

**Town of Bolton  
PLANNING BOARD  
Minutes  
Thursday, March 22, 2007  
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, Zoning Administrator Pam Kenyon

**Absent:** Donald Roessler, Susan Wilson and Town Counsel Michael Muller

H. Koster opened all public hearings at 6:00 pm.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

*Note: Applicant agreed to have public hearing items 1 & 2 heard together.*

- 1) **SD04-08 BRANDOW, EDWARD. Trout Lake West.** Represented by Rolf Ronning. Seeks to divide into 5 lots that parcel designated as Section 185.00. Block 1, Lot 31, Zone RCL3. Property Location: Trout Lake Road. Major Subdivision. Preliminary Plat. Subject to SEQR. *Note: The public hearing was kept open from the February 2007 meeting pending additional information. To date an agreement has not been reached between Julie Denison and Dr. Brandow and Town Engineer Tom Nace is re-reviewing the stormwater plans.*
- 2) **SPR06-21 BRANDOW, EDWARD. Trout Lake West.** Represented by Rolf Ronning. In accordance with Section 125.13C1 of the stormwater regulations, seeks Type II Site Plan Review for a major project to remove more than 15,000 sq. ft. of vegetation. 35,750 sq. ft. is proposed. Section 185.00. Block 1, Lot 31, Zone RCL3. Property Location: Trout Lake Road. *Note: The public hearing was kept open from the February 2007 meeting pending additional information. To date an agreement has not been reached between Julie Denison and Dr. Brandow and Town Engineer Tom Nace is re-reviewing the stormwater plans.*

**Motion by** John Gaddy to extend the public hearing on SD04-08 & SPR06-21 until the April 2007 Planning Board meeting pending additional information. **Seconded by** Sandi Aldrich. **All in favor. Motion Carried.**

- 3) **SPR06-43 SIMONSON, RICHARD & VIVIAN.** Represented by Atty. Melissa Lescault of McPhillips, Fitzgerald & Cullum LLP & D.L. Dickinson Associates. For the construction of a proposed single-family dwelling, seek 1) Type II Site Plan Review for a) a single-family dwelling in the LC45 zone; and b) a major stormwater project to remove more than 15,000 sq. ft. of vegetation; Approximately 15,000 is proposed. 2) Type I Site Plan Review is also sought for development within 100' of a wetland. Section 186.18, Block 1, Lot 31, Zones RCH5000 & LC45. Property

Location: Off Shallow Beach Road. Subject to SEQR. The WCPB determined no county impact with the stipulation that all paperwork be filed. NOTE: This application is in conjunction with V06-50. *The public hearing was kept open from the February 2007 meeting pending additional information.*

**Motion by** John Gaddy to extend the public hearing on SD04-08 & SPR06-21 until the April 2007 Planning Board meeting pending additional information. **Seconded by** Sandi Aldrich. **All in favor. Motion Carried.**

*Note: Applicant agreed to have public hearing items 4 & 5 heard together.*

- 4) **SD04-16 SADDLEBROOK SUBDIVISION. Rolf Ronning.** Seeks to amend previously approved plats (SD03-19 & SD04-05 formerly known as Mowery/High Meadow Farm), specifically to divide into 23 lots that parcel designated as Section 139.00, Block 1, Lot 48.1, Zone RL3. Access to be gained through Section 139.00, Block 1, Lot 28.1(Reed) see SD07-04. Property Location: High Meadow Farm Road. Major Subdivision. Preliminary plat. Subject to SEQR. *Note: This application is in conjunction with SPR05-11 and was tabled at the February 2007 meeting pending additional information and a public hearing.*
  
- 5) **SPR05-11 SADDLEBROOK SUBDIVISION. Rolf Ronning.** 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. 30 acres proposed: total build out is 30 acres, road alone is 12 acres. Section 139.00, Block 1, Lot 28.1, 36.1 & 48.1, Zone RL3. Property location: High Meadow Farm Road. The WCPB determined no county impact with the condition each individual lot be reviewed for stormwater and erosion control measures, lot clearing and lot access. Subject to SEQR. *Note: This application is in conjunction with SD04-16 and was tabled at the February 2007 meeting pending additional information and a public hearing.*

Rolf Ronning gave a project overview and said that he addressed the driveway issues brought up at last month's meeting.

From the public, Chris Navitsky, Lake George Waterkeeper, said that (1) he met with the applicant and Dennis Dickinson regarding project improvements, but he has yet to see any plan revisions as agreed upon, (2) the plan doesn't meet the stormwater regulation requirements and (3) there is still no soil information on the basins, some of which are extremely deep. Chris Navitsky then handed out pictures showing run-off in the area and said that (1) the applicant's project will alter run-off patterns and cause downstream impacts, (2) the applicant proposes to divert the run-off across the neighbors' property, (3) there are no defined channels in the area of the driveway entrance onto New Vermont Road, (4) the applicant is looking to re-route streams which will also have impacts, (5) there are wetland conflicts with Pond 6, which will flood and wash out, (6) the system will not function as proposed, (7) the applicants are proposing culverts on New Vermont Road which don't have covers, so they will get crushed, (8) the maps reflect inaccurate

elevations, (9) a DEC permit is needed to re-route a stream as proposed, (10) the stormwater management systems are located too close to Indian Brook on Lot 5, (11) there are about 30% grades which exceed current standards, (11) the ponds don't meet standards for side slopes and (12) there are still a lot of problems with the stormwater system that need to be improved.

Rolf Ronning said that (1) the basin on the end is designed for a 100-year storm per the Town Engineer's request, (2) Chris Navitsky works for the Lake George Fund and the organization's purpose is to stop development, (3) several engineers have given their opinions on this project and they (the applicants) have done their best.

No additional public comments.

H. Koster noted that the Town Engineer's latest correspondence addresses nine items on the project that he (the Town Engineer) deemed acceptable.

