. So, when the new Code got adopted, and I'll let Dan take it from there.

Dan Barusch: Ok so, there's actually two things that play into what you're talking about and what Carol just mentioned. There was a new Code update adopted that I think in '04 that changed some of the terminology of the districts and the district locations. That was not when Sewell Street, and I'm only saying Sewell Street because it's those properties along the street you're mentioning. There's actually still different districts along Sewell. Really, what happened after 2004 was somewhat of a spot zone for some of the lots, not you're property, but the ones across the street because there used to be a commercial use there and the intent of those owners was to bring that use back, which we've recently gone through and approved so those lots there, in that little block were given basically quazi spot zone to allow for commercial use so they are now in the RMU district. Your property is still in the R. The one next to you is still, I believe, are the RMU and then the one south of Sewell is still in CMU. Everything south of Sewell is Commercial Mixed Use. So, I was not around with the whole 2004 because I would have probably suggested to the Village Board that they not do that because that's what we call spot zoning. So, when you take a select few parcels and really hone in and change the use for a specific benefit to, you know, one party, one person, one lot, whatever. So, in '04 they did a comprehensive change. A lot of lots changed, boundary lines changed but the one after that really didn't even include your property.

Dina Viola: Alright. I was just wondering.

Carol Sullivan: Ok, back to John's email. Blue steel siding. Any? That's just a regurgitation of what we've known. Anybody have any comments, questions?

Dan Wolfield: No, I think, same thing, we've addressed a lot of that already.

Carol Sullivan: Right, I just want to go through this to make sure.

(Inaudible)

Dan Wolfield: Just a couple of things I think part of this is just subject to opinion.

Carol Sullivan: Right. Yeah and I just want to go through this to make sure that we give, you know, John took the time to write this so that we, he knows it's been reviewed by the Board. But a lot of this as you say Dan, is just a regurgitation of things that have been said in the past. Windows, anything new there that we haven't addressed?

Tim Barber: I have a clarification on that. They're not fiberglass panels, those windows. They are insulated, commercial, aluminum framed windows.

Dean Howland: So, they're windows?

Tim Barber: Yes.

Dennis Quirk: Yes.

Dan Wolfield: Thank you.

Carol Sullivan: Anything else and then I can talk about? (Inaudible) The flat roof, anything there? Questions?

Dean Howland: We discussed that. (Inaudible) We know about the overhang. Right, the flat roof and not putting a (inaudible) wall up to make it look worse or whatever. So, I think we discussed that.

Carol Sullivan: Again, it's all been discussed. I just want to make sure there's nothing new or nothing that pops out at anyone. Ok, total project (inaudible). Anything?

Dan Wolfield: (Inaudible)

Carol Sullivan: Oh, about the entire project? Correct and that still holds true. Right. We're addressing this building and can't be, the laundromat for the purpose of site plan review. Water and snow runoff on the south side?

Dean Howland: I don't see how that works because it would have to go uphill. I mean, to get to John's property to me, and you have something on the other parcel anyways, don't you? On the back end, not the laundromat, but the westerly property that you store stuff on? The other parcel? Didn't you say that at one time you have stormwater there?

Dan Barusch: There's a large Village, quasi Village.

(Inaudible)

Dan Barusch: I don't think that's what this is referring to. It's referring the to area south of the building.

Carol Sullivan: Right.

Dean Howland: I know but it has to run there.

Dan Barusch: Well, the basin is, was put there to catch that stormwater.

Dean Howland: I understand that, but if there was an overflow it has to run to that other basin.

Dan Barusch: Right, yup.

Devin Dickinson: John's property is about three feet higher. There's the bank.

(Inaudible)

Dan Barusch: I think his point is the water is going to run off the roof and shoot over seven feet, over the fence, onto his property.

(Inaudible)

Dan Barusch: But the runoff from the roof coming down is just gonna go over the fence.

Tim Barber: Not a chance.

Devin Dickinson: The roof pitch is far too flat for that.

Tim Barber: Yeah it wouldn't get that velocity.

Dan Barusch: We've talked about that before.

Carol Sullivan: Ok.

Walt Adams: Storm water litigation is all standard. You've already kind of addressed that.

Dean Howland: We talked about this just in the general appearance of the building.

Carol Sullivan: Ok, anything else in this email that anyone wants to?

Dean Howland: We did the pedestrian, human friendly.

Carol Sullivan: Yup. So, before we go onto the architectural waivers, and the SEQRA, I will take comments from the public now. Again, you have five minutes and one rebuttal. Anyone?

Dina Viola: Again, I just, I live across the street from Shoreline and just for the record, I'm ok with the building being built.

Carol Sullivan: Anyone else?

Terri Johnson: Good evening, my name is Terri Johnson and my husband and I own the 30, 32 Sewell Street. I want to thank you for giving us permission to have our business there and I think that will be a real benefit to the Town and the Village. My husband and I own 30 and 32 Street, directly across from the laundromat, a property itself and an intricate element of expanding Shoreline Boat storage complex. Given this, I urge the Planning Board to consider the contiguous Quirk property in its analysis of waivers that are sought. Our property is currently negatively impacted by the appearance of storage on the properties, owing to the unsightly accumulation of equipment and debris. Accordingly, it's difficult to have confidence that the proposed substantial building project and increase in intensity will be attentive to enhancing the character of Sewell Street neighborhood or promoting a sense of place. As our representatives, members of the Board have a responsibility to ask themselves if they would want to live across the street from that facility. Keep in mind that zoned residential area as Dina was also saying. Dina, I and John are the only property owners there. The Village of Lake George banned air bnb's and student housing because it wanted to preserve its residential neighborhoods including Sewell Street. It wanted to preserve its residential neighborhoods including Sewell Street. While Shoreline is zoned commercially and has been the corner stone to the area, this proposed project clearly hinges on the spirit of the Village's neighborhood vision. We don't believe, as proposed, this project will maintain or improve the quality of our community. Finally, comments at the last board meeting, suggesting that no one, or very few walk Sewell Street, are inaccurate. I assert that Sewell Street has significant pedestrian traffic, particularly in the summer months when the laundromat is in full swing, going heavy with people and traffic talking past midnight, every night. Both pedestrian and automobile traffic has also increased with the development of the Charles Wood Park. We advocate for a thriving neighborhood with complimentary businesses. We appreciate the input of all those coming out on behalf of improving our Sewell Street community regardless of their perspective. At the December's meeting we heard from several people who were renting properties here. I am compelled to note that my remarks are made as a property owner for fifteen years. Thank you.

Carol Sullivan: Rebuttal anyone?

Dan Barusch: I have two items to note just so you guys have, again, the right information. Quirk's lots are in the Commercial Mixed Use. I'll say it one more time. Commercial Mixed-Use zoning district, ok? I understand Residential zone is across the street, but Mr. Quirk's lot, lots, are Commercial Mixed Use. In that district you are allowed to have short term rentals. I know it has absolutely nothing to do with this project, but in the Residential districts, yes, air bnb's are banned. In the Commercial districts they are not banned. So, if Mr. Quirk had a house on his property or wanted to rent a room in his laundromat, those are two feasible things. Not relevant to this project but, just so you know.

Carol Sullivan: Anyone else rebuttal? Ok.

