

Village of Lansing  
Planning Board Meeting  
Tuesday, January 29, 2019

The meeting of the Village of Lansing Planning Board was called to order at 7:01PM by Chair, Lisa Schleelein.

Present at the meeting: Planning Board Members; Lisa Schleelein, Mike Baker, Carolyn Greenwald, Jim McCauley, Monica Moll, and Alternate Member, Anthony Ingraffea; Code Enforcement Officer, Mike Scott; Village Attorney, William Troy; Village Engineer, Brent Cross; Village Trustee Liaison, John O'Neill; and additional people including; Ralph Varn of Starland Builders, LLC; Josh Stafford of Finger Lakes Tram; Crystal Fan, Yadong Wang; Phil Maguire of Maguire Family Limited Partnership; George Turner of Saratoga Associates; and Tom Schickel of Schickel Architecture.

**Public Comment Period**

Schleelein opened the public comment period.

With no one wishing to speak, Greenwald moved to close the public comment period. Seconded by McCauley.

Ayes by: Schleelein, Baker, Greenwald, McCauley, and Moll.

**Continue Public Hearing for the Final Plat Application for Subdivision #4229 proposed by Starland Builders, LLC.**

The applicants are seeking approval for a 3 parcel subdivision on 1510 East Shore Drive (Tax Parcel #42.1-1-46.11) in order to build (2) residential homes with walkout basement apartments. The proposed 2 lots will be located on the eastern portion of the existing 11.851 acres. Lot 1 will be 6.986 acres (Existing house), Lot 2 will be 2.103 acres and Lot 3 will be 2.828 acres.

Schleelein opened the conversation and stated there were no neighbors of this location in attendance however, we have heard their concerns at previous meetings. She said not all obligations and provisions of a subdivision have been fulfilled and advised what is still required to proceed. Troy said this proposal will need to be tabled until the next meeting, which will be held on February 11, 2019. Varn asked for the Public Hearing to be closed. Schleelein advised that the Public Hearing will remain open, however it would not slow the process.

Cross read through and explained additional observations and recommendation he would like to be taken into consideration of the final plat.

**VILLAGE OF LANSING**  
**ENGINEER'S REPORT**

**DATE:** January 29, 2019

**TO:** Planning Board

**FROM:** Brent A. Cross, Village Engineer

**RE:** 3 Lot Subdivision, 1510 E. Shore Drive

**NOTE:** I have reviewed the Final Subdivision Plat map as prepared by T.G. Miller, PC, dated 11/21/18 for the above referenced project. I have the following observations and comments:

47 (note: a number of the comments below result in the recommendation of additional notations on  
48 the final subdivision plat for the purposes of a "warning" to the perspective buyers of unique  
49 aspects of the sale of these properties that may become the obligation of the future owner)  
50

- 51 1. The project involves the subdivision of the existing 11.851 tax parcel 42.1-1-46.11 with  
52 existing residence into 3 lots as follows:

53  
54 Lot #1 will be 5.920 acres and include the existing residence and a "flagpole" section that has  
55 frontage of 60.64' on NYS Route 34.

56  
57 Lot #2 will be 2.103 acres of vacant land with no frontage on public ROW. A driveway would  
58 need to be accessed from the "flagpole" belonging to Lot #1.

59  
60 Lot #3 will be a total of 2.828 acres of vacant land, but approximately ¼ of the land is  
61 occupied by an existing man-made pond that takes up the entire frontage of the lot along  
62 NYS Route 34, with only access from the "flagpole" belonging to Lot #1.  
63

- 64 2. The access to Lots #2 & #3 will be subject to an easement agreement with Lot #1. I am not  
65 sure of the legal form of this agreement, but as a minimum, it should be identified as such on  
66 the final subdivision plat.

67 Troy expressed his concern that the two lots could be landlocked and stated an easement could not be  
68 granted with the same owner as it would be granted at the time of a new buyer.

- 69  
70 3. I am unaware of the history of the pond along the NYS Route 34 frontage (of current lot), but  
71 I suspect that it was built by NYSDOT for highway run-off purposes. The  
72 ownership/maintenance of this facility should be researched and officially acknowledged on  
73 this subdivision plat.

