

**Town of Bolton
PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES
Thursday, November 17, 2005
6:00 p.m.**

SEQR = State Environmental Quality Review
PB = (Town of Bolton) Planning Board
WCPB = Warren County Planning Board
APA = Adirondack Park Agency
LGPC = Lake George Park Commission
DEC = Department of Environmental Conservation

Present: Chairman Herb Koster, Sandi Aldrich, Henry Caldwell, John Gaddy, Chauncey Mason, Susan Wilson, Zoning Administrator Pam Kenyon, Town Counsel Michael Muller

Absent: Don Roessler

PUBLIC HEARING: None

H. Koster opened the regular meeting at 6:02 pm by asking for corrections to the Thursday, October 20, 2005 minutes.

Motion by S. Wilson to approve the October 20, 2005 minutes as presented. Seconded by J. Gaddy. **All in favor. Motion carried.**

REGULAR MEETING:

1) SPR05-38 MacEWAN, ROBERT & DEBORAH. Represented by Mark Rehm, Esq. Seek Type II Site Plan Review for a 4-unit townhouse complex. Section 171.15, Block 1, Lot 74, Zone GB5000. Property location: 22 Goodman Avenue, formerly known as Wilson's Laundry. Approved by WCPB with the comment that the applicant follow the guidelines of the Town regarding stormwater management. Subject to SEQR. *This item was tabled at the 9/22/05 meeting pending additional information.*

Robert MacEwan introduced Gary Hughes as the project designer and said he would discuss the changes to the plan.

Gary Hughes said that the roofline is designed the way it is, because splitting the units and moving certain sections forward would create another roofline which would force the rain behind the pulled out building creating a valley and several design problems. S. Aldrich asked if it is correct that the fire code requires a firewall between the individual units and that the firewall goes through the roof. Gary Hughes answered by saying that the fire code does require a firewall between the individual units, but does not require it to go through the roof and explained the requirements in further detail.

Gary Hughes said that (1) he proposed 6' high white vinyl privacy fences, (2) he looked at placing the property perpendicular and parallel to the road so when someone pulls their car in, the sidewalk will run parallel to Cross Street and Goodman Avenue which will allow cars to park there as opposed to cars jutting out into the sidewalk if the buildings were staggered and (3) he did not add windows on the side elevations because adding

windows limits furniture placement, so he proposes to add some high transient windows as shown on the plan.

H. Koster asked if it will be vinyl siding on the front of the structure and Gary Hughes responded by saying yes, he has vinyl siding proposed for the structure at this time. J. Gaddy said that (1) in the recent months the PB has been looking at possibilities of clustering individual structures on some larger properties and the PB's past experience with townhouse construction is that the overall effect of that style of architecture is the kind of thing they were really trying to get away from—where you have this long section of the same kind of architecture and (2) he would be interested in looking at some more detail that would break up some of the expanse along there.

Gary Hughes said that it is possible that the units could have four different looks. Robert MacEwan said that (1) he didn't think four different looks would fit in the Town of Bolton—it didn't appeal to him and he didn't like the aesthetics of it at all, (2) they want to design something like what they would live in and (3) even though they were different, they looked like they were rubber stamped to some degree. Gary Hughes agreed and said that it is a matter of opinion or taste.

S. Wilson asked about the possibility of using two different types of materials on the side elevations to break up the expanse and Robert MacEwan responded by saying (1) that is quite possible and (2) they are looking for something with character, which is why they are looking at several different color schemes. Gary Hughes said that there is a possibility of having a scallop or shingle in the gable and carry the overhang on the end. S. Wilson said that she would prefer to see a scallop edge.

H. Caldwell (1) said that he doesn't see how the zoning allows for four identical buildings going with the architectural review and (2) referenced Section 200-53 #1, as well as read it into the record. S. Wilson asked if the proposal is designed more for four separate structures and Gary Hughes said no, it is one structure. H. Caldwell asked if the PB is looking at four different buildings that are identical, because if they are then four identical buildings which the zoning doesn't allow for and H. Koster said yes, they would be four separate buildings that are attached.

H. Caldwell said that four different buildings cannot be identical and S. Wilson said that the PB is looking at one structure, which is separated by four for the purpose of ownership, but it is still one structure with a beginning and an end. H. Koster said he believes the term would be "attached housing".

Counsel said that (1) you definitely have one structure, but you are going to have four separate ownerships considered attached as H. Koster said, (2) the reason the project is before the PB is because everything the applicant needed in a way of variances is in place—the key one being 0' setback between owners in unit 1, 2, 3 and 4, in that they share a common wall, (3) he and P. Kenyon looked at this and determined that it is not a condominium, but it is a townhouse—which is more architectural than a legal concept, (4) he and P. Kenyon looked in the code to find out if a townhouse is allowed in the zone

and it is a word that is included within dwelling multiple or multiple family dwelling, so it does fit by definition, (5) if there was a fire in the building, they would say it was a complete structural fire if it burned through the whole building, but it is clearly four separate ownerships, it will—in the final analysis—have four separate tax map parcels, each of the units can be individually sold, each of the individual units will be separately insured, so it is a little of both which may explain some confusion and (6) he guarantees that there are four deeds there if it goes all the way through the process of approvals.

H. Caldwell asked if this can be done in looking at architectural review. Counsel said (1) that the whole process that the PB is here for as site plan review is to meet some common understanding—a meeting ground—as to what the PB wants to see the structure look like within reasonable expectations, (2) the PB found a section that says they would like to encourage something not so uniform—that there is some dissimilarity in the façade—so the answer is simply yes, the PB has the opportunity to work on this and get it in that direction, (3) in fairness to Atty. Rehm, who is not present, he presented conceptually to the ZBA that there will be some uniform expectation among the four separate owners as to how the exterior of the building is responsibly maintained and managed, (4) referenced the proposed homeowners association guidelines for the individual units submitted by Atty. Rehm and (5) said that the units will have a homeowners association that will have to address what the process will be when there is a major structural need to replace something, ex. siding, roof, windows, etc.

H. Koster asked if the PB has the authority to interpret Section 200-53 any way it wants and Counsel answered by saying (1) no, not any way the PB wants, (2) he would feel more comfortable if he honestly tells the PB that it is a paragraph that has a bit of force of law in it and a bit of wishful thinking, that is that if he were pressed on the point, he would have to admit that although it says that you (the PB) are going to do what it can to discourage excessive dissimilarity, there is a substantial lack of standards—no specification anywhere in the codes that says there shall be no vinyl siding for example—but the PB doesn't have standards in the codes so it certainly has to meet a meeting ground of understanding with the applicant, (3) they are revisiting where Counsel was a year ago saying he wished they could get some standards and have some policy and (4) the PB now has to find out what it and what the applicant can reasonably negotiate—the applicant wants approval and the PB wants dissimilarity.