Claudia Braymer: Just quickly, Claudia Braymer, the attorney representing John Carr and I know he did submit his comments today, and I've submitted information previously, so I will try not to rehash that but I do want to remind the Board, our position is, the size and character of this project is not compatible with the neighborhood, which we've heard tonight, some of which is zoned Residential, even though this particular lot and the adjoining lots are CMU. And I want to point out that in accordance with Section 220-42, the architectural standards apply to all new construction projects requiring site plan review in CMU. So, I'm not sure that the architectural standards apply throughout the Village, but I do know that they apply to site plan review, new projects, new construction projects in the CMU. So, I don't want you to down plan the importance of the architectural standards in the CMU zone which is where this is. And finally, I know we don't agree on this point but I want to bring it up for the record, the change of use and the intensity of use on the laundromat site is important and it requires review by this Board and it should be done in conjunction with your review that you're doing now for this building. Thank you.

Carol Sullivan: Anyone have a rebuttal on that?

Dan Barusch: Something to say also. I agree that, that we should look at the stuff on the neighboring lot, particularly in the sense of SEQR. The reason that they keep bringing this up really is so that we do it for SEQR purposes. Otherwise, we could get claims against us that we're segmenting review. Not really the intent of the segmenting section of SEQR law, but we can include the expansion of the outdoor boat storage on the laundromat site in our SEQR review. I would not suggest that you have them amend the application by any means because like I mentioned, two meetings in a row, prior to this meeting, we do not have authority at the local level, on the boat count for outdoor boat storage. We have no regulations in our Code regarding outdoor boat storage. Only that it is a use allowed in certain districts. It's allowed in the CMU. They came last year, before I took over, I believe in the fall or something, 2017 to get an approval on outdoor boat storage at the laundromat site. This Board approved that proposal and at numerous points in time, the Board discussed do we put a number of boats, do we discuss where, bla, bla, bla. That was all relegated to the Park Commission. They're the ones that put the restrictions and numbers and things on these marina permits. So, you can go in the Code, you can look for, you know, intensity of use changing from 20 boats to 100 boats, you're not going to find anything in there that's based on outdoor boat storage. Like I said, what we can do is include it in our SEQR review. We're going to try and understand the impacts of the entire project, including outdoor boat storage and an environmental sense, but we, as the Village, are not approving 100 outdoor boats because that is not in our purview. So, if you want to do it for SEQR that's perfectly fine. I think we could go through those parts answer, you know, two and three based on the entire thing as the Park Commission will do because that's there, everything is under their purview.

Carol Sullivan: Everyone understand what Dan is saying? Ok. Any other public comments? Chris?

Chris Johnson: For those of you who don't know me, my name is Chris Johnson. I grew up in this Village, almost 50 years, never left. We live on Mohawk Mt. now, a little bit outside the Village, but we still own property on Dieskau Street. As of late, we turn off of Canada Street onto Sewell Street, it's almost like we're pulling into an industrial area. I believe that this project will be the beginning of cleaning that up. If you're lucky enough to not almost run somebody over standing in the roadway to get into the restaurant or trucks that are parked out front, loading beer, unloading beer, and I think over time, that's going to get worse. This is going to start the cleaning up of that kind of thing, getting these boats inside. I think it's a good thing. I'm in favor. The other problem I had is these businesses along there, they have a habit of, for years, of taking what they don't want their customers to see and putting them in the back yard which is our neighborhood. Ok, you can see pallets of beer, fork trucks, all through there.

It's not just the brewery, it's not just Dennis's property, it's Smith Boys. At the last meeting, Ms. Dow went on about having to look at a monotonous wall. I think she'd be horrified to sit in my living room and look at the Smith Boy's lot with all the stuff they don't want their customers to see, we're having to see. So, the random pedestrian that walks down there, yeah that's great. They don't want to have to look at the boats or the wall or whatever it is, but everyday when we're sitting in our living rooms, looking at old forklifts, ramps to get on boats, old tractors, just the stuff that the customer, the business owner doesn't want the customer to see, that's what we're looking at. I talked with Doug when this was starting, you know, in one ear, out the other. So, this here, getting those boats inside, a majority of them. I mean a business that's been there some 25 years, before that there was a batting cage there when I was a kid. So, now what's happened is, a lot of times in the summer I don't even turn off of Canada Street onto Sewell Street because you don't know what's gonna happen in there. Half the time you can't even get your car all the way off of Canada Street because there's people standing in the road because there's no where for the waiting customers to stand because there's a bunch of rocks and I don't even know what it is and several times where I'm like encroaching on people walking to get my car off the road.

Dina Viola: Yeah, there should be a sidewalk. It's dangerous.

Chris Johnson: The other thing too, we just put some money into our property. We sit on the porch there in the summer. All summer long, you can't go out there one night and not look at the garbage that the Smith Boys don't want us to see and smell, whatever is happening at the brewery. It's overwhelming at times. So, I think this is a good start to get this place cleaned up, a new standard, have you, what ever it may be, but I'm in favor of this and I hope you vote to move the boats.

Carol Sullivan: Thank you. Anyone like to comment on that?

Dan Barusch: My ears work. Email me about Smith Boys.

Chris Johnson: You gotta drive by there.

Dan Barusch: Ok.

Chris Johnson: (inaudible)

Terri Johnson: I would have just one brief comment that are we really going to see the trash cleaned up? Let's say across from our place? Is that going to change though? That would be, could I ask Mr. Quirk whether he has plans to change that?

Dennis Quirk: So, we are cleaning up the lot. You know, with our laundromat (inaudible) 30 plus years. But our receptacles towards that back of the lot, which there's no residency back there or anybody to see that. We'll do our best to maintain that property, the best way we see fit and I think we do a pretty good job.

Terri Johnson: How about that big blue crane? Will that remain there?

Dennis Quirk: Big blue crane?

(inaudible)

Dennis Quirk: Yes, yes it will.

Terri Johnson: And all those little trucks around it and all those other boats around it? Will they still be there?

Dennis Quirk: They will be there. We can probably manage them better.

Devin Dickinson: Yeah, if I can clarify that. I think I have a feeling what Mrs. Jamison, correct?

Terri Johnson: Yes.

Devin Dickinson: I think I have a feeling what she's talking about. That area where a lot of that.

Carol Sullivan: You're talking between Shoreline Boat Sales and the laundromat? That area there, not, we're not talking about?

(inaudible)

Devin Dickinson: Correct and I think it's specifically between that boat lift and the laundromat and that area is actually going to turn into stormwater management. So, that area is going to be cleaned up entirely.

Carol Sullivan: Ok.

Terri Johnson: So, you're saying that there won't be all those boats or that boat crane there, or that old, little, cute truck there, or that tractor trailer next to the laundromat?

Devin Dickinson: The boat crane will stay. That's a fixture that's in concrete in the ground. So, the boat lift will stay there, but the, some of the miscellaneous equipment and a couple of those boats in between that crane and the laundromat will be removed because we have a large stormwater device going in that area.

Terri Johnson: A large stormwater device?

Devin Dickinson: So, it would be a basin to treat the stormwater runoff. So, it'd be like a shallow kind of basin. It'd be landscaped. So, that's part of the approval.

Terri Johnson: But all the tractor trailers in the back with all the trash and the dumpsters, they're all going to be there? Nothing is changing there?

Devin Dickinson: There's going to be a dumpster back there. There's a couple of storage units. I guess maybe, is that what you mean by tractor trailer?

Terri Johnson: Yeah, the tractor trailer storage units.

(inaudible)

Devin Dickinson: A lot of that's going to stay. A lot of it's already been cleaned up.