**Motion by** Henry Caldwell to extend the public hearing on SD04-16 & SPR05-11 until the April 2007 Planning Board meeting pending additional information. **Seconded by** Chauncey Mason. Herb Koster opposed. **All others in favor. Motion Carried.**

*Note: Applicants agreed to have public hearing items 6 & 7 heard together.*

6) **SD05-25 McGURL, THOMAS & MARYLOU.** Represented by Attys. Jonathan Lapper & Stefanie DiLallo Bitter of Bartlett, Pontiff, Stewart & Rhodes, PC, and Tom Hutchins P.E. of Hutchins Engineering. Seek to divide into 8 lots that parcel designated as 170.00-1-22.1. Zones RCL3, LC45 & LC25. Property Location: 520 Trout Lake Rd., known as Twin Pines Resort. Preliminary Plat. Major Subdivision. Subject to SEQR. *Note: This item is in conjunction with SPR06-52 and was tabled at the February 2007 meeting pending additional information and a public hearing.*

7) **SPR06-52 McGURL, THOMAS & MARYLOU.** Represented by Atty. Jonathon Lapper of Bartlett, Pontiff, Stewart & Rhodes, PC, and Tom Hutchins P.E. of Hutchins Engineering. In accordance with Section 125.13C1 of the stormwater regulations, seek Type II Site Plan Review for a major project to remove more than 15,000 sq. ft. of vegetation. 6.95 acres is proposed. Section 170.00, Block 1, Lot 22.1, Zones RCL3, LC45 & LC25. Property Location: 520 Trout Lake Road known as Twin Pines Resort. Subject to WCPB review. Subject to SEQR. *Note: this item is in conjunction SD05-25. This item was tabled at the February 2007 meeting pending additional information and a public hearing.*

Tom McGurl, Jr., representing Thomas and Marylou McGurl, gave an overview and said that (1) they made the requested change to the shore frontage by extending it to 598 feet and (2) they reviewed the Lake George Waterkeeper's suggestions, some of which they did incorporate.

No public comments.

**Motion by John Gaddy to close the public hearing on SD05-25 & SPR06-52. Seconded by Henry Caldwell. All in favor. Motion Carried.**

**REGULAR MEETING:**

H. Koster opened the regular meeting at 6:26 pm by asking for corrections to the January 25, 2007 minutes.

1. S. Aldrich said that on page 10, paragraph 3, she believes the first sentence should read as follows, "...Atty. O'Connor said that they are on a very limited timetable, as they have a crew (who are obtaining visas to work on this project for 9 weeks) lined up to construct the aerial courses in late February."

**Motion by John Gaddy approve the January 25, 2007 minutes as amended. Seconded by Sandi Aldrich. Four in favor. One abstained** (Chauncey Mason, as he was not present at that meeting). **Motion carried.**

H. Koster asked for corrections to the February 15, 2007 minutes.

**Motion by John Gaddy to accept the February 15, 2007 minutes as presented. Seconded by Henry Caldwell. Three in favor. Three abstained** (Sandi Aldrich, Henry Caldwell and Chauncey Mason, as they were not present at that meeting.) **Motion carried.**

*Note: Agenda Items were heard in the following order: 1-10, 12, 11, 13-17.*

*Note: Applicant agreed to have agenda items 1 & 2 heard together.*

- 1) **SD04-08 BRANDOW, EDWARD. Trout Lake West.** Represented by Rolf Ronning. Seeks to divide into 5 lots that parcel designated as Section 185.00. Block 1, Lot 31, Zone RCL3. Property Location: Trout Lake Road. Major Subdivision. Preliminary Plat. Subject to SEQ. *Note: The public hearing was kept open from the February 2007 meeting pending additional information. To date an agreement has not been reached between Julie Denison and Dr. Brandow and Town Engineer Tom Nace is re-reviewing the stormwater plans.*
  
- 2) **SPR06-21 BRANDOW, EDWARD. Trout Lake West.** Represented by Rolf Ronning. In accordance with Section 125.13C1 of the stormwater regulations, seeks Type II Site Plan Review for a major project to remove more than 15,000 sq. ft. of vegetation. 35,750 sq. ft. is proposed. Section 185.00. Block 1, Lot 31, Zone RCL3. Property Location: Trout Lake Road. *Note: The public hearing was kept open from the February 2007 meeting pending additional information. To date an agreement has not been reached between Julie Denison and Dr. Brandow and Town Engineer Tom Nace is re-reviewing the stormwater plans.*

**Motion by** John Gaddy to keep the public hearing open and table the applications pending an agreement between Julie Denison and Dr. Brandow. **Seconded by** Sandi Aldrich. **All in favor. Motion Carried.**

- 3) **SPR06-43 SIMONSON, RICHARD & VIVIAN.** Represented by Atty. Melissa Lescault of McPhillips, Fitzgerald & Cullum LLP & D.L. Dickinson Associates. For the construction of a proposed single-family dwelling, seek 1) Type II Site Plan Review for a) a single-family dwelling in the LC45 zone; and b) a major stormwater project to remove more than 15,000 sq. ft. of vegetation; Approximately 15,000 is proposed. 2) Type I Site Plan Review is also sought for development within 100' of a wetland. Section 186.18, Block 1, Lot 31, Zones RCH5000 & LC45. Property Location: Off Shallow Beach Road. Subject to SEQR. The WCPB determined no county impact with the stipulation that all paperwork be filed. NOTE: This application is in conjunction with V06-50. *The public hearing was kept open from the February 2007 meeting pending additional information.*

**Motion by** John Gaddy to keep the public hearing open and table the application at the applicants' request. **Seconded by** Sandi Aldrich. **All in favor. Motion Carried.**