74 Varn said the pond does not seem to have any function. Wang stated he thought the pond may have  
75 served a purpose for the farm that was previously there.

- 76  
77 4. Since no municipal sewer service is available to this property, the two new lots will need  
78 Tompkins County Health Department approval of an Onsite Wastewater Treatment System  
79 (septic). This should be noted on the final subdivision plat.

80 Varn asked if this would be part of the building permit process and suggested this would be the  
81 responsibility of a realtor.

- 82  
83 5. Since all three lots will be greater than 1 acre, the future development of the two vacant lots  
84 will result in an unknown land disturbance area. Therefore, the developer either needs to  
85 provide stormwater management plans that can be filed with the subdivision plat, or a  
86 notation needs to be added to the final subdivision plat that the future owner/developer of  
87 each lot is responsible to provide a stormwater pollution prevention plan at the time of  
88 building permit, and depending on the area of disturbance, may be subject to submission of a  
89 Full Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan to the NYSDEC for coverage under the NYS SPDES

90                                    *Permit for General Construction Activities. The review of each SWPPP is subject to approval*  
91                                    *of the Village's Stormwater Management Officer.*

92

93 Cross stated he was uncertain if this would be a requirement of the subdivision owner and said he would  
94 discuss these concerns with the owners if they would like.

95

96 The Public Hearing was left open.

97

98 **Continued Public Hearing for Special Permit #4233 Proposed by Finger Lakes Tram LLC.**

99 The applicants are seeking approval for installing an approximately 200 ft. long Tram system which  
100 includes a hoist drum/frame and cabin to hold up to 4 people. The Tram, located at 1510 East Shore Drive  
101 (Tax Parcel #42.1-1-46.11), will run from the existing home down to the shore level of Cayuga Lake.

102

103 Schleelein stated there was information that Scott received from Finger Lakes Tram regarding an  
104 archaeological report of Bolton Estates and it did not seem there were any significant issues. She felt  
105 everything had been tested and there were no findings. Schleelein referred to Planning Board minutes of  
106 May 29, 2007, set out here:

107

108 **Public Hearing – Bolton Estate Subdivision – Continuation:**

109 *Hickey stated that the Planning Board is continuing the Public Hearing on the Preliminary Plat Approval of the*  
110 *Bolton Estate Subdivision, a major subdivision by Edward Crossmore dividing one 128.1 acre lot into 21 building lots*  
111 *for one and two family homes and residual land to be dedicated for recreation and infrastructure. **The parcel is***  
112 ***located on the west side of East Shore Drive just north of 1510 East Shore Drive in the Low Density***  
113 ***Residential District, Tax Parcel No. 42.1-1-37.2.***

114

115 *Hickey stated there has not been much change but information has been received from the Public Archaeology*  
116 *Facility for archeological artifacts. In an e-mail from Chris Hohman to Andy Sciarabba dated 5/25/07, **he stated***  
117 ***the testing was completed by digging of pits within the project area and no historic or prehistoric sites***  
118 ***were found.*** *Hickey stated this will now allow the Planning Board to complete the SEQRA review.*

119

120 *Dubow stated the Board must complete Section 12, Part 2 on Page 16 of 21 which is for historical and archeological*  
121 *resources. Hickey stated the Board originally checked small to moderate impact and requested a survey be*  
122 ***completed. This has now been completed and nothing was found so the impact should reflect none.***  
123 *Dubow stated it is up to the Planning Board to determine if this e-mail indicating nothing was found is sufficient*  
124 *with the condition imposed that the report be presented to the Board when it becomes available. **Board***  
125 ***members agreed to mark Section 12 as none. This completes the SEQRA form.***

126

127 Scott stated there were core samples taken from an area that contained the Wang's property and the  
128 results found there were negative archaeological impact. Scott distributed pictures received from Finger  
129 Lakes Tram of the actual site. Scott read a portion of the Planning Board minutes of May 29, 2007  
130 which stated that due to these findings the Board members agreed to mark Section 12 as "none".