Terri Johnson: And then, there's still going to be, you know, we don't have exact number of boats, many, many, white plastic covered boats, behind the storage, behind the laundromat, you know, in rows. Maybe three or four rows, several hundred boats, is that correct?

Devin Dickinson: There will be boats stored there, but they're won't be that number of boats.

(inaudible)

Carol Sullivan: And again, we're mixing, we're getting to the laundromat and (inaudible).

Terri Johnson: Ok, I was just, he was talking about cleaning up trash. I was really just trying to comment on (inaudible).

Jennifer Juzaitis: But I think what she said at the last meeting was that at the last meeting, with the building going up, we thought great. Everything is going to be contained, it's going to look super, but then the idea was learning from these different type applications, there were actually going to be a lot of boats still outside. The question was oh, well, so it's not all going to be tied up into one building and I think that that's where the concern is, is how much is going to be around but clearly mindful of the fact that's not something that's under consideration tonight. Because this is about the three waivers for that particular building. It's just all seemingly of a piece when you're sitting on the porch at their house.

Carol Sullivan: And would you state your name?

Jennifer Juzaitis: Jennifer Juzaitis.

Carol Sullivan: Ok, any other comments from the public? Alright, I'm going to make a motion to close the public hearing. I need a second.

Dean Howland: I'll second it.

Carol Sullivan: Ok, all in favor?

Dan Wolfeld: Aye.

Walt Adams: Aye.

Dean Howland: Aye.

Carol Sullivan: Aye. Four ayes, motion carried. The public hearing is closed.

(Public hearing closed at 6:47pm.)

2nd MOTION: Dean Howland

Carol Sullivan	Dan Wolfeld	Dean Howland	Walt Adams
AYE	AYE	AYE	AYE

Aye = 4 Nay = 0 Motion carried

Dan Barusch: Clock starts. You've got 62 days. If you don't want to make a decision tonight, you've still got two months.

Carol Sullivan: So, we have 62 days. What we're going to do is we'll go over the architectural standards and look at the responses that were provided. Does everyone have a copy of the questions?

(Inaudible)

Carol Sullivan: So, because typically what will happen is the applicant will write a response to the questions that are on this page regarding what their view is, and then we review those and if we are in agreement, we can use them or we can add to them, and eventually what has to come out of all of this is a response from the Board with regard to these questions. Does everyone understand that? Ok, so we're going to do these individually. Each question individually. So, the first one we're looking at is the height of the single floor, which is 14 feet. That is section 220-42 E(2)(b), a lower case b, just for a point of reference and it states stories shall not exceed 14 feet in height from the finished floor to the finished ceiling and we've all seen what the applicant has replied, provided as a response to that in number one, regarding whether or not there is an undesirable change. Does anyone have, Dean?

Dean Howland: Again, this is the kicker for me, cause no one had expected to have a boat storage building from what they wrote as far as I can tell. I walked down to the Marriot and just my thinking here, and again, when you go into the Marriot and you walk up on the third floor, you have a two-story room that's above 14 feet. You never really talked about that at the time and I don't see how that's.

(Inaudible)

Dan Barusch: I've only been with the Village for maybe 14 months now. My assumption is many of the architectural standards and guidelines, preferably the standards that requires something, have been overlooked over the years and there's a pretty good likelihood that there are some 14 plus foot story buildings or some buildings with roof pitches that exceed this number. Not trying to downplay this stuff here, but I'm just telling you that there's a good chance in past that those things had been overlooked and then when we, you know, get to the point in time where we do our Code updates, I'll be back in front of you guys having a separate setting, more of a workshop setting to discuss with you, you know, which of these things are, are really pertinent. Do we care that the Marriot has a 20-something foot high, you know, ballroom? I, you know, it probably never crossed anybody's mind here at this meeting that when you were doing the Marriot review that that was a thing that was in the architectural guidelines, cause when we think that, it's the outside of the building.

Carol Sullivan: I can speak to that a little bit.

Dan Barusch: Ok.

Carol Sullivan: These guidelines came into place more recently.

Dan Barusch: After the Marriott?

Carol Sullivan: I believe so. You'd have to check and it could have been an oversight on the Marriott because the Marriott was a bigger, a big project.

(Inaudible)

Dan Barusch: I'm not trying to criticize or anything because the ballroom is a tiny, tiny piece of a very large project. I probably would have missed it as well. But what I'm trying to say to your point, is there's, there's probably a few examples out there, you know, try to still look at it subjectively in the terms of this project and, you know, I would suggest even the answers that the applicants gave you, read those aloud and, you know, let everyone in the public hear them, kind of dwell on them for a second before you come up with your thoughts on the same question. Because that's, that's something that helps understand, you know, where they're coming, then you're gonna give your input on the same thing.

Carol Sullivan: Ok, thanks Dan. Alright so we're on, I'll read it. There will not be an undesirable, and this is for the single floor only, there will not be an undesirable change to the character of the neighborhood or detriment to the nearby properties by the granting of the requested waiver. The waiver will not be noticeable outside of the building. Comments?

Dan Wolfield: So?

Carol Sullivan: Just look at the, is there an undesirable change to the character?

Dan Wolfield: Yeah, one of the first comments I had to the whole thing was, some of the answers after reading some of them, some of them were just very, very similar and I just didn't feel that the answers truly addressed some of the bigger issues and I felt like things were left out so I didn't think the answers were really well done on certain aspects.

Dan Barusch: Have whatever you don't like you can ask them to supplement.

Dan Wolfield: No, absolutely.

Dan Barusch: A good example is the third one.

Dan Wolfield: I just felt pieces were left out that I already knew the answer to, to be honest. With some of them, I think it would have made it a much stronger answer on your behalf but the one comment that I saw, I just look at it and say I don't see it as being a detriment to the neighborhood by any means, so I do agree that it's not a detriment to the neighborhood as far as being undesirable, I guess that can be, once again, subject to opinion, but I consider that minor in the realm of things.

Walt Adams: I consider it, looking at it, as aesthetically neutral where it's boats out front or a building (inaudible) not undesirable, but more of an aesthetically neutral position.

Carol Sullivan: And I agree with that. I, you know, I think getting rid of the plastic wrap is certainly, doesn't, it's more of a help, I think what's undesirable right now is the plastic wrap and the boats out in Sewell Street, so getting rid of those two things actually creates a desirable change.

Dan Wolfield: I agree.

Carol Sullivan: Dean?

Dean Howland: I agree, I go in and out of the Village that way two or three times a day and I just think when you're going to see something cleaned up and landscaping it's gotta look nicer. In the wintertime we have a lot of boats that are stored around anyway, but in the summertime is when you really notice them. It's just there and to me I don't, that doesn't make an undesirable change to me at all.

Carol Sullivan: Ok.

Dean Howland: The building with the cross pieces, it sort of looks like a story (inaudible) and again, we're talking the outside of the building (inaudible).

Carol Sullivan: Ok, moving on to number two, again just regarding the floor. Whether the benefit sought by the applicant can be achieved by some other method feasible for the applicant to pursue, other than the architectural standards waiver and the response to that from the applicant is the benefit cannot be achieved by other feasible methods other than an Architectural Waiver. A boat storage building does not

have multiple floors like a conventional residential building. A boat storage facility has an interior rack system concealed from the exterior view to facilitate vertical storage. Owners of Marinas have invested in these facilities to maximize their storage requirements, remove the majority of shrink-wrapped boats from the front of their properties. Do we agree, disagree, comments?