Gary Hughes, Robert MacEwan and some PB members gave further suggestions as to breaking up the expanse of the structure, including door styles, windows, trims, gable ends, etc. S. Aldrich asked if it will be in the homeowners association that all of the units can't be the same in the future and Robert MacEwan answered by saying it can be, but he doesn't want too many restrictions put on or it would hinder selling the units. H. Koster said he feels it is subtle design changes like the ones suggested—not building staggering—that would accomplish the dissimilarity suggested by the PB.

J. Gaddy said that the Goodman Avenue side is not attractive and he thinks it leaves a lot to be desired in terms of design since it is very sparse, but he doesn't know what the options are, as he isn't a designer. Robert MacEwan said that increasing window size

would take away usable wall space. H. Koster said the project designer suggested changing the gable to break it up and S. Aldrich said the applicants are also suggesting a green area, which may make it more attractive with taller plantings.

H. Koster said that (1) the PB has been asked by the Town Board to architecturally review the project, (2) the applicants might not like the PB's suggestions, but the PB needs to go through this process, (3) he gets from the PB that they would like to see something a little different on each building just to break it up a little and (4) he personally cannot see telling the applicants to put in more windows, but he can see architecturally enhancing the side of the building without windows.

H. Caldwell (1) said that on the south side of the building the applicants are eliminating any chance of somebody seeing the sun on that unit and (2) made a couple of suggestions, one being to put windows on the second floor. H. Koster agreed by saying that there is an area to put a window over the stairs that wouldn't effect furniture placement. Gary Hughes said that is correct and asked if the PB is looking for symmetry of windows. H. Caldwell said the PB will leave that up to Gary Hughes since he is the designer.

S. Aldrich asked if the floor plan for units one and four are the same and Gary Hughes said yes. Gary Hughes added that while the units will have more brightness and sun than the NYS Code requires they will have further discussion on the possibility of additional window placement.

J. Gaddy asked if the applicant is prepared to offer space on the west side of Cross Street for sidewalks and Robert MacEwan said yes, he would be willing to consider doing that, but he would need Fred Ross' permission to do it on his property. H. Koster said (1) he doesn't think the PB can ask the applicant to put sidewalks on another person's property or even another parcel the applicant owns and (2) asked if it is fair to ask the applicant to put sidewalks across Cross Street on the other parcel he owns which houses a garage, which is a separate parcel from the parcel on the application. Counsel said no, he doesn't think that is fair and H. Koster said he agreed.

P. Kenyon said before the Town starts requesting sidewalks be put in, she feels the Town needs to be consistent in what it is looking for in regards to width, lighting, curbs, etc. H. Koster said that as the applicant has said, there isn't a sidewalk in the Town that has the same width. Counsel said that (1) when this topic first came up he called Town Clerk Kathy Simmes and asked what the Town's sidewalk rules and regulations are, (2) Kathy Simmes gave him information that the sidewalks vary in widths and (3) he feels that the lack of uniformity doesn't diminish the opportunity to start somewhere. H. Koster said he feels the sidewalk plotted on the plan is fine and appropriate.

P. Kenyon again asked if the PB wants to have some consistency and head people in a direction regarding sidewalks and J. Gaddy responded by saying that (1) the direction is that the Master Plan is looking for better pedestrian access to downtown and (2) he brought up to the applicant that if he does come up with an application for his other

parcel to the west, he would be pushing for a sidewalk there too. Counsel said that would be the right time to discuss that parcel—when and if that particular parcel came up in an application.

Counsel said that (1) he senses that once the applicant and the PB can agree on the aesthetics of this plan, that this plan will be used in the future as a reference point for future development and (2) in a sense the PB is kind of creating the whole design on that intersection. H. Koster said he thinks the sidewalk size would depend on foot traffic. Counsel said he was speaking not only of the sidewalk, but the whole structure setting the tone of what will go on in that location.

P. Kenyon said that she was referring to lighting and H. Koster said that it would be better without it. S. Aldrich asked if there was any rule or regulation on lighting in downtown and H. Koster said no. Counsel said that is correct that there is no rule or regulation on downtown lighting, but the PB should have some policies in place and set some standards. J. Gaddy said he would be in favor of not having any additional lighting there. Robert MacEwan said there is enough lighting there now. H. Koster agreed, but added that if the applicant was looking for additional lighting there, that he would suggest it be consistent with what the Town already has along Main Street.

Robert MacEwan (1) said that he asked Town Board members their thoughts on sidewalks and all said that applicants should be given guidance on sidewalks by the PB and (2) gave dimensions of several Town sidewalks that he measured. J. Gaddy said that (1) he thinks a sidewalk on Goodman Avenue but not on Cross Street would be okay and (2) it is a good improvement. H. Koster said that (1) he would recommend that the applicant match his proposed sidewalk to match the existing Catholic Church sidewalk—4' 5" and (2) he recalls reading that Tim Coon didn't want curbs. Robert MacEwan said Tim Coon didn't want curbs or sidewalks.

H. Koster said that he needs each PB member to express his/her personal opinion on the design either being similar or different between the units. J. Gaddy said that (1) if this is successful, this project will be setting the tone for other development, (2) it is not the PB's position to design for the applicant and while he doesn't have enough experience with townhouses, per se, he is sure there are ways that it could be dressed up a bit—he doesn't have that experience. S. Wilson said that (1) she likes the idea of different materials on the sided elevations and breaking it up and (2) she doesn't like the idea of four different façades on the front—maybe just different elements to make them a bit different—not totally dissimilar. S. Aldrich said that she is not an architect, but maybe a change in the doors, windows, color differences and/or the trim would be enough to break it up. C. Mason said that (1) it would be a mistake if the units were the same color and façade all the way down, (2) possibly an alternate color of the façade between the garage and the door as opposed to alternating type of material for that area, (3) it currently takes on the appearance of a barracks and (4) it doesn't take a lot of change to break it up. H. Caldwell said that maybe changing the garage doors, the gable ends and the round vent would be sufficient to break it up.

H. Koster said that (1) he doesn't want the applicant getting bounced around, because it isn't fair and (2) he wants to leave designing up to the applicant, but would like to see him implement some of the suggestions in an attempt to come to a compromise as Counsel suggested.