131

132 Schleelein read a letter from the County Department of Planning;

133

134 *January 25, 2019*

135 *Michael Scott, Code, Zoning And Stormwater Management Officer*

136 *Village of Lansing*

137 *2405 N. Triphammer Road*

138 *Ithaca, NY, 14850*

139 *Re: Review Pursuant to §239 -1, -m and -n of the New York State General Municipal Law*

140 *Action: Special Use Permit for Proposed Tram at 1510 East Shore Drive, Village of Lansing Tax Parcel #42.1-1-*

141 *46.11, Yadong Wang, Owner/Applicant, Finger Lakes Tram, Agent.*

142

143 *Dear Mr. Scott:*

144

145 *This letter acknowledges your referral of the proposal identified above for review and comment by the Tompkins*  
146 *County Department of Planning & Sustainability pursuant to §239 - 1, -m and - n of the New York State General*  
147 *Municipal Law. The Department has reviewed the proposal, as submitted, and has determined that it may have*  
148 *negative inter-community, or county-wide impacts as described below. We recommend modification of the*  
149 *proposal. If the Board does not incorporate the recommendations, such approval will require a vote of a super*  
150 *majority (meaning a majority plus one) of all members of the decision-making body.*

151

152 *Recommended Modifications*

153

154 • *We note that the proposed tram is located within the Lake Cliff, South of Portland Point Unique Natural Area*  
155 *(UNA-64). The description of this UNA is attached and states that it was established in part to the presence of rare*  
156 *or scarce plants including locally scarce bladdernut, hackberry and ninebark. We recommend the Village require the*  
157 *applicant to avoid adverse impact to these species as a condition of the special use permit.*

158

159 • *The location of the proposed tram is identified in the Tompkins County Scenic Resources Inventory as a*  
160 *Distinctive View. To reduce adverse aesthetic impacts, we recommend the Village require the proposed tram be*  
161 *painted in colors that will blend in with the landscape.*

162

163 *Please inform us of your decision so that we can make it a part of the record.*

164

165 *Sincerely,*

166 *Katherine Borgella, AICP*

167 *Commissioner of Planning and Sustainability*

168

169 Schleelein stated she would like to take the issue of the plants seriously and have it resolved. Stafford  
170 said they have reached out to the US Fish and Wildlife, and Cornell Cooperative Extension, and have not  
171 found any survey of existing plants on the property, nor any evidence of endangered species in the region.  
172 Schleelein asked what the color of the tram would be. Stafford said they use a very brown earthy color  
173 as they find that color blends in very well with the environment. O'Neill asked about the issue of  
174 crossing the railroad tracks. Schleelein stated the railroad is not a County concern, nor the Planning

175 Boards requirement, however the owners should be mindful and obtain permission from the railroad and  
176 have the railroad grant permission to cross. Troy expressed his concerns to the owners they should know  
177 their rights before building and stated the railroad can be very aggressive. There was continued  
178 conversation regarding the rights of the railroad.

179

180 Cross read through a list of his observations and comments of the plans by Finger Lakes Tram:

181

182

**VILLAGE OF LANSING**  
**ENGINEER'S REPORT**

183

184 **DATE:** January 29, 2019

185 **TO:** Planning Board

186 **FROM:** Brent A. Cross, Village Engineer

187 **RE:** Tram, 1510 E. Shore Drive

188 **NOTE:** I have reviewed the plans by Finger Lakes Tram LLC, dated 10/29/18 for the above referenced  
189 project. I have the following observations and comments:

190

191 .1. The project involves the installation of a structural railway system for the support of a carriage to traverse  
192 the steep slope between the house (at the top) and the lake access (at the bottom).

193

194 .2. The railway system will occupy part of the slope that is located within the unique natural area(s) as  
195 identified by Tompkins County Planning Department, which has special requirements for sensitive  
196 environmental conditions.

197

198 .3. The installation of the railway system on the steep slope requires special construction methods for limited  
199 access (from top only) as well as the requirement for the construction process to minimize the impacts to  
200 the land and surrounding features.