Dan Wolfield: I agree.

Carol Sullivan: I agree.

Dan Wolfield: I think they addressed a lot of that with the lines and the colors of the building.

Dean Howland: I agree with that.

Carol Sullivan: Ok. Three. Whether the requested Architectural Standards waiver is substantial. Response to that: The waiver requested from the Architectural Standards is not substantial. I don't feel that gives us enough information. I'd throw a why in there. Why, it's not substantial. I don't know how the rest of the Board feels about that?

Dean Howland: It's something that's, because you're talking about the single floor heights, you can't really address it in this type of situation unless you go inside and you, the height of a rack is a story you know. (inaudible)

Dan Barusch: Is there something in particular you want to add to that answer?

Devin Dickinson: We're at a little disadvantage. Of course, Jon isn't here tonight, but um, I'll take a whack at it. I think, you know, it's non-substantial in the sense that it's not something that you can really determine the outside the building, so the average passerby won't have any idea if there was floors or how high they were or any of that. I think the outside, you know, architectural details of the building kind of mask, you know, what it is, so I think in that sense maybe it's not substantial.

Carol Sullivan: Ok. Comments anyone?

Dan Wolfield: I tend to agree.

Dean Howland: Yeah.

Dan Wolfield: (inaudible) I kind of put things in a category of minor or major. I consider that a small thing.

Carol Sullivan: Yeah.

(Inaudible)

Dan Wolfield: But I think it was addressed by the lines and the colors.

Carol Sullivan: Ok number four. Whether the proposed Architectural Standards Waiver will have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions of the neighborhood or the district. The applicants answer: The Architectural Waiver requested will not have an adverse physical or environmental impact on the neighborhood. The floor height will not be noticeable to the general public. This facility has been designed and engineered to accommodate the majority of the boats Shoreline sells, services and stores. And I agree with that.

Dan Wolfield: I agree.

Walt Adams: I agree.

Dean Howland: I agree. That goes up to number three too, but the answer.

Dan Wolfield: Yes, correct.

Carol Sullivan: Five. Whether the alleged difficulty was self-created. Which consideration shall be relevant to the decision of the Planning Board, but shall not necessarily preclude the granting of the Architectural Standard Waiver? And the applicant's answer to that is: The difficulty is not self-created. The parcel has been used as a continuously functioning marine facility since the mid 90's. A boat storage building does not have multiple floors like a conventional residential building and I agree with that.

Dean Howland: I agree.

Carol Sullivan: Dan?

Dan Wolfield: Yeah, I agree. I think my only comment to it is, yes, the property like you said, the property has been there. He's had the property. It's been a commercial use the whole time so I don't see any other, necessarily changes to use, so to speak, it's not an issue.

Carol Sullivan: So that's the first waiver. (inaudible)

Dan Wolfield: How would we do the motion on these? Do you want to make a motion after each one?

(inaudible)

Carol Sullivan: Well the language has to be put into the minutes according to what is written here and anything that we added. So, if we're gonna for instance, add anything to these, that would maybe change the applicant's response. We can do each one individually and do the, say we agree with the language as it is written and go with that and then make a motion to grant the waiver, or we can do all of them, each one them individually and then back track. Whatever you're most comfortable with.

(inaudible)

Carol Sullivan: Ok, so let's do them as we go. Ok, so.

Dan Wolfield: This one was good. I think if there was another one with questions then.

Carol Sullivan: Right.

Dean Howland: Cause there were no changes on this one per say.

Carol Sullivan: Right. Ok so for purposes of the record, we're going to go with the applicant's response to the five questions that were asked and.

Dan Barusch: With the supplemental to number three.

Carol Sullivan: Right. The supplemental, Devin comments to number three. So, Stephanie when you do the minutes, just as you do in the Zoning Board minutes, you'll put the questions in there, and you'll

respond, you'll put the responses with them and add Devin's comment. Ok. So now we'll do, make a motion to grant the waiver for the single floor.

Walt Adams: I make a motion to accept the response to the Architectural Waiver responses and except them as they are with the addition of the comments that were made.

Carol Sullivan: I will second that.

Dan Barusch: And this is for an approval of the waiver?

Dean Howland: For approving, yeah, I'd say for approval.

(inaudible)

Carol Sullivan: Ok so just to reiterate. The motion that's on the table is for the approval of waiver for the height of the single floor.

Dan Wolfeld: Of 14 feet.

Carol Sullivan: And I second it.

Dean Howland: I approve.

Dan Wolfeld: Aye.

Dean Howland: Aye.

Carol Sullivan: Ok.

2nd MOTION: Carol Sullivan

Carol Sullivan	Dan Wolfeld	Dean Howland	Walt Adams
AYE	AYE	AYE	AYE

Aye = 4 Nay = 0 Motion carried

(inaudible)

Carol Sullivan: Ok. The second one is regarding the metal siding. So, this is 220-42F(2)(d)(2) which states the following material shall not be used on any portion of the building. Number two is metal siding. And again, I'll read through each of the items and we can discuss them. Ok, the first one is: Whether an undesirable change will be produced in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties will be created by granting the Architectural Standards waiver. The answer that the applicant provided: There will not be an undesirable change to the character of the neighborhood or detriment to the nearby properties by the granting of the requested waiver. Measures have been taken to mitigate the impact to the surrounding neighborhood through the use of vegetative screening, color choices and architectural details and I agree with that.

Walt Adams: I agree.

Dean Howland: I agree. I mean they address some of the concerns.

Dan Wolfield: Yes, I agree.

Carol Sullivan: Two. Whether the benefit sought by the applicant can be achieved by some method, feasible for the applicant to pursue, other than an Architectural Standards waiver. And the reply to that is: The benefit cannot be achieved by other feasible methods other than Architectural Waivers. The metal siding is a structural component of prefabricated metal buildings. The architectural features of the Nucor Accent wall panel make it ideal for decorative wall designs. The recessed fasteners provide a clean exterior appearance and the deep rib configuration creates an attractive shadow pattern. I agree with that. I think may changes have been made to the building, based on the requests of the Planning Board so I agree with that.

Walt Adams: I agree.

Dan Wolfield: I agree. Can I just ask a question though? Wouldn't this also, for this particular change using metal siding verses another alternative material, be a safer material for that type of building? Clearly?

Tim Barber: I don't understand the question.

Dan Wolfield: Wouldn't it be a safer material verses using wood or fiberglass?

Tim Barber: Sure.

Devin Dickinson: Yes, Correct.

Dan Wolfield: Or some other material for the purpose being used? I just feel it would be a nice addition to add to that line that it's also, it's a better choice overall from a safety standpoint.

Dean Howland: Well, besides a safety standard, that, those products maintain their appearance for a long period of time without.

Devin Dickinson: Correct.

Dean Howland: Maintenance which I think in that particular park is, I see critical. So, that's the only thing I can add to it just from experience, so.

Carol Sullivan: Ok, so for purposes of number two, we're going to add that the metal siding is a safer component to be used and that it also maintains its character.

Dean Howland: It's safer in this.

Dan Wolfield: Use.

Dean Howland: Application. Yes.

Dan Wolfield: For this application.

Carol Sullivan: Ok. Three. Whether the requested Architectural Standard waiver is substantial. The waiver requested by the Architectural Standards is not significant and measures have been taken to minimize the waiver requested and its impact on the surrounding neighborhood.