*Note: Applicant agreed to have agenda items 4, 5, 6 and 7 heard together.*

- 4) **SD04-16 SADDLEBROOK SUBDIVISION. Rolf Ronning.** Seeks to amend previously approved plats (SD03-19 & SD04-05 formerly known as Mowery/High Meadow Farm), specifically to divide into 23 lots that parcel designated as Section 139.00, Block 1, Lot 48.1, Zone RL3. Access to be gained through Section 139.00, Block 1, Lot 28.1(Reed) see SD07-04. Property Location: High Meadow Farm Road. Major Subdivision. Preliminary plat. Subject to SEQR. *Note: This application is in conjunction with SPR05-11 and was tabled at the February 2007 meeting pending additional information and a public hearing*
- 5) **SPR05-11 SADDLEBROOK SUBDIVISION. Rolf Ronning.** 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. 30 acres proposed: total build out is 30 acres, road alone is 12 acres. Section 139.00, Block 1, Lot 28.1, 36.1 & 48.1, Zone RL3. Property location: High Meadow Farm Road. The WCPB determined no county impact with the condition each individual lot be reviewed for stormwater and erosion control measures, lot clearing and lot access. Subject to SEQR. *Note: This application is in conjunction with SD04-16 and was tabled at the February 2007 meeting pending additional information and a public hearing.*
- 6) **SD06-14 RONNING, ROLF & LEONE, MICHAEL.** Seek lot line adjustment between those parcels designated as Section 139.00, Block 1, Lots 48.1 & 36.1, Zone RL3. Property Location: New Vermont Road, approximately 2000 ft. north of County Route 11 intersection. Sketch Plan Review. Subject to SEQR. *Note: This*

*application is in conjunction with SD04-16 Saddlebrook Subdivision and was tabled at the February 2007 meeting pending a public hearing on SD04-16 & SPR05-11.*

- 7) **SD07-04 RONNING, ROLF & REED, WILLIAM.** Seek lot line adjustment between those parcels designated as 139.00, Block 1, Lots 28.1 & 48.1, Zone RL3. Property Location: 252 New Vermont Road. Sketch Plan Review. Subject to SEQR. *Note: This application is in conjunction with SD04-16, Saddlebrook Subdivision and was tabled at the February 2006 meeting pending a public hearing on SD04-16 & SPR05-11.*

Rolf Ronning said he is shocked the public hearing is still open since they have complied with all previous PB requests and asked what the problem is.

H. Caldwell said that the house site on Lot 23 is right on the pond and asked if the house site for that lot could be moved to a dry spot or if the lot could be eliminated. Rolf Ronning said that (1) the site location is on a dry spot and (2) all of the proposed house sites have been reviewed and approved by the Town Engineer. J. Gaddy said that (1) they walked the property with the surveyor that Rolf Ronning provided and (2) he (Gaddy) requested the road be moved in that general vicinity. Rolf Ronning said there is no pond there. J. Gaddy said that the representative from Dickinson Associates walked the property with them and said that they looked at the drainage and in the circle there is a permanent stream shown. Rolf Ronning said that (1) that is not a permanent stream—it is an intermittent stream, (2) there are five acres along that road with plenty of places to build a house and (3) if the PB wants the house site moved then he will do it. J. Gaddy said the PB asked the house site be moved a couple of meetings ago and Rolf Ronning said that he was never given this information, but he will note it and move the house location on Lot 23. J. Gaddy said that (1) they made a date to go up to the site with Dennis Dickinson so the exact representative would be there to show it and in the translation, something got lost, and Dennis Dickinson didn't come himself, but sent one of his representatives and (2) he (Gaddy) agrees that the house site could be on higher ground.

H. Caldwell said that he still has problems with the driveway of Lot 16 in that it goes through and uses up a lot of Lot 17. Rolf Ronning said that (1) he has a contract on Lot 17 and the purchaser has full knowledge of the driveway location and has acknowledged there is no problem, (2) the person interested in purchasing Lot 17 is very satisfied in how it is proposed and (3) the stormwater report as requested by the PB has been provided. J. Gaddy said that (1) he is looking for a different access to Lot 16 and (2) when you take a look at the impact it will have on the hydrology, the road is the biggest thing that will effect it—these kind of long driveways don't help things. Rolf Ronning said that (1) they revised the stormwater plan to show that there is going to be no impact, (2) there is only one logical place to build on Lot 16 and the only logical way to get there is the driveway as shown on Lot 17, and (3) they revised the run-off patterns for Lots 16 and 17, which were approved by the Town Engineer. H. Koster asked how the applicant will gain access to the septic system on Lot 16 given that it is extremely steep. Rolf

Ronning replied by saying that it appears to be 100 feet away. H. Koster said that the majority of the PB has had a problem with Lots 16 and 17 since day one.

From the public, Don Kingsley asked if each site would be subject to PB review H. Koster said that part of the review of a subdivision is to see if it is feasible to accommodate what the applicant is proposing, so there isn't pressure on the Zoning Administrator or the ZBA. H. Caldwell said that each parcel will be subject to major stormwater. H. Koster said that the applicant has to design it to meet stormwater for each lot with a typical house on the lot and show that stormwater will not leave the lot—just because the applicant has the acreage that does not entitle him to a lot. Don Kingsley said there is not a problem accessing the septic system as shown and H. Koster responded by saying what concerns the PB is that it is either going to come across the property line or down the steep hill to get at the site, which is why he (Koster) asked how it would be accessed. Don Kingsley said that access from the main association road is the best side to go across slope, that way there is no steep grade at all.

H. Caldwell said that in order to follow the contour across Lot 17 to access the septic system the applicant would need a right-of-way from Lot 17 and Rolf Ronning said that whatever right-of-ways they need, they will put in the deeds. H. Caldwell said that the proposed septic system would go under Lot 16's driveway. Rolf Ronning said that they picked the best locations for the septic systems. H. Caldwell said that if the pipes freeze then the neighbors would start battling. Rolf Ronning said that if the PB wants them to redesign the road so the septic system doesn't have to cross it, they will do so.

H. Koster asked if the applicant met with Town Engineer Tom Nace for the stormwater on Lots 16 and 17. Rolf Ronning said that Dennis Dickinson met with Tom Nace last month, but he was not present at that meeting. H. Koster said that if he is not mistaken, stormwater management cannot be diverted onto somebody else's property and P. Kenyon said that is correct. H. Koster said that a variance would be needed to lead water onto somebody else's property. Rolf Ronning said that it may be in the stormwater report and P. Kenyon said that the applicant just gave her the stormwater report at this evening's meeting. H. Koster said that they are not going to review the stormwater report right now, as it was submitted tonight.

