

MINUTES of the Village of Montgomery Planning Board meeting held in the Conference Room of the Village Hall, Clinton Street, on Wednesday, November 30, 2016, at 7:30 pm.

ATTENDANCE: Chrm. Conero, Mbr. Weeden, Mbr. Crowley, Mbr. Steed, Atty. Kevin Dowd, Eng. Dawn Kalisky of Lanc & Tully, Maria Beltrametti, Ross Winglovitz, Darren Doce, Joe Catalano, Skip Chambers, Sharon Stevens, Becky Pierson, Alex Pierson, Anthony Tether

OPEN: Chrm. Conero opened the meeting with the Pledge of Allegiance.

PUBLIC HEARING

**RE: MILLS / SAGER KNAPP SUBDIVISION 65 Prospect 207-1-22.22 &
43 Valley Avenue 207-1-22.28**

A MOTION was made to **OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING** by Mbr. Weeden and seconded by Chrm. Conero and carried 4 Ayes 0 Nays.

Darren Doce introduced himself as the engineer for the applicant; they are proposing a 4 lot subdivision of a 3 acre parcel. It falls between Valley Avenue and Robert Street. The lots will range in size from ½ acre and ¾ acre lots; well above a minimum of ¼ acre. Each lot will have an individual connection to Village water/sewer lines. As part of the application, the proposal is a lot line change with land of Andrew Sager. We're adding 9,000 sq. ft. to his parcel. Two lots have frontage on Valley, two lots have frontage on Robert Street. That's the proposal.

Atty. Dowd said there's also a lot line change involving Knapp. Mr. Doce said, yes, a minor lot line change to get the frontage required for the two lots on Valley Avenue.

Chrm. Conero said the last engineering report we had was from the 17th and it talked about the drainage easement. Can you explain a little about that?

Ms. Kalisky said number 1 is the proposed 15 ft. wide drainage easement along the rear of the property along the post office-the rear of lots 1 & 2. It shows it on the plan as requested but we'll need a description of that, that it is a private easement in favor of tax lot 26, Mills. But that will need to be filed with the County; we'll need the description and easement for review. Comment #2 for the Lands of Mills, is supposed to be in favor of the Village of Montgomery, and Darren has in fact revised the plan to show that, once it's resolved, we'll need a copy of the proposed easement and description that will also have to be filed with the County. There's an issue with that drainage run. It's to be dedicated...they did provide the stipulation agreement that said to give an easement for that, which was never filed. We've been doing a lot of research on this. It appears that the drainage was not installed by the Village of Montgomery. Not a Village of Montgomery project. Mr. Doce said he was told that the materials were supplied by the Village but Mills put it in, possibly by the direction of Bruce. Ms. Kalisky said the issue that they have, aside from the pipe sizing which we aren't thrilled about, is the drainage run actually goes onto the Lands of Chambers, to a catch basin on Chambers property and then back through, which will be Lands of Sager with the lot line change. Mr. Doce said, pointing to the site plan, a catch basin was put here and it crossed over to Chambers with a catch basin and then back onto Mills to the stream. Ms. Kalisky said that drainage needs to be relocated back onto the Lands of will be Sager and the Chambers property restored accordingly. This was discussed with the DPW Super and Mr. Chambers. Mr. Doce said Mills family is aware of this and that it had to be relocated. Chrm. Conero said you are realigning the drainage on the easement area between those two lots? Mr. Doce said this catch basin and the runs between that catch basin and the stream would have to be

moved. Chrm. Conero said then the easement would be maintained by the Village of Montgomery? Atty. Dowd, Ms. Kalisky and Mr. Doce said it is private right now, but it drains Valley Avenue. Ms. Kalisky said a revised plan has to be in writing or you can take it from the minutes, here, that that relocation; setting a new catch basin, removing the old basin or do you even need a basin? How long is the run? Chrm. Conero questioned the first easement in back of the post office. Mr. Doce said that Mr. Mills had a catch basin in his driveway and he ran it down through his property to the stream. We're going to leave that there. Ms. Kalisky said that is a private easement and if there are any backups/flooding on proposed lot 1, they will have to take it up with Mills. Chrm. Conero thanked Ms. Kalisky for the clarification.