Dan Wolfield: Agree.

Carol Sullivan: I agree with that.

Walt Adams: I agree.

Dean Howland: I agree.

Carol Sullivan: Four. Whether the proposed Architectural Standards waiver will have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district. The applicant's response is: The Architectural Waiver requested will not have an adverse physical or environmental impact on the neighborhood. The design allows for proper drainage and stormwater management controls eliminating environmental impacts.

Dean Howland: Giving out one question, isn't the stormwater looked at once a year on a commercial property?

Dan Barusch: For like an inspection of the devices?

Dean Howland: Just to make sure it's working?

Dan Barusch: Yeah, so anything that gets what I call a major stormwater plan, so these hydro-cad packets, that we have Chazen review. Those we enter into a stormwater maintenance agreement. The Village, Town, whatever signs that and then the applicant signs it and it gets, because we're an MS4 community, not going to get into the MS4 right now because it's a whole ball of wax, and yes, we go out once a month and inspect all of those MS4 properties.

Dan Wolfield: Once a year?

Dan Barusch: Once a month. If you have a swip, it's once a month.

Dan Wolfield: Is this considered a major stormwater project?

Dan Barusch: You guys have a swip on that site? For everything?

Devin Dickinson: Yup.

Dan Wolfield: Ok. So, it will be followed up on in (inaudible)? Add it to your list.

Carol Sullivan: Ok, so, but there are no changes based on what the applicant has?

Dean Howland: No, I just asked a question, that's all.

Dan Wolfield: No.

Carol Sullivan: Ok. Five. Whether the alleged difficulty was self-created, I'm not going to read the rest of that. We know what that is and the answer to this is the same as the previous answer, which I agree with.

Walt Adams: I agree.

Dean Howland: I agree.

Dan Wolfield: I agree.

Carol Sullivan: So again, we're going to accept the applicant's responses with the addition to number two, that the metal siding is safer in this particular use and that the quality of the material presented, presents a better aspect for maintaining.

Dean Howland: Longevity.

Dan Wolfield: The longevity.

Carol Sullivan: And that was really the only changes. Ok, so I'll make a motion to accept the waiver responses as presented with the addition of the safety and quality of the building materials added to number two as previously stated.

Dan Wolfield: For metal siding.

Carol Sullivan: For metal siding.

Dean Howland: I'll second it.

Carol Sullivan: Dan?

Dan Wolfield: Aye.

Walt Adams: Aye.

Carol Sullivan: All in favor? Motion carried.

2nd MOTION: Dean Howland

Carol Sullivan	Dan Wolfield	Dean Howland	Walt Adams
AYE	AYE	AYE	AYE

Aye = 4 Nay = 0 Motion carried

Dan Barusch: And that's an approval of the waiver?

Carol Sullivan: Yup. Should we be making two motions for this?

Dan Barusch: Um, I mean, we don't make a motion at the Zoning Board level when somebody goes through the variance process or any Planning Board waiver process that I've seen, personally. They don't make a motion to accept, like the verbiage, because this is just what the applicant, just like SEQR, they give you a Type I, that's their side and then the Type II is your side.

Carol Sullivan: Right.

Dan Barusch: So, what you do is you go through, basically agree with the verbiage that was put or you add verbiage, give your own answer, whatever, and the motion is typically the approval of the item.

Carol Sullivan: Oh, well then, we'll do it that way.

Dan Barusch: Ok.

Carol Sullivan: Ok. On the third waiver that's being asked for is for the roof slope and that is Section 220-42(G) entitled Roof Design and 1(d) which is sloped roof. (d) is for gabled roofs. The pitch shall be between 6:12 and 14:12. Ok, number one. Whether an undesirable change will be produced in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties will be created by granting, by the granting of the Architectural Standards waiver. And the applicant's response is: There will not be an undesirable change to the character of the neighborhood or detriment to the nearby properties by the granting of the requested waiver. The waiver is minimal in nature and measures have been taken to mitigate their impact to the surrounding neighborhood through the use of color choices and architectural details and I would add to that, landscaping as well. So, surrounding neighborhood through the use of color choices, architectural details and landscaping.

Dan Wolfield: And drainage controls should also be added to that shouldn't it?

Dan Barusch: That would tie more into the fourth.

Dan Wolfield: In the next one?

Dan Barusch: Number four.

Dan Wolfield: Ok.

Carol Sullivan: Ok. Number two, whether the benefit sought by the applicant can be achieved by some other method, feasible for the applicant to pursue, other than an Architectural Standards waiver. And the applicant's response to that is: The benefit cannot be achieved by other feasible methods other than an Architectural Waiver. The required 6:12 roof pitch will render most of the structure unusable for interior boat rack storage. This facility has been designed and engineered to accommodate the majority of the boats Shoreline sells, services and stores. The ridge height is 39'-9" and the eaves are 36'. Shallow roof lines are a feature of this type of facility to minimize the overall height and size of these buildings. And I think, all I would add for purposes of clarification, when you say ridge height, that's where the peak, the center peak is?

Devin Dickinson: Correct.

Tim Barber: Correct.

Dean Howland: I agree.

Walt Adams: I agree.

Dan Wolfield: I agree.

Carol Sullivan: Three, whether the requested Architectural Standards waiver is substantial. The waiver requested from the Architectural Standards is not significant and measures have been taken to minimize the waiver requested and its impact on the surrounding neighborhood. The architectural standards allow flat roofs. This roof system will appear generally flat due to the slope only being .75/12.

Dan Wolfield: I agree.

Dean Howland: I'm good with it.

Walt Adams: I agree.

Carol Sullivan: I agree. Four, whether the proposed Architectural Standards waiver will have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district. And the applicant's response is: The Architectural Waivers requested will not have an adverse physical or environmental impact on the neighborhood. The design allows for proper drainage and stormwater management controls eliminating environmental impacts. I agree with that.

Dean Howland: I agree.

(inaudible)

Carol Sullivan: Ok so then except it as is.

Walt Adams: Agree.

Carol Sullivan: Five and this is the same question, whether the alleged difficulty was self-created (inaudible). The difficulty is not self-created. The parcel has been used as a continuously functioning marine facility since the mid 90's. As is industry standard, the existing and new marine building will be prefabricated steel construction with metal siding and roof and then the required 6:12 roof pitch will render most of the structure unusable for interior boat rack storage and I agree with that.

Dan Wolfield: Agree.

Dean Howland: Agree.

Walt Adams: Agree.

Carol Sullivan: Ok. So, we're going to except the applicant's explanation for the waiver responses for the roof slope with the addition to number two where I just asked for clarification that ridge height is center peak.

Dean Howland: What part is that? G? What's that number?

Carol Sullivan: Section 220-42(G) Roof Design 1(d).

Dean Howland: Should we just add those in there, too?

(inaudible)

Dean Howland: I mean, cause that's what they're asking about. That's the only thing and then I'll second that.

Carol Sullivan: I haven't made the motion yet.

Dean Howland: Oh, I thought you did.

Carol Sullivan: I'll make a motion to grant the waiver for the roof slope. I need a second.

Walt Adams: I'll second that.

Carol Sullivan: Walt, Dean is in favor. Dan?

Dan Wolfield: I agree.

Dean Howland: Aye.

Carol Sullivan: Aye.