H. Koster said that another concern is the length and steepness of the driveway and he would personally like to see one lot there in the proposed locations of Lots 16 & 17. Rolf Ronning said that he understands steepness, and while they are long, they are on an approximate 10% grade.

H. Caldwell asked if the septic system on Lot 17 could be moved. Rolf Ronning said that he doesn't understand why the septic line can't be run under the driveway. H. Koster said he believes the concern is that the road gets plowed and the frost goes deeper under a road than it does on ground that is not plowed. Rolf Ronning said that when you put a water line under a road you want to put it five feet down, but when you put a septic system under a road you want to put it three feet down. H. Caldwell said that he doesn't think it would be a big problem to move the driveway or the septic system.

J. Gaddy said that on the Reed plan for Lots 9 & 10, he didn't see topo. lines for the stormwater coming off the house. Rolf Ronning approached the PB bench to clarify it on the map.

Rolf Ronning said that they received APA approval on everything already and now with the PB's request for stormwater on the Reed right-of-way, the APA already signed-off on it before the amendment. H. Koster said the PB can proceed on this with the contingent that the APA has approved it.

**Motion by** John Gaddy to keep the public hearing open and table applications SD04-16, SPR05-11, SD06-14 & SD07-04 pending additional information as follows:

- 1) The house site on lot 23 is to be relocated to higher ground.
- 2) The stormwater controls may have to be changed so there will be no additional runoff from lot 16 onto lot 17.
- 3) The septic system on lot 17 is to be relocated whereby the septic line is not under the driveway. An alternative would be to relocate the driveway.

**Seconded by** Sandi Aldrich. **All in favor. Motion Carried.**

*Note: Applicants agreed to have agenda items 8 & 9 heard together.*

- 8) **SD05-25 McGURL, THOMAS & MARYLOU.** Represented by Attys. Jonathan Lapper & Stefanie DiLallo Bitter of Bartlett, Pontiff, Stewart & Rhodes, PC, and Tom Hutchins P.E. of Hutchins Engineering. Seek to divide into 8 lots that parcel designated as 170.00-1-22.1. Zones RCL3, LC45 & LC25. Property Location: 520 Trout Lake Rd., known as Twin Pines Resort. Preliminary Plat. Major Subdivision. Subject to SEQR. *Note: This item is in conjunction with SPR06-52 and was tabled at the February 2007 meeting pending additional information and a public hearing.*
- 9) **SPR06-52 McGURL, THOMAS & MARYLOU.** Represented by Atty. Jonathon Lapper of Bartlett, Pontiff, Stewart & Rhodes, PC, and Tom Hutchins P.E. of Hutchins Engineering. In accordance with Section 125.13C1 of the stormwater regulations, seek Type II Site Plan Review for a major project to remove more than 15,000 sq. ft. of vegetation. 6.95 acres is proposed. Section 170.00, Block 1, Lot 22.1, Zones RCL3, LC45 & LC25. Property Location: 520 Trout Lake Road known as Twin Pines Resort. Subject to WCPB review. Subject to SEQR. *Note: this item is in conjunction SD05-25. This item was tabled at the February 2007 meeting pending additional information and a public hearing.*

Tom Hutchins, project engineer, said that (1) they made the changes the PB requested regarding the shore frontage and (2) he changed some of the inlets to open channels as requested by the PB.

S. Aldrich asked if the shore frontage is adequate and H. Koster said yes, the applicants made an adjustment to accommodate the PB's request for the shore frontage.

WCPB determined no County impact by default approval.

Section II of the Long Environmental Assessment form was filled out by the Board. A negative declaration was made.

J. Gaddy 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 constitutes 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 stream bank erosion and will not pollute Lake George, its tributaries or streams with run-off.

**Motion by John Gaddy** to approve the preliminary plat, convert the preliminary plat to final plat and grant final approval as presented with the following conditions:

- 1) Site plan review is required for the construction of a single-family dwelling on each lot.
- 2) A \$400 recreation fee is to be paid to the Town of Bolton prior to a certificate of compliance being issued.
- 3) Construction times are from 8:00 am to dusk Monday through Saturday and 9:00 am to dusk on Sunday from July 4<sup>th</sup> to Labor Day. This includes any proposed blasting.
- 4) Based on Town Engineer, Tom Nace's approval of the proposed stormwater controls this motion includes the approval of the major stormwater project.
- 5) The stormwater controls proposed for each parcel must meet the criteria of a major stormwater project.

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.** *Note: Although not a condition of approval, it is noted*

*that the Town Engineer is to make periodic inspections and sign off on the stormwater controls and road construction. The applicant must contact the Zoning Office prior to any work being undertaken.*

**10) SPR07-08 DOMERS GOLDEN PROPERTIES, LLC.** Represented by Tom Hutchins PE., of Hutchins Engineering. As part of subdivision approval set forth by the Planning Board on January 23, 2003 and in accordance with Section 125.13C1 of the stormwater regulations, seek Type II Site Plan Review for a major project to remove more than 15,000 sq. ft. of vegetation. 35,000 sq. ft. is proposed. Section 171.07, Block 1, Lot 58, Zones RM1.3 & RL3. Property Location: Cobblestone Court, Lot 2 of the Cobblestone subdivision. Subject to WCPB Review. Subject to SEQR.

Tom Hutchins, project engineer, representing Dormers Golden Properties, LLC, gave an overview and said that (1) the lot slopes gently toward 9N then drops off, (2) they propose a two-story single-family residence, (3) the driveway would enter from the left side of the house, (4) the wastewater system was approved in the subdivision and is very large, which explains the large clearing in that area, (5) for stormwater they will be using driveway trenches and a shallow retention area to the rear of the house, which the Town Engineer signed off on and (6) the house will be 1 X 6 cedar siding in a dull beige color and the roof will be charcoal grey asphalt shingles.