Atty. Dowd said he spoke with Mr. Yancewicz and was told that when the line was put in, that Mr. Yancewicz would run the line on his property but that the actual catch basin was supposed to be on Mills property. Mr. Yancewicz stated that he had a survey that he followed his survey but Mr. Mills did not have a survey, that, he believed he knew where his line was. Mr. Doce said it's all on Mills except for that's on Chambers. Atty. Dowd said yes, but the ultimate catch basin ended up on Chambers, possibly inadvertently. Chrm. Conero asked if there were any questions.

The Chrm. opened the public portion of the public hearing; he asked for names and addresses to be stated and they would hear their comments.

Sharon Stevens – 227 Robert Street

Reading from a prepared letter; a copy was given to Deputy Clerk Murphy.

My backyard and the side of my property share Mr. Mill's property. I've been in and out of that property since 1975. My parents bought the 227 Robert Street house and then I bought it from them in 2001. The property is extremely wet. It has been since the time my parents bought the property. The OC Soil Survey, a copy of which I'm enclosing, calls for a CA, which is a Canandaigua soil on the entire site. The OC Soil Survey booklet lists this soil as extremely wet, severe and poor in all categories, as Building Site Development, Construction Materials, Sanitary Facilities and Water Management. The category Engineering Properties and Classifications lists the soils as silt loam and clay loam to 35 inches, with loamy fine sand to 60 inches.

I checked the wetlands mapper on the NYS DEC and the US Fish and Wildlife web sites, and they don't have any wetlands listed but once upon a time, somewhere between 75 and, the tail-end of 80, that was a protected wetland, at one point in time. That was all overgrown, wooded area. Once that ended, Mr. Mills cleared that land. He put a drain along the property, which caused flooding into our backyard. John Noorlander was on the Board at this time and it was brought to his attention and the drain was supposedly filled in. I believe that the Planning Board can ask the applicant to have federal wetlands inspector visit the site and provide documentation stating that there are no federal wetlands actually on this property or have the wetlands flagged and located and shown on the mapping. This may impact the proposed building and driveway locations and the area of disturbance proposed on the mapping. I would think that OC Soils survey is stating that there are extreme soils on the site, it would be prudent.

I would also ask that a drainage study be performed on the property, which, obviously you've been doing. The entire property drains along the existing streams along the back of my property, under Goodwill Road through a culvert, and out past the Waterwheel Apartments property. The Village has added several catch basins along Boyd Street that dump on that property, and the Army Corp. of Engineers used to dredge the existing stream of that culvert, which hasn't been done in over 15 years. The back of my property, along with Chambers property on the other side of the stream, constantly floods and I would like to know if the culvert crossing under Goodwill

Road is large enough to accommodate the increase in drainage. Which it sounds like you are dealing with, as well.

Also, the Creamery Pond is held by an earthen dam with a concrete spillway draining to the existing stream. This pond was created by the owners of the creamery and that was in business over 80 years ago. Has this been checked to see if the dam or spillway needs repair or has been inspected? If either gives way, then the entire Creamery Pond will drain across Mills property to the existing culvert under Goodwill Road.

Lastly, the proposed subdivision mapping shows my existing driveway cutting across the corner of the Mills property. This driveway has been there since my parents owned the property. Since the driveway has been there for over 7 years, there is now a prescriptive easement over that portion of the property. Since this part of the property does not affect the proposed driveway location or the lot area, I was wondering if the applicant could either give me a fee title for the part of the property that the driveway is on, or at the very least a written easement over that portion. I believe the Planning Board can ask the applicant to fix this matter, thereby eliminating any cloud of title on the new proposed lot.