2nd MOTION: Walt Adams

Carol Sullivan	Dan Wolfield	Dean Howland	Walt Adams
AYE	AYE	AYE	AYE

Aye = 4 Nay = 0 Motion carried

Carol Sullivan: The last one is the eave, which is 220-42(G), Roof Design 1(b) which states shall include eaves which are at least 18” in width. Ok. The first one, whether an undesirable change will be produced in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties will be created by granting of the Architectural Standards waiver and the applicant’s response is: There will not be an undesirable change to the character of the neighborhood or detriment to the nearby properties by the granting of the requested waiver. The waiver is minimal in nature and measures have been taken to mitigate its impact to the surrounding neighborhood through the use of material choices, color choices and architectural details. I agree with that.

Dan Wolfield: I agree.

Dean Howland: I agree.

Walt Adams: I agree.

Carol Sullivan: Two. Whether the benefit sought by the applicant can be achieved by some other method, feasible for the applicant to pursue, other than an Architectural Standards waiver. And the applicant’s response is: The benefit cannot be achieved by other feasible methods other than Architectural Waivers. The steel framed structure is prefabricated, and the eaves are part of the structural roof members. The deluxe eave and rake trims give this facility an enhanced architectural appeal. The standing seam roof system on this facility has a floating concealed clip designed to enable the roof system to expand and contract in our diverse environmental climates. The eave design is integral part to the overall roof system. I agree with that.

Walt Adams: I agree.

Dan Wolfield: I agree.

Dean Howland: I agree.

Dan Wolfield: Can you just comment a little bit on how that works? (inaudible) There’s no way to add an eave, I guess cause I don’t know if we’ve addressed this?

Tim Barber: There’s a concealed slide clip, it’s a (inaudible) roof system, so the clip is a two-part system so it’ll enable the roof to expand and contract up to an inch with the different, you know, climate changes.

Dan Wolfield: Ok.

Tim Barber: It does, it does grow and shrink so it'll be an intricate part of that whole structure.

Dan Wolfield: Alright, and there's no feasible way to add an eave. You can't add another ledger board or anything else to the outside without that in effect falling off due to the expansion?

Tim Barber: Or it'll push against that.

Dan Wolfield: And break?

Tim Barber: And render the pulling system useless.

Dan Wolfield: Ok. I think that answers my question.

Carol Sullivan: Ok. Three, whether the requested Architectural Standards waiver is substantial and the applicant's response is: The waiver requested from the Architectural Standards is not substantial, it's (10 ¾") due to the scale and height of the building, the difference will not be significantly perceptible.

Dan Wolfield: Can I ask what is 10 ¾"?

Devin Dickinson: That's the relief we are requesting from the 18".

Dan Barusch: So, you're saying that?

Carol Sullivan: 18" is required.

Tim Barber: The eave is 7 ¼". The engineering eave system on this facility is 7 ¼" out.

Devin Dickinson: Sticking out from the.

Tim Barber: From the steel line.

Carol Sullivan: The eave is 7 ¼" which the, our Code is requiring 18".

Devin Dickinson: Correct.

Carol Sullivan: So, you're asking for relief of 10 ¾"?

Tim Barber: That's correct.

Dan Wolfield: So that white trim around the top of the building sticks at about that far?

Tim Barber: Yes.

Dan Wolfield: About 7, 7 ¾" that sticks out? So, it does stick out?

Tim Barber: It does stick out.

Dan Wolfield: It's odd looking in the picture.

Tim Barber: Yeah, the rendering doesn't, doesn't do that part justice.

(inaudible)

Dan Wolfield: So, it does. Any of the roof water, as we were talking about earlier that is not going to.

(inaudible)

Dan Wolfield: Ok, yes, so it does clear the building?

Tim Barber: Yup.

Dan Wolfield: Ok, excellent thank you. So, yes, I agree.

Carol Sullivan: Ok. Four, whether the proposed Architectural Standards waiver will have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district and the applicant's response to that is: The Architectural Waiver requested will not have an adverse physical or environmental impact on the neighborhood. The design allows for proper drainage and stormwater management controls eliminating environmental impacts and I agree with that.

Dan Wolfield: I agree.

Dean Howland: I agree.

Walt Adams: I agree.

Carol Sullivan: And five is the, whether the alleged difficulty was self-created and it's pretty much the same answer that we've seen previously.

Dean Howland: Agreed.

Dan Wolfield: Agreed.

Walt Adams: Agreed.

Carol Sullivan: Ok. So again, we are in agreement with the applicant's waiver responses for waiving the 18" eave requirement, the eave will be 7 1/4" with relief of 10 3/4" so we will use these responses and I know we asked some questions but there wasn't anything additional to make changes to these responses. So, I'll make a motion to waive the 18" eave requirement as required by 220-42(G) Roof Design 1(b). I need a second.

Walt Adams: I'll second.

Carol Sullivan: Walt seconded it. Dean?

Dean Howland: Aye.

Carol Sullivan: Dan?

Dan Wolfield: Aye.

Walt Adams: Aye.

Carol Sullivan: Aye. Motion carried.

2nd MOTION: Walt Adams

Carol Sullivan	Dan Wolfeld	Dean Howland	Walt Adams
AYE	AYE	AYE	AYE

Aye = 4 Nay = 0 Motion carried

Carol Sullivan: Ok. Onto the SEQR.

Dan Barusch: Everyone still have the Part I from several months ago?

(inaudible)

Carol Sullivan: So, again for purposes of the SEQR review, as Dan discussed earlier, we will review this looking at both parcels. So, it will be the Shoreline Boat Sales parcel and the laundromat parcel. For SEQR only.

(Inaudible)

Carol Sullivan: Are we ready guys?

Dean Howland: Yes.

Carol Sullivan: Ok. I'll just read through the Part I answers that have been provided by the applicant and then we will go through the Part II Impact assessment. Does the proposed action only involve the legislative adoption of a plan, local law, ordinance, administrative rule, or regulation? The answer to that is no and I believe is correct. I'm just going to read through these. If anyone has a comment just shout out. Just for the people who don't have copies or can't locate them. Does the proposed action require a permit, approval or funding from any other government Agency? The answer is yes and the response is Warren County Building Codes and the Lake George Park Commission. Total acreages of the site, of the proposed action, total acreage to be physically disturbed, oh so the total acreage is 1.11 acres. The total acreage to be physically disturbed is .34 acres. Total acreage owned or controlled by the applicant or project sponsor is 4.8 acres and is that 4.8 include the laundromat?

Dan Barusch: That's a continuous 4.8 acres.

Devin Dickinson: Yes. Correct.

Carol Sullivan: Ok. So, the land uses are checked as Urban, Commercial, and Residential. Is the proposed action a permitted use under the zoning regulations? Yes.

Consistent with the adopted comprehensive plan? Yes.

Is the proposed action consistent with the predominant character of the existing built or natural landscape? Yes.

Is the site of the proposed action located in, or does it adjoin, a state listed Critical Environmental Area? No.

Will the proposed action result in a substantial increase in traffic above the present levels? No.

Are public transportation services available at or near the site of the proposed action? Yes. That's the trolley.

Are any pedestrian accommodations or bicycle routes available on or near the site of the proposed action? Yes.

Does the proposed action meet or exceed the state energy code requirements? Yes.

Will the proposed action connect to an existing public/private water supply? No.

Will the proposed action connect to existing wastewater utilities? No.

Does the site contain a structure that is listed on either State or National Register of Historic Places? No.

Is the proposed action located in an archeological sensitive area? No.