J. Gaddy asked what year storm discharges in to the swale and Tom Hutchins said that (1) it is not designed as an infiltration basin per se, but it will likely overflow with a reasonable significant rainfall--it is in the model that way and (2) he could lessen the extent of that with more overflow in the natural channels there. J. Gaddy said that the lot was cleared by a previous owner as part of a campground, so they are essentially dealing with two sets of clearing limits, thus they are dealing with a lot of water for this project.

J. Gaddy asked for the proposed well location and Tom Hutchins said that the whole subdivision is on public water. J. Gaddy said that it is relatively flat in that location.

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

WCPB determined no county impact.

J. Gaddy 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 constitutes 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 stream bank erosion and will not pollute Lake George, its tributaries or streams with run-off.

**Motion by** John Gaddy to accept the application as complete, waive a public hearing and based on approvals from Town Engineer, Tom Nace, grant approval as presented with the following conditions:

- 1) Exterior lighting must be downward facing and shielded with low wattage bulbs used.
- 2) The channel outlet is to be shortened to maintain a 10 ft. setback from the drainage area.

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.**

**11) SPR07-06 DJMD, BOLTON NY, LLC.** Represented by Tom Hutchins PE., of Hutchins Engineering. As part of subdivision approval set forth by the Planning Board on January 23, 2003 and in accordance with Section 125.13C1 of the stormwater regulations, seek Type II Site Plan Review for a major project to remove more than 15,000 sq. ft. of vegetation. 41,500 sq. ft. is proposed. Section 171.07, Block 1, Lot 63, Zones RM1.3. Property Location: Cobblestone Court, Lot 9 of the Cobblestone subdivision. Subject to WCPB Review. Subject to SEQR.

Tom Hutchins, project engineer, gave an overview, and said that (1) it is a relatively steep and narrow lot, (2) the driveway is an average of 17.5%, (3) for stormwater, there is some diversion at the top and there is a shallow retention area that is not designed as an infiltration basin, but it will infiltrate some and (4) the proposed wastewater system is located down by the cul-de-sac, which the NYSDOH has been receptive to—the reason for the new location is because it is partially cleared.

H. Koster asked if the intention is to build the stormwater system before starting any other excavation, as there is concern since the northern lot had severe washout problems and Tom Hutchins said that (1) they are going to be very cognizant of temporary erosion control measures and (2) to build the stormwater first would be tragic and it would have to be built again. H. Koster said that his interest is to catch it before it gets back out onto that road again, because there was sediment that went all the way down to Braley Hill Road. Tom Hutchins said that (1) they are aware that it is an issue and (2) they will have to take extra precautions during construction when they are exposed and expose as little as possible for as short a time as they can.

J. Gaddy said that he is concerned with the back of the house where it looks like they went from an elevation of 700 feet to about 720 feet. Tom Hutchins said that he has a retention wall designed at 4 to 5 feet.

J. Gaddy asked what the total the height of the house would be and Gabriel Hodge, project architect, said that the total height of the house at the highest point is 35 feet. P. Kenyon said that she had a concern with the area to the back of the house regarding whether it was a stream or a drainage way, (2) she spoke with the NYSDEC and was told there are no streams in that area, so for the record, she did consider it to be drainage way and will continue to consider it drainage and (3) Tom Hutchins is aware that he has to stay 10 feet away from that drainage area. Tom Hutchins agreed. J. Gaddy asked if this is referring to 200-37 regarding there being neither removal of vegetation or any grading within 10 feet from the top of the slope of any streambed or drainage way and P. Kenyon said yes.

S. Aldrich asked if a flat roof is proposed and Gabriel Hodge said yes, the front portion of the building has a flat roof and the garage has a gabled roof. H. Caldwell asked what direction the three stories of glass faces and H. Koster said it faces east. H. Caldwell asked if the trees there now will be left, because if there aren't any trees there this building will look like an aircraft carrier from the lake. Gabriel Hodge said that they will leave every tree that they can between the septic system and the house. J. Gaddy said that (1) this has been a spot that he brought up before, that it was cleared once, he takes it under false pretenses, as the PB was told it was going to remain a campground and the PB approved it—now the PB has a second set of clearing for each of these individual homes and (2) with the amount of glass proposed, it would be nice to be able to break it up and get some more plantings in there that would go to maturity at some point to soften this. Gabriel Hodge said that they would be more than happy to replant between the house and the road. Tom Hutchins said that (1) there are a significant number of mature hardwood and softwood trees all the way up and (2) he understands the PB needs some assurances that they can maintain that. H. Koster said that they are changing the grade between the house and the stormwater and 50 feet beyond the stormwater. Tom Hutchins said that is a subtle grade change to show uniformity. Atty. Lapper suggested they show a no cutting area in the center. J. Gaddy said that (1) the PB understands there is going to be some vegetation removal during construction, but it would be nice to have a replanting plan that would eventually mature and keep a softer edge on this and (2) you can get a good view looking out—he is sure that is what the glass is for—but the PB also wants to make sure the applicant can minimize the effect looking back at the house. Gabriel Hodge asked what vantage point J. Gaddy is concerned with that this project will impact and J. Gaddy replied by saying that he is concerned with the cumulative effect of Cobblestone, so he would like to see a replanting plan of what will be left after construction of this project. C. Mason said that the PB could require special glass in order to make the reflection as seen from the lake less offensive. H. Caldwell said that the applicant will have a wall of glass measuring 52 feet by 35 feet that is almost solid glass, so if it reflects out onto the lake it will just be a big flash out there. Gabriel Hodge presented photos to clarify the views from down below and from the house and said that (1) the middle of the house will be half covered with a screened porch which will create

some shade on the glass behind, (2) there is a deck that overhangs that will put the bottom level in shade and the bottom level is also partially obscured by the nature of the site, (3) you can't see past the thick forested area between Cobblestone and 9N, so you couldn't see the house from anywhere other than Shelving Rock on the other side. Further discussion ensued about screening from the lake.