Thank you for listening and I hope this helps in your review process.

Chrm. Conero thanked Ms. Stevens.

Becky Pierson – 225 Goodwill Road

I am representing my son on Goodwill Road. In your comprehensive plan from 2008, it talked about your implementing plan for about the soils and it talks about, when Mrs. Stevens talked about the soil, that wasn't working...let me read it to you.

Chrm. Conero asked, this is in the Village of Montgomery? Comprehensive Plan?

Ms. Pierson said yes, it was difficult to find the Comprehensive Plan, I had to dig for that. I found it under the Orange County...you don't have it on your website.

Chrm. Conero said it's on the website. Deputy Clerk Murphy confirmed that they were.

Ms. Pierson said this one I have seen from 2007-2008. Is there a newer one?

Chrm. Conero responded with yes.

Ms. Pierson said ok. It talks about restricted development on slopes, I don't know if that's a concern here. Protect water resources by providing wetland buffers, I don't know if you've talked about buffers. Lands between people's properties...100 ft. it says in there. And limited development within areas that contain hydraulic soils that are prone to seasonal high water tables and ponding. That is section 5.4 and that in 2007 was an immediate priority so I don't know whether you need to change your Comprehensive Plan or whether you're in line within your Comprehensive Plan, but that is from your Comprehensive Plan.

I did read the minutes from the last meeting, as well, and it talked about Mr. Dowd talking about the dam and Ms. Stevens brought that up, thank you for bringing that up. There is a concern about that because I don't think you know that there if there are concerns about the dam and no one seems to have that answer-who's inspecting it, who works with it, who's in control of that. So

that might be something you look out before you make any final determination. Also, storm water runoff, I read in the minutes, also about hooking into the sewer line, the storm water runoff for regulations, you cannot run your water into your sewer line, so you do have to have a catch basin. And whether you can take a catch basin and run it into a stream, I'm not sure about that, I'm not an engineer, but it's something to think about. That's coming from the minutes from the last meeting. And Ms. Kalisky also talked about she doesn't the drainage, so I'm glad we're talking about that again. My son is here and he does have pictures just from tonight's raining so you can see what his backyard looks like.

Alex Pierson – 225 Goodwill Road

My main concern is the water and I'm wondering if there are any provisions for storm water runoff from the four new houses for quantity and quality? I did take pictures, just tonight, of the field behind my house, which, I believe is Chambers. This was just from 2 days of rain. So if we add four more houses...(he shows them pictures) The stream runs along here, the side of the picture...these lights are actually the post office, the stream runs along here, this is about 8 inches deep and about 20 feet wide, 10 feet long.

Chrm. Conero said the elevation and the contours would prohibit the ponding and runoff into the stream. I mean, the way that the map is designed.

Ms. Kalisky said the houses are going to be elevated up a bit; anything running down is actually going to go around the houses and divert down into the stream.

Mr. Pierson said that is the stream without the houses there. And like I said, we haven't had rain in, how long? And that's just two days of rain.

Mr. Kalisky questioned, that stream runs behind your house? All the way down?

Mr. Pierson said yes.

Anthony Tether - 219 Goodwill Road, I'll second that, I'm his neighbor and I'm in a border-line flood zone; I'm right next to that little creek. It floods all the time when there's excessive rain, so it's a concern of mine, also.

Ms. Stevens asked, are these houses going on slabs or basements?

Mr. Doce said they will be raised ranches, the two on Robert, so they will be similar to what's existing on Robert Street. Plus, they're going to bring in 3-4 feet of fill to raise them up above the stream.

Ms. Stevens asked if it was going to flood her property.

Mr. Doce said it should drain out-north westward, the stream.