Does any portion of the site of the proposed action, or lands adjoining the proposed action, contain wetlands or other waterbodies regulated by a federal, state or local agency? Yes.

Would the proposed action physically alter, or encroach into, any existing wetland or waterbody? No.

Identify the typical habitat types. Urban and Suburban.

Does the site of the proposed action contain any species of animal, or associated habitats, listed by the State or Federal government as threatened or endangered? No.

Is the project site located in the 100-year flood plan? No.

Will the proposed action create storm water discharge, either from point or non-point sources? No.

Does the proposed action include construction or other activities that would result in the impoundment of water or other liquids? No.

Has the site of the proposed action or an adjoining property been the location of an active or closed solid waste management facility? No.

Has the site of the proposed action or an adjoining property been the subject of remediation, ongoing or completed for hazardous waste? No. So, those are the applicant's answers to the Part I and now this Board will go through Part II and provide answers and again, I will read through them.

Dan Barusch: And make sure when you're coming up with your answer, you're taking into context of the whole picture, inclusive of the outdoor boat storage next door. So, if you can, try and find that map that we had given to us, I don't remember which month, but that also shows the outdoor storage next door.

(inaudible)

Carol Sullivan: Do we have any more Part II's?

Dan Barusch: I have one that I'm going to fill out as we go along.

Carol Sullivan: That will work.

Dan Barusch: Does anyone have one?

Carol Sullivan: Yeah, we do. (inaudible)

Dan Barusch: Yeah, if just one person does the questions and everybody makes sure you say something to make up the answer.

Carol Sullivan: Ok. So, one. Will the proposed action create a material conflict with an adopted land use plan or zoning regulations? I say no.

Walt Adams: No.

Carol Sullivan: No. Dan?

Dan Wolfield: No, what's the question? (inaudible)

Carol Sullivan: You don't have one either?

Dean Howland: No, I have all the parts but that.

(inaudible)

Dean Howland: That's ok. You read it.

Carol Sullivan: Ok.

(inaudible)

Carol Sullivan: Ok. Will the proposed action create a material conflict with an adopted land use plan or zoning regulation? No.

Dean Howland: No.

Dan Wolfield: No.

Walt Adams: No.

Carol Sullivan: Ok. Four members all saying no. Will the proposed action result in a change in the use or intensity of use of land? Now remember, we're looking at the entire project.

Dean Howland: It's still boat storage right?

Carol Sullivan: Right. And again, under Village (inaudible). And in the Village Code, we're not charged with the intensity of the boat storage. It's still boat storage and the Lake George Park Commission is looking at the, how many boats you can have there, so I would say the answer is no.

Walt Adams: Agree.

Dean Howland: I would agree.

Dan Wolfield: I would say minimal at the most.

Carol Sullivan: Ok.

Dan Wolfield: So, it would fall under the no.

Carol Sullivan: Ok. So, four no's. Well three no's and one minimal. Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of the existing community?

Walt Adams: No.

Carol Sullivan: No.

Dan Wolfield: No.

Dean Howland: No.

Carol Sullivan: Four no's. Will the proposed action have an impact on the environmental characteristics that caused the establishment of a (CEA) Critical Environmental Area?

Walt Adams: No.

Dan Wolfield: No.

Carol Sullivan: No.

Dean Howland: No.

Carol Sullivan: Four no's. Will the proposed action result in an adverse change in the existing level of traffic or affect existing infrastructure for mass transit, biking or walkway? No.

Walt Adams: No.

Dan Wolfield: No.

Dean Howland: No.

Carol Sullivan: Four no's. Will the proposed action cause an increase in the use of energy and it fails to incorporate reasonably available energy conservation or renewable energy opportunities? No.

Walt Adams: No.

Dan Wolfield: No.

Dean Howland: No.

Carol Sullivan: Four no's. Will the proposed action impact a: existing public/private water supplies? No.

Walt Adams: No.

Dan Wolfield: No.

Dean Howland: No.

Carol Sullivan: b: public/private wastewater treatment utilities? No.

Walt Adams: No.

Dan Wolfield: No.

Dean Howland: No.

Carol Sullivan: So, four no's each for 7a and b. Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of important historic, archaeological, architectural or aesthetic resources? No.

Dan Wolfield: No.

Dean Howland: No.

Walt Adams: No.

Carol Sullivan: Ok. Four no's for eight. Will the proposed action result in an adverse change to natural resources, in other words, wetlands, waterbodies, groundwater, air quality, flora and fauna? No.

Dan Wolfield: No.

Dean Howland: No.

Walt Adams: No.

Carol Sullivan: Four no's. Will the proposed action result in an increase in the potential for erosion, flooding or drainage problems? No.

Dan Wolfield: No.

Dean Howland: No.

Walt Adams: No.

Carol Sullivan: Four no's. Will the proposed action create a hazard to environmental resources or human health?

Dean Howland: No.

Dan Wolfield: No.

Walt Adams: No.

Carol Sullivan: Four no's.

Carol Sullivan: So that is the SEQRA. Need a motion to pass the neg dec. A neg declaration on the SEQRA.

Dan Wolfield: Ok. I'll make a motion to, that the SEQRA review for the project for the boat storage building is a negative declaration.

Carol Sullivan: I'll second that.

Dan Barusch: I would maybe put a sentence in there about why. Usually, I write in for Part III, because all the answers were x, this is what lead us to our determination.

Dan Wolfield: Ok. I'll make a motion to declare a negative declaration for the boat storage building as reviewed for the Short Environmental Assessment Form with no or minimal impacts for any of the questions asked.

Carol Sullivan: I'll second that. Dean?

Dean Howland: Aye.

Walt Adams: Aye

Carol Sullivan: Four Aye's. Motion carried. SEQRA is approved.

2nd MOTION: Carol Sullivan.

Carol Sullivan	Dan Wolfield	Dean Howland	Walt Adams
AYE	AYE	AYE	AYE

Aye = 4 Nay = 0 Motion carried

Carol Sullivan: So last but not least, we need a motion to approve the Site Plan review, the project, the building, etc.

Dan Barusch: Any other last minute, pressing questions, concerns?

Walt Adams: Looking at the overall project to see it as a relatively quiet industry for boat storage which is positive to the neighborhood. Also, there was talks about the view in the neighborhood and looking at the view (inaudible) fairly neutral certainly any trees that could be growing up could certainly grow as high as that so that long distance views would be equally apart of the blocking of the views. I didn't see that as something that was important but most interesting was the, I thought, less plastic waste was quite significant as well as during the public hearings that a majority of the neighbors that live there, that would be most impacted by it, were relatively positive of the changes so that was an interesting aspect of the project.

Carol Sullivan: Thanks Walt. Anyone else?

Dan Wolfield: No, I agree with Walt. That was well said.

Carol Sullivan: Yes. It very well said. Ok, motion?

(inaudible)

Dan Wolfield: Ok. We're good to do a motion for the building right?

Carol Sullivan: For the building.

(inaudible)

Dan Wolfield: We're not doing the sign at this point.

(inaudible)

Carol Sullivan: This motion is to approve the building as it was presented with the final changes that were made.

Dan Wolfield: Ok. Alright, I will make a motion to approve the boat storage building at 21 Sewell Street, as presented with the last final changes that we've discussed and reviewed, with the landscape plan, with the changes for the evergreen trees and adding a tree on the south side, as we discussed, with the drainage that's being worked on and its current drainage plan, with the building colors that have been presented, with the lower blue and the white and the tan or greyish color on the upper portion, with the windows as presented as well, and all the current landscaping. Did I miss anything? Also, with the current lighting that is also planned and has been discussed around the perimeter of the building as well.