Robert MacEwan said that they are trying to keep with colors that aren't extreme and S. Aldrich suggested using different shades of the same color. Robert MacEwan approached the PB bench with color samples and further discussion ensued between the applicant and the PB and between individual PB members. H. Koster said he hopes Robert MacEwan understands that the design of this in Town is something new to the PB as well as the applicant.

J. Gaddy asked if there was any PB member interest in having a Public Hearing on this proposed project and several PB members said it would be a good idea. P. Kenyon said that this proposed project was before the ZBA on Monday, November 14, 2005 which was a Public Hearing. Fred Lethbridge spoke on the matter.

Motion by Sue Wilson to table the application pending the following information; 1) *A stormwater plan.* 2) *Alternate window, door and garage treatments.* 3) *The south side of the structure is to be enhanced with windows, siding, gable, etc.* **Seconded by** Sandi Aldrich. **All in favor. Motion Carried.**

2) SD05-31 MacEWAN, ROBERT & DEBORAH. Represented by Mark Rehm, Esq. Seek to divide into 4 lots that parcel designated as Section 171.15, Block 1, Lot 74. Zone GB5000. Property location: 22 Goodman Avenue, formerly known as Wilson's Laundry. Minor Subdivision. Subject to SEQR

Robert MacEwan gave an overview and said that the proposed subdivision has been before the ZBA.

Counsel said that (1) per his (Counsel's) and P. Kenyon's discussion they feel there won't be any changes in lot sizes because there won't be enough wiggle room to do that and (2) P. Kenyon is pointing out that if the PB approves these lots as they are, the applicant has drawings of where the façades are as they lay on that lot and asked if the PB will be changing façades, because by approving what is offered, that is what will be filed in the clerk's office. H. Koster said the PB is not looking for façade changes. Counsel said that the facades would then work into the budget of what the PB approves tonight.

H. Caldwell asked if the applicant should even be showing the building on the plan at this point in time and Counsel said yes, because if he didn't show the building someone on the PB would have legitimately asked where the building is. H. Koster said that if the applicant understands that the variance he got included the overhang of the buildings and that any little stepping on the gable ends or anything the applicant decides to do still needs to be within the overhang of the roofline because that is what governs the variance as far as the ZBA goes then he doesn't see why the PB can't go forward. Counsel said yes, as long as this print is going to be something satisfactory that doesn't change when

the PB and applicant get to their perfect building then H. Koster is right, because he (Counsel) doesn't see lots changing.

The PB found no concerns with Section 200-31A-D of the zoning ordinance and C1-C7 on the SEQR form.

Motion by Henry Caldwell to accept the application as a completed sketch plan, waive a public hearing, convert the sketch plan to final plat and grant final approval as presented. This motion includes a SEQR analysis and findings of no negative environmental impacts with all aspects favorable to the application as presented. **Seconded by** Chauncey Mason. **All in favor. Motion Carried.**

3) SD05-30 GOLLHOFER, PAUL & LYNN. Seek to divide into 2 lots that parcel designated as Section 140.00, Block 1, Lot 42. Zone RL3. Property Location: Padanarum Rd. Minor Subdivision. Sketch Plan Review. Subject to SEQR.

Lynn Gollhofer gave an overview and said that (1) they would like to divide the parcel into two parcels, which they don't plan on building on at this time, (2) there is an existing right-of-way going to Townsend's property which they are hoping the PB will grant the permission for them to improve further as opposed to creating an additional right-of-way area and (3) they would like the least amount of impact regarding improving anything.

H. Koster asked if the existing right-of-way is 16.5' and Lynn Gollhofer said yes. H. Koster asked if the Townsend's right-of-way is approximately the same distance and Lynn Gollhofer said yes. H. Koster asked if the applicants will be combining the right-of-ways and Lynn Gollhofer said no, they were suggesting to not have to take out any trees or vegetation in the area shown on the map, so at present she is just requesting a division of the right-of-way that is in their deed.

J. Gaddy asked if the applicants have received any APA response to their APA jurisdictional inquiry regarding wetlands and Lynn Gollhofer said no. S. Aldrich said that this property comes up on the County map as APA designated. H. Koster said there is a road going through that area already. Lynn Gollhofer said that (1) the road is going through the designated wetland zone now, (2) she would like the least impact in that area (by the right-of-way), so they will try to get in touch with the neighbors in an effort to not have to increase the size in that area and (3) the land itself is very high, dry and quite level with not much slope or steepness, so she doesn't think there would be any impact in any direction when and if anyone ever chose to build there.

S. Aldrich said her concern is the wetland area, as she walked it today and it is very wet. Lynn Gollhofer said that she acknowledges S. Aldrich's concern, but it would have to be improved, which she can't do without knowing she can have it. H. Koster said that (1) the application is for the subdivision of two lots, (2) the applicant is not landlocked—she has a right-of-way to the road and (3) whether the applicant has one or two lots, she still needs access to it and she will either use her right-of-way or her neighbors' right-of-way.

S. Aldrich asked if access and APA designated wetlands will be addressed in the future. H. Koster said that is the applicant's problem and S. Wilson said the APA will deal with it. H. Koster (1) said that the applicant has deeded right-of-way for six plus acres and the PB is dealing with a two lot subdivision and the applicant has a right-of-way whether this parcel is one or two lots and asked if it is correct that the applicant will have to deal with the APA if they have a problem with her widening a right-of-way, meaning that the PB can rule on the subdivision. Counsel said that (1) is entirely correct, (2) the PB can assume that the right-of-way services the whole parcel and by splitting it in two, it will continue to service the subdivided portions and (3) the applicant should not do anything in the right-of-way area without getting APA approval.

P. Kenyon asked if the applicant would have to bring fill into the area and Lynn Gollhofer said yes. P. Kenyon said that if the applicant keeps it under 15,000 square feet of land disturbance, then she (Kenyon) thinks the applicant would only need a stormwater permit from the Zoning Office. Counsel said that the applicant may have a minor stormwater issue in the future.

The PB found no concerns with Section 200-31A-D of the zoning ordinance and C1-C7 on the SEQR form.

Motion by Sue Wilson to accept the application as a completed sketch plan, waive a public hearing, convert the sketch plan to final plat and grant final approval as presented. This motion includes a SEQR analysis and findings of no negative environmental impacts with all aspects favorable to the application as presented. **Seconded by** John Gaddy. **All in favor. Motion Carried.**

4) SPR05-47 PARKER, SUE SCOTT. Dba Supreme Tan & Spa. Seeks Type II Site Plan Review for an advertising sign greater than 4 sq. ft. Specifically 9.8 sq. ft. is proposed. Section 171.19, Block 1, Lot 84. Zone GB5000. Property Location: 4941 Lake Shore Drive, known as Happy Jacks & Bug Bytes Internet Café. Subject to WCPB review. Subject to SEQR.