Ms. Stevens said, I have a question about that because in 2003, we originally dug on our property to put in in-ground swimming pool. We dug in a place where we had initially wanted that pool, when I got to 4 ft., the excavator had 2 ft. of water, when it went down 7 ft., there was 4 ft. of water and we had to close the site with 2 trucks of item 4 and another 2 trucks of dirt. And then I went and saw Bruce and he showed me all the water tables in that area so we were able to move

our pool to a different location on the property, but that was all along our property line where it butts up again to Mills property.

Chrm. Conero asked, does anyone else have comments? I think we'd be wise to leave this public portion of this open for another month to iron out some of these issues. I take it very seriously about having run-off from a house. When you build a house, you excavate a piece of property and it runs off in someone else's...it happened before, in our Village, in two other subdivisions. A neighbor of mine, every time it rains, his entire back yard's flooded. It's ridiculous. So I like to be certain that the run-off is going to work, the drainage is going to work. That the culvert that goes under Goodwill Road is going to be able to handle the run-off that you will have. In respects to the dam, the dam isn't their responsibility, the dam is part of the homeowners association that owns the dam?

Atty. Dowd said I don't think so. I know that...

Chrm. Conero said we don't own it, the Village doesn't own it, right?

Atty. Dowd said I believe that it's the property owner who is responsible for the dam. The DEC has disavowed any authority over that dam and any regulation of that dam.

Mr. Doce said that according to them, it's not a dam, it's a levy and it does not fall under their inspection requirements.

Chrm. Conero said, again, it's out of this subdivision's responsibility. You should probably bring it up to our Village Board, if you're concerned about that and see what can happen on that end. But that's not part of this plan. I would like to recommend that we leave the public part of this open for another month just to see that we have everything covered. I'm not aware of a lot of these things with the water and the drain and the pond in the backyards. That's the first time I've heard this.

A MOTION was made to **RECONVENE THE PUBLIC HEARING FOR MILLS/SAGER/KNAPP SUBDIVISION ON WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 28th at 7:30pm**, by Mbr. Steed and seconded by Mbr. Crowley and carried 4 Ayes 0 Nays.

Ms. Kalisky said everyone knows this is a low area, water flows downhill. The amount of disturbance does not warrant drainage calculations or swip. This is a residential that is less than 5 acres. It is not a designated federal or state wetland according to the mapping; if it's on the map, then we've got to confirm it, if it's not indicated on the property, there's nothing (inaudible). The amount of fill being brought in for the houses adjoining Robert Street, 1st floor elevation, the house is 365. There will be increased run-off to the stream. What magnitude? You're talking the small house footprints; the driveways, I assume will be paved. You will need to add a note, you will need sump pumps; they will not, cannot be discharged into the septic. This subdivision is in accordance with the Village Code. There are no designated wetlands. We know the area is wet; it's common knowledge. People do buy houses in low areas.

Chrm. Conero said but if there are ways that you can mitigate some of the run-off in this...just take one more look at it and make sure there's not something you can change to make this happen. I've seen this a lot of times, people come in, they put subdivisions in on their property, they put a house in and then their neighbors are flooded out. They we get calls asking why we let that happen. This is one of the first things I ask when we start doing this kind of thing. I just want

to be certain that there isn't something else we can do with the drainage that would help eliminate flooding/drainage problems on someone else's property.

Ms. Stevens said the majority of the land around them was farmland, so a lot of that excess moisture was absorbed by corn. When Tropical Storm Lee came through, I had 18 inches of water and I'm not in a flood zone. All ground water from up high where they built Lakeside Apartments and diverted it; it's not being absorbed by...

Chrm. Conero said the fourth Wednesday of December, we'll be back here.

Ms. Kalisky said to Darren, to revise the relocation of the drainage so that it's a little better. I don't think you would need another basin with the 220 ft. run; you can do it from the existing basin to the Sager property.

RE: RIVER STREET SUBDIVISION 208-1-24.1

Ross Winglovitz introduced himself as the engineer for the applicant. This is the remaining land from an initial subdivision done 2-3 years ago. The tax maps haven't been corrected to reflect the subdivision and he has called the County regarding it.