H. Caldwell asked what color the window frames would be and Gabriel Hodge said that the window frames would be a light gray aluminum and the glass would be coated to reduce glare. C. Mason said that there are concerns in avoiding reflection from the sun as well as visibility of the proposed house from the lake at night. Gabriel Hodge said that he doesn't think anyone will be able to see this house from the lake at night given the dense trees that screen it. H. Koster asked why the client would want so much glass on the lake side if they don't have a view of the lake and Gabriel Hodge said it is so the clients can get the open feel of being in the woods.

H. Koster asked where the third floor sliders go. Gabriel Hodge approached the PB bench to explain and said that (1) they are basically windows and there are guardrails on the inside of the room that span all the way across, so there would be a guardrail in front of you before you even open the glass doors. P. Kenyon said that her understanding from the Warren County Building Codes Dept. is that if you do have sliders you do have to have some type of landing outside. H. Koster asked if the applicant is sure it meets NYS code and Gabriel Hodge said he is not 100% positive, but he is pretty sure—he'll look into it.

J. Gaddy said that (1) there is a lot of glass here and he (Gaddy) is not going to want to give an approval on something that somehow gets mistranslated, (2) the applicants have a plan here—they have a lot of work to do and he would like to have the applicants come back after they have their work done, so the PB can see what trees are doing well and then see how to replant it. Atty. Lapper said that they are agreeable to that. H. Koster said that the PB would like to see less glass on the lake side and Atty. Lapper replied by saying that (1) they would rather do trees to screen it because they would like to keep the proposed design and (2) he likes the idea of coming back after their work is done to discuss a replanting plan. H. Koster said that the PB is going to give them a fair warning that any of these mature trees that are taken out, the PB is no longer going to ask for replanting of 4-5 foot trees, but the PB will ask for replanting of something complimentary to it. Tom Hutchins said that with some snowmelt, they will be able to better see the situation and will protect as many trees as possible. Gabriel Hodge said that if the trees are of size, they could mitigate it with a stone well around the tree to keep the regrading away from it.

S. Aldrich asked about louvered panels being used for screening and reduction of glare at night. Atty. Lapper said that this project is further into the hillside.

J. Gaddy asked about proposed colors and Gabriel Hodge said that it is basically cedar stain with an earth tone color so that it is of the same value of the cedar forest and the garage will be mason, neutral tone, natural coloration, middle grays. J. Gaddy asked

about exterior lighting and Gabriel Hodge said that he doesn't think they'll have any other than soffit lighting at the entryways and they might want to do a couple on the driveways which would be low cut-off lighting.

C. Mason asked for dimension on the second floor glass and Gabriel Hodge said that it is 11 feet floor to ceiling; it is floor to ceiling in the middle level and about knee height on the upper floor. H. Koster asked about the glass on the ground floor and Gabriel Hodge said it is 8 feet, so the total glass for the structure is 8 feet, 11 feet, 8 feet of glass. H. Koster said he doesn't think it is unreasonable to ask the applicant to cut down on the amount of glass--there is no viable reason to have 11 feet of glass on one floor in this area. S. Aldrich asked if it is the county building code that limits the amount of glass facing the lake and H. Koster said that the Bolton PB used to arbitrarily use a percentage figure facing the lake, but it was not written anywhere and that figure used to be 30%. S. Aldrich said that she would like to see less glass on all three levels, as it is a huge amount of glass facing the lake. Atty. Lapper said that they will have to go talk to the owners regarding the PB's concerns. H. Caldwell said that the glass doesn't bother him if the trees are there. Atty. Lapper said that he thinks the owners would be more receptive to planting as opposed to cutting down on the amount of glass.

Gabriel Hodge said that the directive they got from Dan Lewis today was that he agrees to any reasonable condition on replanting and maintenance as a first offering before conceding on architectural integrity and (2) he (Hodge) thinks you'd be hard pressed to see this house from the lake and feels it will have far less impact than the PB thinks. H. Koster said that (1) the normal door height is between 6 foot 8 inches to 6 foot 10 inches—to have 8 feet is beyond that and to have 11 feet is almost ridiculous and (2) he doesn't think the PB is asking for too much to cut down on the glass.

H. Caldwell asked about the heat inside when the leaves are on the trees and Gabriel Hodge said that (1) there will only be some light bouncing into the house from the east and (2) once the sun moves into early afternoon and later in the day it is shielded by the tree cover to the south. H. Caldwell asked about sun on glass in winter regarding reflecting off the snow and Gabriel Hodge said that during the winter there won't be much at all because the sun rises south due east—maybe an hour or hour and a half.

**Motion by** John Gaddy to table the application pending additional information as follows:

- 1) New plans are to be submitted showing a reduction in glass.

**Seconded by** Chauncey Mason. **All in favor. Motion Carried.**

**12) SPR07-57 DJMD BOLTON NY, LLC (Daniel Lewis, Managing Partner).**

Represented by Peter L. Gluck and Partners, Architects. Seeks to amend previously approved application (SPR08-18) approved by the PB on 11/16/06 for a new land use within 250' of the Lake George Shoreline and major stormwater project. Specifically to reconfigure the main house and recreation building and to reconfigure the

stormwater controls. Section 156.20, Block 1, Lot 39, Zone RCM1.3. Property Location: 5274 Lake Shore Drive. The WCPB determined no county impact. Subject to SEQR.

Peter L. Gluck, representing DJMD Bolton NY, LLC (Daniel Lewis, Managing Partner), gave an overview and said that (1) the basic idea of the project is to mitigate the impact of the buildings on the premises, (2) they believe the building has less impact than when it was first presented to the PB, (3) they had gone to the ZBA because they made a change in the width of one of the buildings-- a change they made in an effort to make the project better.