Sue Scott Parker gave an overview and said that she is before the PB to get permission for a proposed sign for Supreme Tan & Spa which would be identical in size/dimensions, design, hanging and lighting as the signs the PB previously approved for Happy Jacks and Bug Bytes Internet Café.

S. Aldrich asked if the lighting for the proposed sign will be consistent and Sue Scott Parker said yes, they want it all to be uniform.

The PB found no concerns with Section 200-31A-D of the zoning ordinance and C1-C7 on the SEQR form.

Motion by Sue Wilson to accept the application as complete, waive a public hearing, and grant approval with the following condition: *That the lighting be downward facing and shielded with the light bulbs being no more than 40 watts.* This motion includes a

SEQR analysis and findings of no negative environmental impacts with all aspects favorable to the application as presented. **Seconded by Sandi Aldrich. All in favor. Motion Carried.**

5) SPR05-46 JORDON, PAUL & LORI. Seek Type II Site Plan Review for an indoor boat maintenance facility less than 5,000 sq. ft., in an APA Low Intensity Use area, not visible from the public right of way. Section 140.00, Block 1, Lot 81. Zone RL3. Property Location: 640 & 624 Federal Hill Rd. Subject to WCPB review. Subject to SEQR.

Lori Jordon gave an overview and said that (1) the proposed facility will not be open for any retail business, (2) there is no floor plan submitted because it is proposed to be one big open area for a workshop, (3) the lighting on the front and the back of the proposed boat maintenance facility will be on motion sensors and downward facing and (4) the proposed facility is shown as being on her in-laws property, but that property has been deeded to herself and her husband, but her in-laws have a life estate reserved on that, which is why it still shows up on the tax map in her in-laws' name.

H. Caldwell asked if the stone wall is the 1' x 2' trench and Lori Jordon replied by saying that Code Enforcement Officer Mitzi Nittmann that as long as they (the applicants) ran it down both sides, it would be more than adequate.

H. Caldwell asked if the proposed facility would have a single door and Lori Jordon said that (1) the one end will have a walk door and a garage door and about halfway down the exposed side there will also be a walk door and (2) there will be no door on the back side, because it is too close to the bank.

S. Aldrich asked the distance from the easternmost side of the proposed facility at the top of the bank where it drops off steeply to Indian Brook and Lori Jordon answered by saying that the distance is at least 25' from the edge of the bank. S. Aldrich (1) said she is concerned with the proposed facility being a repair shop and the proposed location is relatively close to Indian Brook and (2) asked if the applicants have made any provisions for possible gas or oil spills. Lori Jordon said that any oil that is drained from motors gets put in containers and brought to Maranville's for disposal, (2) paint stripper will also be put in containers and there are companies in Albany and Hudson Falls that take that type of product and (3) if there is any drained gas from boat tanks, it is put into containers for their personal use—there will be no sale of gas on the property. S. Aldrich asked if anything toxic like the items mentioned would be picked up on a regular basis and Lori Jordon said yes.

H. Caldwell said that while it is unlikely that the applicants will ever sell this property, he is would like the condition that the property come back to the PB for site plan review if there are any future owners. S. Wilson said they would have to go to the ZBA for change of use and H. Koster said yes.

S. Aldrich asked if the colors will be earth tones and Lori Jordon said yes, the siding will be beige and clay colors and the roof will be evergreen.

No County impact.

The PB found no concerns with Section 200-31A-D of the zoning ordinance and C1-C7 on the SEQR form.

Motion by John Gaddy to accept the application as complete, waive a public hearing, and grant approval as presented. This motion includes a SEQR analysis and findings of no negative environmental impacts with all aspects favorable to the application as presented.

Seconded by Henry Caldwell. **All in favor. Motion Carried.**

6) SPR05-43 MILLER, JOHN. Represented by Tom Sargent of Fountain Forestry. Seeks Type II Site Plan Review to timber harvest an area greater than 1 acre on one parcel in the RL3 Zone and Type II Site Plan Review for a stream crossing for motor vehicles in the LC25 Zone. Section 140.00, Block 1, Lot 51. Zones RL3 & LC25. Property Location: Padanarum Road. Subject to WCPB review. Subject to SEQR.

Note: H. Caldwell recused himself from the PB for this agenda item.

Tom Sargent of Fountain Forestry, representing John Miller, gave an overview and said that (1) the 13 acres in the RL3 Zone is a pine forest that is crowded with some good quality stems, (2) the intent is to remove the good quality stems, (3) he has received DEC permit for a temporary stream crossing which will be removed at the end of the job and (4) he has received DEC permission to put wood across the stream, then the skidders will cross that and (5) there is a silt fence on the property that will be installed and (6) he will be installing silt fence on the existing skid trail which was requested by Warren County Soil & Water.

H. Koster asked when they will be doing the cutting and Tom Sargent answered by saying in the winter when it freezes.

No County impact.

The PB found no concerns with Section 200-31A-D of the zoning ordinance and C1-C7 on the SEQR form.

Motion by Sue Wilson to accept the application as complete, waive a public hearing, and grant approval as presented. This motion includes a SEQR analysis and findings of no negative environmental impacts with all aspects favorable to the application as presented. **Seconded by** Sandi Aldrich. Henry Caldwell recused himself. **All others in favor. Motion Carried.**

7) SPR05-44 WERNE, JOSEPH. Represented by Jarrett Martin Engineers. Seeks Type II Site Plan Review to construct a single family dwelling in the LC25 Zone.

Section 213.05, Block 1, Lot 5. Zones LC25 & RL3. Property Location: Route 9N, approximately 1 mile north of Coolidge Hill Rd. Subject to WCPB review. Subject to SEQR.

Tom Jarrett of Jarrett Martin Engineers, representing Joseph Werne, gave an overview and said that the proposal is to (1) build the driveway further from the stream which would include at least a 25' buffer, (2) build a three-bedroom home, (3) have the house set back away from the ledge with trees being maintained between the ledge and the house to keep a good buffer from the lake and (4) the only lighting be downward facing lighting on the east side of the house in order to minimize the impact.

H. Koster asked if the PB could review SPR05-44 and SPR05-45 together and Counsel said yes, as long as there are two separate and distinct motions—one for each agenda item and each with its own criteria.