The proposal is a 2 lot subdivision; it's a 1.6 acre parcel. They considered a public road with a cul-de-sac and doing 4 lots, but the applicant feels this is better for the neighborhood, the 2 lots. The zone allows 8,000 sq. ft. lots. Lot one is 34,000 sq. ft., lot 2 is 37,000 and will require a variance for road frontage. They are proposing 20 ft. when 40 is required. Lot width, he's not sure how it's measured and may need a variance for lot width.

Atty. Dowd said it's measured at the building line but we have another provision about the 40 ft. of road frontage.

Mr. Winglovitz said they know about the frontage. Atty. Dowd asked, you don't have 40 ft.?

Joe Catalano, Attorney for the client, said they are asking for a referral so they can go before the Zoning Board of Appeals. Atty. Dowd asked if there was any way they could make the lot bigger and still have the 40 ft. Mr. Winglovitz said they could do it but it would drastically affect this lot (indicating on the site plan). It's a much better layout for planning perspective to have this as a much wider lot up front and provide the minimum needed to get that driveway in there. Chrm. Conero asked, but the minimum is 40, right? We just talked about this at the last one and he moved it to make the 40 ft. Mr. Winglovitz said that's why we're asking for a variance. Atty. Catalano said they would like to go with this plan if Zoning grants them a variance. Chrm. Conero said if they don't give a variance and you want to comply, what do you do? Atty. Catalano said the only way to comply is to push that out and get the full 40 ft. but that makes the other lot pretty narrow. Mr. Devitt said, at that point, they would just put in a private road and just subdivide it into 4 lots. They think this is less impact-we know we need a variance. But overall, provides a better project. Chrm. Conero said if you put the 4 lot subdivision in with a cul-de-sac then you would have 40 ft. out here and you'd have the lots around it. Atty. Catalano said that would be their case, as well, with the Zoning Board. It would be more beneficial to the surrounding area than not granting the variance. The only other way to put more than one lot in without the variance would be either to make a very narrow lot which would affect the size and esthetics of the home, but also to put a private road in and maximize the development. Chrm. Conero asked, the driveway for this proposed lot is...is that the driveway (indicating on the site plan). Mr. Winglovitz said yes. Mr. Catalano asked about the previous subdivision he was

discussing regarding the drainage issues. It is noted on the top of the map, the Village drainage is directly on the front area of this property-it travels north-eastward. We've talked to DPW about it and mentioned it to Kevin and we are go to see if the Village can resolve that issue to redirect it further down the street. Also, this parcel is owned by Devitt Family Trust, not Marc & Colleen Devitt.

Mr. Winglovitz noted that the property is actually 1.64 acres. Ms. Kalisky said where you have the base, annotation on lot 2 is 1.85. Mr. Winglovitz will correct it.

A MOTION was made to **REFER RIVER STREET SUBDIVISION 208-1-24.1 TO THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS FOR AN AREA VARIANCE**, by Mbr. Steed and seconded by Mbr. Weeden and carried 4 Ayes, 0 Nays.

RE: 232 WARD STREET SUBDIVISION/SEU/LOT LINE CHANGE 203-1-12.2

Atty. Dowd told the Planning Board that on Monday, November 2nd, the Zoning Board did grant them two variances; one was for the front-yard setback. That would be 37 ft.-street line from Patchett House down Ward Street, would be the same. They also gave a conditional variance for the side-line on the left side of the building. Right now, it's about 28 ft. off the line, but they are going to ask for a lot line change on the adjoining lot that would make it 27 ft. but it still requires 50 ft. under the SEU requirements so they gave them a 27 ft. variance condition upon this Board approving the lot line change on the other lot.