Carol Sullivan: And just for clarification that the tan is "light stone".

Dan Wolfield: The tan color, so the, the colors, the tan color around the perimeter of the upper portion of the building will be "light stone." The blue is considered an Aztek blue in a metal siding color and then we have the white color, the white trim as presented.

Dean Howland: And we have the reddish, is that stain?

Dan Wolfield: Is it a brown siding? Tim, what's the brown?

Tim Barber: It's (inaudible).

Dean Howland: What's the name of it?

Tim Barber: "Red cedar".

Dan Wolfield: With "red cedar" shake around the perimeter as well, adjoining the tan on the upper portion of the building.

Carol Sullivan: I'll second that. Dean?

Dean Howland: I'm good. Aye.

Dan Wolfield: Aye.

Walt Adams: Aye.

Carol Sullivan: Four ayes, motion is carried. Your building is approved.

2nd MOTION: Carol Sullivan.

Carol Sullivan	Dan Wolfield	Dean Howland	Walt Adams
AYE	AYE	AYE	AYE

Aye = 4 Nay = 0 Motion carried

Dennis Quirk: Thank you.

TAX MAP: 264.06-2-5

APPLICANT: JAMES D. QUIRK

ADDRESS: 21 SEWELL STREET

ZONE: COMMERCIAL MIXED USE

APPLICATION: SIGN APPLICATION #1855

Applicant is proposing a wall sign that will be mounted to the side of the building, 25 square feet in size. Lettering made of white, one-inch PVC. Background will be the wall color. Sign will be illuminated by three gooseneck lights, mounted above the sign.

Carol Sullivan: So, now we have the sign. We've seen this at the last meeting. Do you have the sign application out? Is there any additional comments that we haven't discussed at the previous meetings? Alright, so everyone is happy with the sign? I'll make a motion.

Dan Wolfield: I'll make a motion to approve the sign as presented at 21 Sewell Street with the Shoreline Boat Sales Services Storage letters to be a white one-inch thick PVC white lettering, placed as presented below that 15' line with the three lights above it.

Carol Sullivan: I'll second that.

Dan Barusch: And this one would have the condition to make them come into a conforming scenario with the other wall signs.

Carol Sullivan: Right.

Dan Barusch: Remember, we discussed that.

Dean Howland: That's on the other building?

Dan Barusch: That's on the other building, but an approval of this additional sign would put them over the limits so we have to knock, knock one down. How many is on the existing building, two?

Carol Sullivan: Two.

Dan Barusch: Two. Ok, and he has a freestanding.

Carol Sullivan: Well, he can have a freestanding.

Dan Barusch: He can keep the freestanding and the other two wall signs have to come down off the building.

Dan Wolfield: Ok, so as part of this motion with the approval of this sign, the two other wall signs that are on the adjacent building property need to come down and the freestanding sign can stay as is.

Carol Sullivan: I'll second that. Dean?

Dean Howland: Aye.

Dan Wolfield: Aye.

Walt Adams: Aye.

Carol Sullivan: Four ayes, motion is carried. Your sign is approved.

2nd MOTION: Carol Sullivan.

Carol Sullivan	Dan Wolfield	Dean Howland	Walt Adams
AYE	AYE	AYE	AYE

Aye = 4 Nay = 0 Motion carried

Dennis Quirk: Thank you all.

Devin Dickinson: Have a good night.

Carol Sullivan: Thank you guys for all work.

Tim Barber: Thank you. Have a great night.

(inaudible)

Carol Sullivan: Ok, so we have minutes to approve. We have the December minutes and the November minutes. Has everyone got through the November minutes? The November minutes and the December minutes, if everyone has gotten through the December minutes. Are we ready for approval of the November minutes? Ok, as previously stated in the last meeting, I provided Stephanie with my corrections via email. Anyone else with any other changes for November?

Walt Adams: No other corrections.

Carol Sullivan: Ok, I make a motion to approve the November 28, 2018 minutes as presented, with the changes that I had recently provided in a previous email. Second?

Dean Howland: I'll second that.

Carol Sullivan: Aye.

Dan Wolfield: Aye.

Walt Adams: Aye.

Carol Sullivan: All in favor, motion carried.

2nd MOTION: Dean Howland

Carol Sullivan	Dan Wolfeld	Dean Howland	Walt Adams
AYE	AYE	AYE	AYE

Aye = 4 Nay = 0 Motion carried

Carol Sullivan: Ok, December minutes. Did everyone have the opportunity to read through them? Changes?

(inaudible)

Dean Howland: I could not open them.

Carol Sullivan: Alright.

Walt Adams: I did not see anything.

Dean Howland: Stephanie, you send those out with Word right? (inaudible)

Dan Barusch: Sometimes Microsoft downloads oddly from cellphones.

Dean Howland: Well, ok, yeah but I mean I tried. I got it open and I couldn't open it when I downloaded it.

Stephanie Fregoe: Do you want this, my copy?

Dan Wolfeld: Can you possibly save them as a PDF next time and send them that way? That also prevents us from accidentally (inaudible)

Stephanie Fregoe: I can do that and they're on the website too.

Dan Wolfeld: Ok.

Dean Howland: Oh, they're on the website?

Stephanie Fregoe: Always, I always put the draft up.

Dean Howland: Where do you find that on the website?

Stephanie Fregoe: You go to right to planning and zoning and then you can click on minutes.

(inaudible)

Carol Sullivan: Ok, any changes anyone? Ok. I just have a couple, page 12. Five down Dennis Quirk, I think there is an "a" missing so I have a permit. These are all minor stuff. Would you prefer me to send them to you in an email?

Stephanie Fregoe: If you want to and I found some after I sent them out, and Deb always reads these over, so she found a lot of it, just like a comma here.

Carol Sullivan: Right. Ok.

Stephanie Fregoe: You know, minimal.

Carol Sullivan: I'll do that. They're just minor, you know, it's nothing, it's just like words missing so I'll send you an email tomorrow.

Stephanie Fregoe: Ok. And a lot of them we may have already found.

Carol Sullivan: But based on the context of it, I think it's fine. Ok. I'll make a motion to approve the December 19th, 2018 minutes as presented with additional changes, possibly coming from me, which I will email to Stephanie tomorrow.

Walt Adams: Second that.

Dean Howland: Aye.

Dan Wolfield: Aye.

Carol Sullivan: Four ayes, motion carried. Ok.

2nd MOTION: Walt Adams

Carol Sullivan	Dan Wolfield	Dean Howland	Walt Adams
AYE	AYE	AYE	AYE

Aye = 4 Nay = 0 Motion carried

Carol Sullivan: Anything else that anyone wants to discuss? Somebody make a motion to adjourn?

Dan Wolfield: I'll make a motion to adjourn.

Carol Sullivan: I'll second that.

Walt Adams: Aye.

Dean Howland: Aye.

Dan Wolfield: Aye.

Carol Sullivan: The meeting is adjourned.

2nd MOTION: Carol Sullivan

Carol Sullivan	Dan Wolfield	Dean Howland	Walt Adams
AYE	AYE	AYE	AYE

Aye = 4 Nay = 0 Motion carried

The meeting was adjourned at 7:45pm.