Tom Jarrett said that regarding stormwater for the driveway, they are proposing check dams, ditch lines, run-outs and retention basins to comply with the Town of Bolton regulations for stormwater.

H. Caldwell said that a whole lot of houses will look down on this proposed house, so he would like to have subdued lighting all the way around—not just on the lake side. Tom Jarrett asked if the PB would accept floodlights on motion detectors, for example on the garage. J. Gaddy said that he thinks floodlights are fine as long as they are shielded over the lighting element to prevent glare.

S. Aldrich asked if the house placement or driveway will require any blasting and Tom Jarrett said yes, in the upper section blasting for both the house and at least a significant area (200' +/-) of the driveway, but the lower section will not require blasting.

H. Koster asked if Town Engineer Tom Nace has looked at this plan and P. Kenyon said no, she did not send it to him because she doesn't feel it is necessary, but the PB may feel it is necessary.

S. Aldrich asked if any other old buildings exist other than the ones shown. Joe Werne pointed out on the map all of the locations where buildings currently exist. S. Aldrich asked if all of the existing buildings will remain and Tom Jarrett said yes.

Tom Jarrett said that there is a mistake in their application as they show the building height at 35' 8" and it should be 34' 8".

J. Gaddy referenced map C3 and asked if it is possible to move the well more north, closer to the driveway area. Tom Jarrett said that he could swing the well north, but then he would have to lower the stormwater system below the well.

J. Gaddy asked if the pink-tagged trees will remain and Tom Jarrett said yes.

J. Gaddy asked if the well could be moved a little out of the east and Tom Jarrett replied by saying he doesn't see that as a problem because he has a little flexibility there.

No County impact.

The PB found no concerns with Section 200-31A-D of the zoning ordinance and C1-C7 on the SEQR form.

Motion by John Gaddy to accept the application as complete, waive a public hearing, and grant approval with the following conditions: 1) *Exterior lighting be downward facing and shielded.* 2) *A flood light is allowed over the garage door provided it is shielded.* 3) *The well is to be located north of the proposed location shown.* This motion includes a SEQR analysis and findings of no negative environmental impacts with all aspects favorable to the application as presented. **Seconded by** Chauncey Mason. **All in favor. Motion Carried**

8) SPR05-45 WERNE, JOSEPH. Represented by Jarrett Martin Engineers. In accordance with section 125.13C1 of the stormwater regulations, seeks Type II Site Plan Review for a major project, specifically to remove more than 15,000 sq. ft. of vegetation. 40,000+ sq. ft. is proposed. Section 213.05, Block 1, Lot 5. Zones LC25 & RL3. Property Location: Route 9N, approximately 1 mile north of Coolidge Hill Rd. Subject to WCPB review. Subject to SEQR.

H. Koster said that being that most of this road is dry and pre-existing, he tends to agree with P. Kenyon that this project doesn't need to go to Tom Nace for review.

J. Gaddy (1) said that it seems to be an improvement and (2) asked if the applicants will be actively vegetating and Tom Jarrett said that they will be seeding the old road and letting it grow.

No County impact.

S. Wilson said (1) there is a consensus to approve this major stormwater project and (2) based upon the materials submitted and accepted as part of the record, the findings are as follows;

1. The project meets the design requirements and performance standards set forth in the code.
2. The project will not have an undue adverse impact regarding the criteria set forth in the code.
3. That the stormwater control measures proposed will function as designed and constitute the best possible methods feasible and practicable for the project site.
4. Adequate and sufficient provisions are presented as part of the plan to assure future function or responsibility in the event of failure.
5. The project will not contribute to flooding, siltation, or streambank erosion and will not pollute Lake George, its tributaries or streams with run-off.

The PB found no concerns with Section 200-31A-D of the zoning ordinance and C1-C7 on the SEQR form.

Motion by Sue Wilson to accept the application as complete, waive a public hearing, and grant approval as presented. This motion includes a SEQR analysis and findings of no negative environmental impacts with all aspects favorable to the application as presented. **Seconded by** Sandi Aldrich. **All in favor. Motion Carried.**

9) SD05-23 WIDE WATER SUBDIVISION (Keith Van Buskirk). Represented by Atty. Jonathan Lapper. Seeks to merge those parcels designated as Section 213.05, Block 1, Lots 6 & 7 and then subdivide into 3 parcels. Zone RM1.3. Property location: 4124 Lakeshore Drive, known as Wide Waters Motel. Minor subdivision. Sketch plan review. Subject to SEQR. Variance approvals were granted on 05/16/05 for deficient lot width and shore frontage. *This item was tabled at the October 2005 meeting, pending additional information.*

Attorney Stephanie DiLallo Bitter, representing Wide Water Subdivision and Keith Van Buskirk, gave an overview and said that (1) it appears that the septic proposed on Lots 1 and 3 will need variances—minor variances per Tom Nace—which they are submitting, (2) they are proposing to renovate the house located on Lot 1, to construct a new house on Lot 2 and to put an addition on the log cabin on Lot 3, (3) Keith Van Buskirk notified her that the soil contamination is on Lot 1 and the current owners are working with DEC to reconcile this situation, (4) the recently submitted Dennis Dickinson map depicts the trees at issue, (5) they will be removing the cabins located on Lot 1, (6) they will be connecting the cottage identified on Lot 3 to the septic system of Lot 3 and (7) they are hoping the PB will grant approval with the following conditions: they will submit the DEC documentation prior to the Certificate of Compliance for Lot 1, the plan will be amended so the cottage on Lot 3 will be included in the septic system and that they will have to get Town Board approval for the septic variance and any other area variances.

H. Caldwell asked what other variances will be needed and Atty. DiLallo Bitter answered by saying that her understanding is that they will need a variance for the addition on the log cabin and the renovations of the Lot 1 construction.

P. Kenyon asked if it is correct that the applicant will be connecting the boathouse and house together with a flight of stairs and Keith Van Buskirk answered by saying no, there is no bridge, but there were going to be stairs going down on the north side of the house where stairs currently existed. P. Kenyon asked if it would be like a deck connecting the house and the boathouse and Keith Van Buskirk said no. S. Wilson asked if the house and boathouse are proposed to be connected and Keith Van Buskirk said no, he could see how it may look like that on the plan, but that is not what is intended. P. Kenyon said she believes that the house on Lot 1 and the boathouse will need variances.