Mr. Winglovitz said, that lot line is here (indicates on the site plan), this existing lot is like this, and what we're doing is moving this lot over and this will be the new lot. Atty. Dowd said that would be 23 ft. from the side of the proposed building which requires 50, so they (ZBA) granted them the 27 ft. variance. He hadn't written up the decision yet. Mr. Catalano said the side lot setback is 20 ft. in this zone, but the SEU for schools and churches say 50 ft. from all boundary lines. That's why we included that with the ZBA.

Mr. Winglovitz said that's the lot line change (indicates on the site plan). With that lot line change, the new lot will be subdivided into two lots. The Wallkill River School and Ms. Claire's will be subdivided off the new lot; created just for this use.

Mr. Catalano said the reason why we wanted to create the separate lot for a variety of reasons but the new use, proposed, is a school that's going to be housed in a 2-story building. The new proposed lot will be maintained by Montgomery Group, and the lot will be leased out to the school operators. For our purposes and liability, we're just making sure that there's a distinction between the various uses on this corner. When he originally spoke with Mr. Dowd about this, they were talking about just including it on that lot with a lot line adjustment, but he's more comfortable drafting a lease and having it for liability purposes, so that it be separate from common uses.

Mr. Winglovitz said they would grant common use easements between the two properties with access and parking. Mr. Catalano said they are proposing the only access off of Factory Street. There will be no curb cut in the front at the proposed use. The reason why is it's better traffic-wise for Rt. 17K and the buses will be able to go into the parking lot area, turn around and drop the kids off and then go out. Traffic will not have to be stopped on 17K. Chrm. Conero asked, are they actually going to do that, though?

Mr. Devitt said the difference was, and that's what we specifically asked the school operators, that this is a County provided busing service, it's not the district (First Student said they refused to go into the parking lot), their preference is to have the buses in the parking lot to drop the kids off.

Chrm. Conero said the in and out is one way of that parking lot; there's a one way over by Ms. Claire's...Mr. Catalano said it's an entrance only. Mr. Winglovitz said here's the two-way entrance behind... Mr. Catalano said the exit is coming out onto Factory Street. We'll eliminate 4 parking spots here (indicating on site plan) and move them down. The parking totals will remain the same. That's why we made a modification in the site plan.

Mr. Catalano said the proposed building will be two stories and housing this one tenant. It's going to be maximum capacity of 80 children, 5 classrooms, a teacher with 2 teacher's assistants in each classroom. It's going to have an impressive staff. For the public hearing, we're hoping to have Cathy Wesloski, the exec director be here to do a presentation. It will be for 3-4 year olds, typical preschool based on the child's birthday, so 2-5 years old. Chrm. Conero said it's an early intervention program? Mr. Catalano said yes, the executive director, she specifically targeted the Village of Montgomery as the ideal location to serve multiple counties but the concentration of students appears to be within the surrounding area. It will be an integrated school so if there are spaces available, students who don't need special education or have an IEP, will be able to attend. Mr. Catalano asked Mbr. Crowley if the staffing was appropriate, as she operates a Special Ed School. She said yes. The other reason for the area variance, for the front yard setback, was to maintain the line of the Patchett House and that all of the parking was in the back. 42 spaces, 33 for the staff and 9 for visitors. They will be doing case evaluations throughout the year, by appointment, they will have visitors often. The reason why they moved the building to the left is they wanted to have a good size outdoor area, fenced in, that would be access from the side of the building. The children could go directly into that area from the building. The school operator said it would be used by one class at a time so they could manage the children. The front yard will not have any children at all.

Ms. Kalisky asked if they were removed the oak tree. Mr. Devitt said no, they could adjust the parking to keep it.