H. Koster asked if this now conforms to the Town of Bolton Zoning requirements and Peter Gluck said yes.

Peter Gluck explained the changes made and said that (1) they had a large cut and changing of grade in the recreation building which they made much smaller, (2) they cut down the impact of second-story buildings, (3) there is more space between the buildings to break up the visual from the lake, (4) they are demolishing and filling the existing boathouse, (5) the proposed new boat house has been made smaller and (6) the height of some of the buildings are lower in switching from a pitched roof to a flat roof. Peter Gluck then clarified the changes by pointing them out on the model.

H. Caldwell asked why the change was made from the pitched roofs to flat roofs and Peter Gluck said that the water run-off is decreased and the flat green roofs will be able to be occupied.

S. Aldrich asked if the footprints have expanded with the reduction of the roof heights and Peter Gluck said that the recreation-building footprint has increased slightly, but it is an underground increase.

H. Caldwell asked if the stormwater has changed and Peter Gluck said yes, they fine-tuned the whole system, which has been back through the whole process.

S. Aldrich requested the original and the new models be put side by side to see the changes. Peter Gluck accommodated the request and pointed out the changes made on the models.

H. Koster asked if the driveway to the guesthouse facing the neighbors' was discussed with the ZBA and Peter Gluck said that is not what they (the ZBA) were concerned with. S. Aldrich said that she likes it better and Peter Gluck said that it is better.

S. Aldrich asked if the stormwater has changed significantly and Tom Jarrett said no, they modified a couple of the basin locations and increased several of them slightly in size to accommodate the increased footprint, but basically the concept stays the same and it didn't change materially. Peter Gluck said that (1) he thinks the stormwater run-off will

be less with the flat roofs and (2) there is ledge all over the site currently that they will be replacing with green planting and 8 inches of soil.

J. Gaddy asked if it meets all of P. Kenyon's requirements. P. Kenyon said (1) yes, to the best of her knowledge and (2) the excavator was on site about a week ago, put one load of stone down, she contacted him and he instantly stopped and the equipment was moved off site, so she asked if the office should proceed with a violation—she doesn't think they need to continue with any violation. H. .Koster said no, there is no need to proceed with any violations.

WCPB determined no County impact.

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

P. Kenyon said there was no reply from the Bolton Fire Dept. on this project.

J. Gaddy 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 constitutes 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 stream bank erosion and will not pollute Lake George, its tributaries or streams with run-off.

**Motion by** John Gaddy to accept the application as complete, waive a public hearing, and grant approval as presented. All conditions set forth by the Planning Board on November 16, 2006 when approving SPR06-18 continue to apply. 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.**

**13) SPR07-07 CEVASCO, MATTHEW & KRISTINE.** Represented by Bruce Mowery. In accordance with Section 125.13C1 of the stormwater regulations, seek Type II Site Plan Review to remove more than 15,000 sq. ft. of vegetation. 27,616 sq. ft is proposed. Section 199.08, Block 1, Lot 10.5, Zones RL3. Property Location: 45 Deer Creek Road of Coolidge Hill Road and being lot 5 of the Deer Creek Subdivision. Subject to SEQR.

Kathy Suozzo of Deleware Engineering, representing Matthew and Kristine Cevasco, gave an overview and said that (1) the project started as a minor stormwater, but due to the addition of the garage it was changed to a major stormwater, (2) they have used the Town of Bolton requirements to design the stormwater, (3) the infiltration basins are designed as dry ponds that will contain at least a 25-year storm, (4) the interesting thing about the site is that the existing logging road was put to re-use for the entrance to the facility, so the overall imperviousness of the site went from 5.5% to 8%, (5) Town Engineer Tom Nace approved the stormwater plan and (6) there are small wetlands on a very small portion of the property and all activities are at least 100 feet from the wetlands.

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

J. Gaddy 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 constitutes 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 stream bank erosion and will not pollute Lake George, its tributaries or streams with run-off.

**Motion by** John Gaddy to accept the application as complete, waive a public hearing and based on approvals from Town Engineer, Tom Nace, 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** Chauncey Mason. **All in favor. Motion Carried.**

**14) SPR07-05 BECKER, DAVID & MARIA.** Represented by Chuck Moody. As conditions of approval set forth by the Planning Board on June 24, 1993, when approving the Forbidden Forest Subdivision (SD88-22), seeks Type II Site Plan Review. 1) To remove vegetation. 2) Site specific review for the construction of a single-family dwelling, stormwater controls & septic system. Section 156.00, Block 2, Lot 46, Zone RL3. Property Location: Lot 1 of Forbidden Forest, North Bolton Rd. Subject to SEQR. Subject to WCPB Review.

J. Gaddy asked if the applicant has seen the original approval, then read the approval into the record. David Becker said that he knows of the restrictions of the initial approval and they coincide with what he has on the mylar. J. Gaddy asked if they have a clearing plan

and David Becker said that the clearing plan is just to clear as many trees as they need for the driveway and the house as indicated on the map—they are trying to keep the disturbance minimal.

H. Koster asked if the applicant has seen Town Engineer Tom Nace's letter and David Becker said no. H. Koster said that the letter says that: (1) basically the applicant has everything adequately addressed except that the line along the flow arrows south of the driveway should be labeled as a swale on the drawings, (2) the silt fence details were provided, but location of where silt fence is to be installed should also be shown on the site plan, (3) he (Nace) requests the septic system be labeled as a shallow septic as required by the subdivision drawings and (4) all other comments were adequately addressed.

J. Gaddy said that all exterior lighting should be shielded and downward facing and David Becker agreed.

P. Kenyon said that she would like the PB to discuss the planting plan. J. Gaddy said that it is obvious that with construction the applicant will have to take down trees to be able to get the building in there, (2) the PB is trying to keep the roads as wooded as possible, (3) he would like to see the applicant come back to have a planting plan once he has an idea of what he has. David Becker said that they have a good idea of what their plan is and Carol Monassa said that (1) they have a phased planting program to acknowledge the fact that saplings will have a better chance of growth after removal than they do under the canopy of some diseased and damaged trees that are there now first, then they will identify selective species that will fill in areas that they need to protect from erosion (septic field, the house itself, etc.), (3) they want to focus on the northeastern hardwoods and anything that is vigorous, hardy and sturdy that would not be subject to damaging winds and would not pose a threat of damaging the structure and (4) for ground cover they would look for something that is low growing that would grow back each year. J. Gaddy said it sounds good. H. Koster asked when they plan to come in with the planting plan and Carol Monassa said that they can submit the plan as she briefly described it anytime within the next day or two then come back with a more detailed plan when they are before the PB again. J. Gaddy asked what the proposed schedule is and David Becker said they hope to break ground this spring and to complete it by the end of 2007, if possible.