S. Aldrich asked if the proposed changes to the retaining wall in front of the cottage needs a variance and P. Kenyon asked if it is a retaining wall or a sea wall. S. Aldrich said it looks like it will be part of the foundation of the top porch. P. Kenyon said she

thinks what is shown on the map is a sea wall, but she is not sure. S. Aldrich asked if the stone work shown on the bottom of the cottage versus what is open now, will require a variance and Counsel said yes, it is a change to a non-conforming structure. S. Aldrich asked if it is accurate that the applicant would need three variances for Lot 1 and P. Kenyon said yes she thinks so, but she needs more information.

P. Kenyon asked if the applicant will be applying for the variance for the additional setback on the stairs and Atty. DiLallo Bitter said yes.

H. Caldwell asked what the timetable is for the removal of the structures on Lots 1 and 3. Keith Van Buskirk answered by saying as soon as they get approvals, so in the winter or the spring.

H. Koster asked if the applicant will also be removing the u-shaped dock on Lot 3 and Atty. DiLallo Bitter said yes.

J. Gaddy said that his understanding is that the proposal for Lot 2 is for the house only and pointed out that if the applicant is looking for any decks or porches on the south or east side of that, the house needs to be moved back.

S. Aldrich asked if another public hearing is warranted since the plans have changed so much and H. Koster answered by saying that the main difference is that there will be no building down where the current concrete building is and the six cabins will be removed, so he doesn't think it needs another public hearing, because it will be a substantial increase to the Town not to have anything down by the lake on Lot 3. He added that (1) the applicant will have to go for a variance on the log cabin and on Lot 1 for the house and boathouse, which will be additional public hearings and (2) there aren't any changes to Lot 2 from the original proposal.

S. Aldrich asked if it is correct that Lot 2 will not be cleared until the lot is sold and P. Kenyon said that is correct, there will be no clearing on Lot 2 until a building permit is issued. Counsel said that if the PB wants more than a generalized understanding then the PB needs to make it part of the conditions of this subdivision or it may be disappointed.

H. Caldwell asked about setting a timetable for when the structures are to be removed and Counsel said that (1) the PB needs to work with the applicant on that by finding out what his plan is all about and then try to meet a common ground and (2) obviously the PB's interest is to see this place developed. Keith Van Buskirk (1) said that he would like to do it this winter, but doesn't see the possibility of having all of the approvals by then, so in the spring they will start with the building on the shore and (2) pointed out on the maps and gave his timeframes for other buildings.

S. Wilson said that S. Aldrich is concerned with the trees being removed then a house being placed elsewhere and S. Aldrich said that is correct. H. Koster said that (1) it should be put in the motion being very specific that there is to be no clearing until a building permit is obtained and (2) the same thing applies to Lot 3 where if the applicant

does not get a variance to expand the lot, there is no need to remove the trees. S. Aldrich said that the existing driveway accesses all three lots so there is no reason to remove trees for anything like that.

H. Koster said that the applicant brought some additional plans to the Zoning Office today and asked if there are any changes on those plans. P. Kenyon said that the plans that were submitted were for the septic variance.

Further discussion ensued regarding imposing a timetable for this project, as reflected in the conditions in the motion.

The PB found no concerns with Section 200-31A-D of the zoning ordinance and C1-C7 on the SEQR form.

Motion by Sue Wilson to accept the application as complete, waive a public hearing, and grant approval as presented with the following conditions; 1) *Prior to a certificate of compliance being issued: a) No tree removal is to be conducted b) Documentation from DEC regarding the contaminated soils must be submitted to the planning office. c) Demolition of the existing structures to be removed must be completed.* 2) *Site plan review is required for the single-family dwellings on lots 2 and 3.* **Seconded by** John Gaddy. **All in favor. Motion Carried.**

10) SD05-24 WESTWOOD FOREST WEST. Rolf Ronning. Seeks to divide into 11 lots that parcel designated as 139.00, Block 1, Lot 8.1, Zones LC25, RR10 and RIL3. Property location: west side of Hendricks Road off County Route 11. Sketch Plan Review. Major subdivision. Subject to SEQR. *This item was tabled at the October 2005 meeting, pending additional information.*

Rolf Ronning gave an overview and said that (1) they are proposing a road to a cul-de-sac to access Lots 1-4, which will be the industrial zoned lots, (2) Lots 5-11 will be the residential lots, (3) they are proposing a driveway to access Lots 9 and across Lot 10 and (4) they can't move forward with the project until they know that the proposal is acceptable, in theory, by the PB.

J. Gaddy asked if the power will be coming in from Hendricks Road from the north and Rolf Ronning said (1) yes, National Grid is working on getting two right-of-way easements from neighboring property owners and (2) the power, which he has already paid for, should be in this winter (2005) running from Alder Brook Lodge to the end.

S. Aldrich asked for clarification of the dotted line shown on the map from Lot 9 through Lot 10 and Rolf Ronning said that is a proposed deeded right-of-way across Lot 9 for Lots 10 and 11. S. Aldrich asked if the road would be built there at this point in time and Rolf Ronning said that he would like to at the very least put the road in, which would be a driveway for Lot 11, but he won't if the PB doesn't want him to. H. Koster asked if stormwater management would be submitted for the driveway and Rolf Ronning said yes.

H. Caldwell said that the house site on Lot 11 will need to be changed, as it is shown right now as being right by the road, to reflect accurate stormwater. Rolf Ronning said that (1) there are 60+ acres on Lot 11 and the purchaser of Lot 11 would determine the house location and (2) he will do the stormwater from the driveway to that point. H. Koster said that H. Caldwell is pointing out that if the purchaser of Lot 11 decides to move the house to the upper part of Lot 11, then they will have to come back to the PB for major stormwater design for the driveway and the house, because it is a major subdivision. Rolf Ronning said he doesn't know who is going to buy Lot 11 or what they are going to do with it.

H. Caldwell asked if the overhead power will come down Hendricks Road and asked if it would come in underground. Rolf Ronning said that that is largely up to the power company and H. Koster said no, it is not. Rolf Ronning said that (1) above ground is cheaper and (2) above ground would be consistent with what is coming down Hendricks Road. H. Koster said the power could come underground from Hendricks Road as well and Rolf Ronning said that National Grid has determined that above ground is the only way they are going to do it there.

H. Caldwell asked how the culvert crossing the creek will end up looking as it currently has hay bales there. Rolf Ronning said that (1) he doesn't think the hay bales have any function at this point, so they can be removed and (2) he thinks the culvert is done.