Ms. Kalisky said you're parking is proposed on the property line, which you cannot do, especially the rear one. Mr. Catalano was going to ask for a grading easement, or license from the property owner behind them. Mr. Winglovitz said he may be able to adjust by 3-4 feet to move that. Ms. Kalisky said you cannot put the fence on the property line. You may own it but you might sell it. Mr. Devitt said he can change it to 49 ft. Ms. Kalisky asked what the...going to the adjoining...Mr. Winglovitz said they could temporarily park that long-term. Mr. Devitt owns this piece (indicates on the site plan) and they were thinking of connectivity; to avoid any entrances on 17K; keep it together. Ms. Kalisky said if you look at the original Patchett House and the Carriage House, how that site has grown with the impervious, you're doing these little pieces just under an acre, if you're going to do that in a year, you're going to have to do a full swipp because you're going to be over an acre. If there's a future plan...

Mr. Devitt said he didn't have one yet. We'll get those parking spaces and deal with the adjacent lot whenever that happens. Ms. Kalisky said it's the way the laws are.

Atty. Dowd said you don't know what the other use would be so how do you know how much traffic?

Ms. Kalisky asked, with the lot line adjustment on the side, you can't give it two feet so that you're curb-line isn't on the property line? Marc may decide to sell the property. Mr. Winglovitz said yes, they can move it 3-4 feet to pull it down. It will increase the side lot.

Ms. Kalisky said there is nothing but asphalt in the back-no landscaping. Mr. Devitt said they may be able to put something in the islands.

Chrm. Conero asked about a barrier between the parking and play area. Similar to Ms. Claire's. Mr. Devitt said yes.

Atty. Dowd requested proposed directional signs for navigating in the parking lot. Mr. Catalano said they could do that. Ms. Kalisky said it will need to be included on the full site plans.

Mbr. Crowley asked why only one handicapped space. Mr. Devitt said they will ask the operator if more would be needed.

Chrm. Conero said you mentioned that this would need to be opened by July? Mr. Devitt said they would try. There's a lot to go through.

Chrm. Conero asked if the Board had any questions.

Mr. Winglovitz said they would need referrals to Orange County Planning and SHIPO.

A MOTION was made to **INTEND TO BECOME LEAD AGENCY** by Mbr. Steed and seconded by Chrm. Conero and carried 4 Ayes, 0 Nays.

Atty. Dowd asked Deputy Clerk Murphy to provide Mr. Devitt the new form from the County; a new form of ownership that has to be part of the Planning Board's complete packet when submitted to the County. Some towns changed their local laws; Atty. Dowd said it comes from Orange County Planning and not the Village. She gave to Mr. Winglovitz, Mr. Devitt and Mr. Catalano.

Chrm. Conero asked what they thought the building would look like. Mr. Devitt provided a picture of how he would like the proposed building to look; based on cost. If not brick, then hardy board. Ms. Kalisky asked if they really wanted chain link to go with the beautiful building. Laughter from all.

Ms. Kalisky reminded everyone that DOT needs to be notified because of the location on 17K.

Atty. Dowd asked where the utility lines would be located. Mr. Winglovitz said they would be overhead. Chrm. Conero asked where the run-off for all of this would go. Mr. Winglovitz said there is an existing 24" culvert that goes under the highway and connects to a 36" culvert that goes in front of the senior housing property across the street. It will be discharged down below the waterworks building.

A MOTION was made to **SCHEDULE A PUBLIC HEARING FOR 232 WARD STREET, LOT LINE CHANGE/SUBDIVISION/SEU, FOR WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 28, 2016, AT 7:45 pm**, by Chrm. Conero and seconded by Mbr. Steed and carried 4 Ayes 0 Nays.

RE: MINUTES

A **MOTION** was made to **ACCEPT THE MINUTES OF OCTOBER 26, 2016** by Mbr. Crowley and seconded by Mbr. Weeden and carried 4 Ayes 0 Nays.

RE: ADJOURNMENT:

A **MOTION** was made to **ADOURN THE MEETING AT 8:30 pm** by Mbr. Crowley and was seconded by Mbr. Weeden and carried 4 Ayes 0 Nays.

Tina Murphy
Deputy Village Clerk