H. Koster asked if there are power lines parallel to Padanarum Road and David Becker said that there is a power line that comes in and a power line on there, but there are no power lines parallel to there—they come across Padanarum Road and kind of hit one corner of his property. H. Koster asked if that whole strip area parallel to Padanarum Road is already cleared now and David Becker said yes, it is partially cleared.

WCPB determined 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 Henry Caldwell** to accept the application as complete, waive a public hearing, and grant approval as presented with the following condition:

1) The required planting plan is to be submitted no later than April 5, 2007, to be heard at the April 19<sup>th</sup> Planning Board Meeting. Failure to submit the plan will result in stop work orders being issued. **Seconded by John Gaddy. All in favor. Motion Carried.**

**15) Cossman, Peter & Barbara.** Seeks to discuss map note on the Keissling subdivision plat (SD02-11) approved by the Planning Board on August 22, 2002. The condition reads as follows: Neither Lot #1 or Lot #2 will be allowed to further subdivide. Section 171.11, Block 2, Lot 13, Zone RCM1.3. Property Location: 5078 Lake Shore Drive.

Peter Cossman gave an overview and said that (1) when the subdivision was done the approximate property size was 3.5 acres, (2) there were three chalets and a large house known as High Point on the property along with a small cottage above that, (3) that subdivision was approved on the condition that the Keisslings would connect two of their cottages to combine them into one, which resulted in the Keisslings giving up 9/10s of an acre and these applicants having more than 2.6 acres, (4) note 11 on the subdivision map says no further subdivision, (5) they (the Cossmans) decided to build another house on their property and to do so they would have to eliminate the existing cottage on the property, (6) they are interested in looking into the possibility of subdividing an acre lot from their property which would result in them having two lots—one consisting of 1.6 acres and one consisting of 1.0 acres, (7) there would be no increase in density and all of the requirements of the ordinance would be met and (8) the neighbors have no objections to this proposal--a copy of the letter to that effect has been given to the PB.

H. Caldwell asked if P. Kenyon has a copy of the condition of approval from those meeting minutes and P. Kenyon said that in researching it, it seems as though it wasn't a condition of approval, but a map note that the Keisslings put on the map themselves, which is why she recommended the applicant go to them for their approval. H. Caldwell said that he saw that the PB made a recommendation to the ZBA that they put that condition on and P. Kenyon said yes, that is correct, but the ZBA never put that condition on.

H. Koster asked if the ZBA put the conditions on and P. Kenyon said no and added that the Keisslings got a variance for Lot 2, which is .9 acres, but she is not sure how to deal with the subdivision even though the Cossmans' lots are conforming--she needs to research it further. H. Koster said that it seems the PB gave a motion for a variance and this is part of the whole project and now it is coming back to the PB, but it is part of a variance application, so he believes it should go back to the ZBA first. P. Kenyon said she would put it on the next ZBA agenda. H. Caldwell asked if it is in the minutes that the Keisslings agreed to putting the condition on and P. Kenyon said no, she is speculating, but she thinks the Keisslings put that there as a result of the recommendation from the PB to the ZBA. David Becker said that in speaking with the Keisslings, his

impression is that their understanding was that the ZBA was concerned with density. H. Caldwell said he is wondering if the deal for no further subdivision was based on approving the variance for the Keislings. H. Koster again said that the matter should go back to the ZBA for their opinion.

Peter Cossman said that (1) the issue they are raising is that if they are allowed to put up another house, they either end up with two houses on one big piece of property or two houses on two separate pieces of property and (2) if they put the house on the upper level, the overall impervious cover would be reduced. H. Koster said that he doesn't have anything against the applicants' project, but he doesn't think the PB has the authority to make a decision on it—it has to go to the ZBA.

**Motion by John Gaddy to forward the request to the ZBA for their input. Seconded by Sandi Aldrich. All in favor. Motion Carried.**

**16) SD07-01 LAVOY, GARY & ANNEGRET.** Represented by Kyle LaVoy. Seeks lot line adjustment between those parcels designated as Section 186.06, Block 1, Lots 2 & 1.2. Zone RM1.3. Property Location: 4767 Lake Shore Drive. Subject to SEQR. *Note: This application is in conjunction with V07-05 for deficient density on 186.00-1-2, for which a variance was granted on February 26, 2007.*

Kyle LaVoy gave an overview and said that (1) they are seeking approval for a lot line adjustment and (2) there are northern and southern pieces of property where the southern property has a right-of-way over the northern property of about 12 feet by 100 feet and this lot line adjustment would negate the need for the right-of-way.

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

**Motion by Sandi Aldrich to accept the application as a completed sketch plan, convert the sketch plan to final plat, waive a public hearing and grant approval as presented. Seconded by Chauncey Mason. All in favor. Motion Carried.**

**17) SD07-07, BIXBY III, WILLIAM.** Seeks to amend previously approved plat SD96-04 approved by the Planning Board on July 25, 1996. Specifically to merge those parcels designated as Section 156.00, Block 1, Lots 70.3 & 70.4 and then subdivide into 3 parcels. Zones RL3 & LC25. Minor Subdivision. Sketch Plan Review. Subject to SEQR. Property Location: County Route 11.

This item was not heard by the Planning Board as a variance will be required.

Meeting adjourned at 10:08 pm.

Respectfully submitted by  
Jennifer Torebka  
Recording Secretary

03/30/07