S. Aldrich asked the status of the applicant's APA Jurisdictional Inquiry that was submitted and Rolf Ronning said that (1) they had the wetlands looked at and (2) he thinks they (APA) are coming back December 6th or 7th and he is not sure if he will be required to flag the wetlands at that point in time. H. Koster said there is a possibility that the wetlands may go beyond the property line between Lots 10 and 11 and Rolf Ronning said that (1) Dennis Dickinson doesn't think so, which is why the property line is as shown and (2) if the wetlands do go over the Lot 10 property line, then the Lot 10 line will have to be moved a little bit.

H. Caldwell asked if it is accurate that Lots 1-4 will be accessed from the new proposed road and not Hendricks Road and Rolf Ronning said that is correct and the reason for that is because of the stream, which creates an impossible situation.

H. Caldwell asked if it is accurate that there will be no further subdivision of Lot 11 and Rolf Ronning said yes, that is fine.

H. Koster asked if the maps show stormwater basins on Lots 1-4 and Rolf Ronning answered by saying that yes, it is stormwater that Dennis Dickinson is fiddling around with, but it may be change. S. Aldrich pointed out that it wasn't labeled.

H. Koster asked why there is an outline of a second cul-de-sac just beyond the first cul-de-sac and Rolf Ronning said that (1) he has no idea what that is—perhaps Dennis Dickinson thought of building the road further, then brought it back and (2) he thinks the second light circle should be removed.

H. Koster asked if the applicant will submit stormwater for the road and the driveway and Rolf Ronning said yes, as long as the PB conceptually likes this plan.

H. Koster asked if any blasting will be needed and Rolf Ronning said that (1) they haven't hit any ledge yet and (2) they have done test pits and never hit ledge, so he doesn't anticipate any blasting will be needed.

S. Wilson asked if the applicant would need to come back for a lot line adjustment if the APA determined the wetlands crossed over Lot 10's proposed property line and H. Koster said yes. Rolf Ronning said that (1) they will need the wetland information prior to completing stormwater and (2) the APA wants all of the wetland on one lot.

S. Wilson asked if there needs to be a condition that the project is subject to stormwater and H. Koster said yes. Rolf Ronning asked if the PB is seeking stormwater for all of the homes at this point in time or just the roads, as each individual will be coming back for site plan review in the future—there is no point in doing it twice. Further discussion ensued on the rationale of stormwater for everything now versus later for each individual lot.

Counsel said that the PB attempts to do it (stormwater) comprehensively, but then the PB would also do it individually as each lot is presented. Rolf Ronning asked if it is accurate that his stormwater responsibility would be for the road and the driveway going up to the deeded right-of-way and not for the individual lots. Counsel said that is the PB's call as he has seen them done comprehensively and individually.

Rolf Ronning said that there are plenty of places to build on 5 acres and regarding the industrial lots, they have no idea what will be built there. Counsel said that (1) the applicant has to take his best shot in terms of what he thinks will be built, (2) it was considered and decided in a previous lawsuit (regarding a different item) that the Town tried to do the best job it could with the hypotheticals—the general configurations, contours and possibilities—when they laid that to rest the outcome and approval, it was followed by now there would be a particular lot on a particular day being revisited.

Rolf Ronning asked if it was required by the Town to do stormwater on these big lots and Counsel said yes. H. Koster asked if the stormwater for the lots would have to be designed to a maximum of recharge that could be put into that lot without flowing over onto someone else's property and (2) there are so many variables, which questions what the sense is of having a design unless the applicant gives some sort of a cut-off point. Counsel said (1) that he understands the PB's argument, but he made that argument and lost in court, (2) he thinks the PB has a good argument, but it will lose in court and (3) the applicant has to come up with a reasonable ordinary proposal.

Rolf Ronning asked if he suggests something for a three or four-bedroom house and somebody wants something larger, then it would be that individual's responsibility to come back with additional stormwater. Counsel said (1) yes, because then the Town of

Bolton has fought it and done a correct job because they will have accepted this applicant's platform of the typical then actually used specific criteria when it got to actual construction and (2) all the current applicant can do is do is present what he thinks logically might be done there. P. Kenyon referenced Wright's Farm and H. Koster agreed saying that (1) every lot would be a major stormwater when it comes back before the PB and (2) the applicant should do stormwater for each lot and up to the lot line of Lot 11. Rolf Ronning said he would do that.

H. Koster (1) said that the applicant shows a 16' driving surface with 2' shoulders on each side for the cul-de-sac road and (2) asked if there would be a turn around on the driveway. P. Kenyon said that the turn around is not required by the code. H. Koster suggested a hammer-head be added to Lot 11. S. Aldrich asked if a 16' driving surface is sufficient for work vehicles and P. Kenyon said she thinks 18' driving surface is the minimum. Rolf Ronning said he will make the driving surface 18' with 2' shoulders on each side and the PB agreed with that compromise.

Motion by Henry Caldwell to accept the application as a completed sketch plan and table it pending the following information; 1) *A hammerhead turn around is to be shown on lot 11.* 2) *The travel surface of the roadway is to be 18 ft. wide with 2 ft. shoulders.* 3) *It is noted that the lot shall not be further subdivided.* **Seconded by Sandi Aldrich. All in favor. Motion Carried.**

11) WARREN, GLENN. Request for discussion of potential regulated uses and structures. A) Sign for "sustainable forest management and research center" B) Home occupation: professional engineering with sign; C) monopole communications tower D) onsite mineral extraction in support of forest road construction; E) sawmill operation as part of sustainable forestry management and onsite construction; F) operation of educational activities related to sustainable forest management and research center G) stream crossings for forest access road improvement. H) timber harvest > 1 acre in RL3. Section 140.00, Block 1, Lots 44, 47 & 49. Zones RL3, LC25 & LC45. Property Location: Padanarum Rd.

Glenn Warren gave an overview and said that (1) he is looking for PB feedback regarding items for future applications and (2) regarding sawmill operation, he would like to operate a portable sawmill to use for wood in construction of the approved dwelling and in the future.

H. Koster asked about the type of saw and Glenn Warren answered by saying a band sawmill. H. Koster asked how it would be made portable being that it needs tracks and Glenn Warren said that (1) the band sawmill is sold as portable, but then while it would be used it would need to be made semi-permanent, so he would need to put down tracks and (2) he would use it seasonally as he doesn't see it as being a year-round operation.

H. Koster asked if there is the possibility of future commercial activity and Glenn Warren said that he plans on using the saw band mill for rough sawing to sell the boards that result from what he mills. H. Koster asked if the plan is to go beyond rough sawing, such

as using planers and Glenn Warren answered by saying that he wouldn't rule out using planers.

S. Wilson asked if a use variance would be needed and P. Kenyon said no, sawmills are considered Type I uses in LC25 and Glenn Warren is aware that he would have to go to the APA to do that as well. H. Koster asked if a variance would be needed for this use in an RL3 Zone and P. Kenyon said no. Counsel said that the use of a sawmill is still a Type I use in a RL3 Zone.

H. Caldwell said he has no problem with the proposed use of a sawmill because it is not of a great noise factor. H. Caldwell said Glenn Warren is speaking of a portable mill, which seems fine, but if he were to get into a fixed mill with lots of big equipment, he feels it would require a second look. Glenn Warren said that if his permit is for a certain size portable mill, he would imagine there would be some type of review if he desired to upgrade to larger equipment.

Glenn Warren said that regarding the communication tower, (1) he doesn't have cell company interest presently, (2) he is interested in a communication tower so he will be able to be in communication with the crews and people working from one side of the ridge to another, (3) he has done two different coverage studies: one suggests that the location to the south gives better coverage to the property as a whole and the other wider area study (required by the APA for regional review) suggests that it would provide coverage to 1/3 of Bolton, to Tongue Mountain and parts of the other side of the Lake, (4) his concept for the cell tower is a flag pole style monopole that could support a large American flag which would have the antennas mounted internally so the flag pole would not be seen through the tree line.

H. Caldwell said he thinks that anything over 35' would require a variance. Glenn Warren said he thinks it would be a Type I Site Plan Review and APA approval since it is a telecommunications tower. P. Kenyon said that is correct.

H. Koster said the only cell tower ever applied for in the Town of Bolton was up at the Sagamore Golf Course garage and the PB suggested the cell tower be one of the imitation pine tree types of cell towers. Glenn Warren said that (1) he doesn't like the look of the imitation pine tree towers, because they don't look real, (2) his personal preference is to use a flag pole, (3) he has done a couple of photographic studies that he will submit in the future where he has superimposed what the proposed flag pole would look like from different vantage points and (4) his sense is that when you put something there like a simulated pine tree, it is enough different from what is there to just really stick out and sometimes it is better to make something that is intended to stick out that is in effect subtle because it is different.

J. Gaddy said that (1) he loves to see the flag flying, but he doesn't see anything subtle about having some monstrous flag flying and (2) he doesn't agree that a flag flying from the top of the ridge will make an improvement from the view from the lake. Glenn

Warren said that a monstrous flag sounds awfully big, but when you are a mile away on the lake, a monstrous flag looks awfully small.

J. Gaddy (1) referenced a proposal to have houses on Thomas and Cat Mountains with a heliport, (2) said that he doesn't think a huge flag would necessarily be a real positive thing and (3) asked what the minimum height needed is for communication on the property. Glenn Warren said that the minimum height needed would be approximately 130' to give coverage to the entire property.

J. Gaddy said that the coverage from The Narrows through Northwest Bay is already covered by The Sagamore cell tower. Glenn Warren said that (1) from the point of view from a commercial carrier co-locating on the tower—it is highly likely it would be the interest of one or more cell companies that would move this part of the project ahead—if the cell companies felt that this would be no benefit to their coverage and their system, then it is much less likely he would go ahead with it and (2) when it comes to having his work crews, he wants to be able to have good communications with them because that is consistent with a good site safety and health plan and (3) it would certainly provide added coverage to the community, but he is unsure at this time as to how valuable that added coverage would be to a potential carrier.

H. Koster said that to have a safe workplace the tower height necessary would only need to be about 25'. Glenn Warren said that he did a line-of-site study and there are enough steep contours where several spots on-site would fall into the shadows being unable to communicate without a tower being tall enough.

H. Koster asked where the proposed 135' pole would be visible from other than Padanarum Road and Glenn Warren said it would be visible from Green Island and the point of Tongue Mountain, but it would be the size of a pea from those locations. S. Wilson suggested the possibility of an old-fashioned Adirondack fire tower and Glenn Warren said he is open to suggestions, which is why he is here tonight.

Regarding Type I mineral extraction, Glenn Warren said that (1) he would anticipate that he would want to include to sell aggregate as well on his use permit and (2) currently his intention is that if he were to extract minerals that it would be below the 700' and 900' contours along the slope of the ridge with access from the new logging road put in. H. Koster asked if this would basically be a granite quarry and Glenn Warren said yes, basically cutting a bench into the hill and ending up with a climbing wall for his son and end up with a relatively flat area that would be re-vegetated with some sort of tree or other forest product to derive a future potentially benefit.

J. Gaddy asked how tall and how long the climbing wall would be and Glenn Warren said maybe 100' high and up to a maximum of 1,000' long (which would be the width of the property). J. Gaddy asked if it would be blasted out and Glenn Warren said that (1) blasting is one technique available, but he will be living in close proximity to that area, so he has looked into other non-blasting technologies as an alternative and (2) at this point in time it would probably be a combination of technologies. J. Gaddy asked how many

cubic yards that would equate to and Glenn Warren answered by saying that it would be about 1 million or so cubic yards, but he won't need 1 million cubic yards to do the roads.

J. Gaddy asked about the noise effect on the neighbors and Glenn Warren said that (1) his neighbors would have ample opportunity at the PB, APA and DEC to make their comments well known and (2) he is sure he is going to have to find ways to compromise with his neighbors if he were afforded the opportunity to go forward.

Regarding timber harvest, Glenn Warren said that timber harvesting the area between Padanarum Road and the stream would be primarily a thinning operation. H. Koster said that he has no problem at all with this type of timber harvesting.

Glenn Warren said that (1) over time, it will be his intention to move his engineering practice to a small office type of set-up and be basically a small professional office with possibly one employee and the possible corroboration with one or both of his sons depending on their plans and (2) he would want to put a sign bigger than four square feet and probably smaller than 10 square feet up front to advertise his business. H. Koster said it two signs are listed and Glenn Warren said that (1) the second sign would be for the Forest Management Research and Educational Facility, which is this big activity and (2) he would like to put a sign up for that activity similar to Up Yonda's or Darren Freshwater Institute's, that advertises that he is doing something different here.

Regarding operation of educational activities, Glenn Warren said that over time, he would like to offer seminars, short courses or summer or school types of courses to clientele interested in what he is doing and experimenting with on the property, which is what the aforementioned sign would be for as well.

H. Koster said that he doesn't have a problem with the concept of the signs, but that each sign would have to be reviewed if it is larger than four square feet. Glenn Warren said he understood and added that he is not planning on lighting the signs at all.

Meeting adjourned at 10:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted by
Jennifer Torebka
Recording Secretary
12/03/05