201

202 .4. The plans for the tram profile do not include a known scale, and therefore I am unable to determine the  
203 height of the individual supports columns. From the photographs that I have seen, I estimate that the height  
204 of this rail system is as much a 25' above the ground at its steepest point.

205

206 .5. Do we know if the property owner has legal rights to cross the RR tracks at the bottom of the tram? (I would  
207 be surprised if they do). If not, then this seems to be a project that could have an impact on the local  
208 environmental features that does not otherwise have a purpose.

209 Troy asked how high the tram would be. Stafford did not believe it would be as high as 25'. He also said  
210 it would all be in the same color and he could bring an example. There was conversation regarding colors  
211 used and Cross's suggestions of using galvanized or dull/mill finishes as they weather nicely.

212

213 Schleelein advised the Public Hearing would stay open and asked the owners if they would be notifying  
214 the Railroad. Wang said he would reach out to their attorney. Greenwald offered them a contact that she  
215 knows that may be a neighbor in the shoreline and suggested they could reach out to them as they may  
216 have had the same concerns with the railroad.

217

218 **Public Hearing for Special Permit #4242 Proposed by Maguire Nissan of Ithaca.**

219 The proposed project will include development of 35 Cinema Drive (Tax Parcel # 46.-1-6-5.1) which is a  
220 4-acre commercial property consisting of an existing Chevrolet Cadillac dealership, and a presented new  
221 Nissan dealership. The proposed action includes: construction of a two story, 25,235 Sq.Ft. (Gross Floor  
222 Area) sales and service building with associated parking; public water, sewer and electrical services;  
223 pedestrian and vehicular circulation; site lighting and signage; retaining wall; fence screening;  
224 landscaping; and improvements to existing curb cuts along Cinema Drive and Uptown Road.

225

226 George Turner, of Saratoga Associates, representing Nissan Maguire introduced himself, and thanked the  
227 Board for this opportunity and said they were excited to work with the Village on their project. He then  
228 introduced Phil Maguire, of Maguire Family Limited Partnership, and Tom Schickel, of Schickel  
229 Architecture.

230

231 Turner presented power-point presentation.

232

233 Maguire stated they have been a family business for 42 years and own 18 franchises and have been  
234 attempting to expand in the Ithaca area. He said in the past few years they have acquired and purchased  
235 the parcel on which the Chevrolet/Cadillac Cooke Dealership is located and would like to expand that  
236 location by moving their Nissan dealership next to the existing dealership. He said they are under time  
237 constraints as they are rebuilding their Ford franchise which now houses Nissan. Maguire continued to  
238 explain the Maguire business and said they would like to do long term investments in the Village and are  
239 very open minded to what would work best for the Village.

240

241 Turner proceeded through the presentation and said the three abutting land owners had been notified but  
242 were unable to attend this meeting. He explained the existing Chevrolet/Cadillac dealership site and  
243 stated they did their research on the State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR) and cultural resources.  
244 He mentioned the wet zones and wetlands and said there is not much significance in that area. Turner  
245 showed a diagram of the existing dealership and one with the added Nissan dealership. He said the  
246 Nissan dealership would be condensed into the existing dealership and stated the primary entrance would  
247 be on Uptown Road with a service entrance on Cinema Drive. He spoke of what is in existence now and  
248 what would be added, which he said would bring improvements to that location. Turner said he would  
249 like to come up with the needed variances for site plans and recommendations regarding the buffering and  
250 setbacks. They would like to get this project moving quickly and said they would meet with the Planning  
251 Board as many times as needed to meet the requirements.

252

253 Turner continued through the presentation and showed examples of what the required site signage would  
254 be and what would be adequately sized for the view from Route 13 and Uptown Road. He spoke of the  
255 parking and maintenance areas, grading, stormwater design, and how they would want to tap into the  
256 public water and sewer. He said the landscaping/planting design will be mostly on Uptown Road and an  
257 8 foot high stockade fence would separate Gaslight Village and the Nissan dealership to provide a buffer.

258

259 Turner talked about the lighting levels as they would increase on the property lines, however, they would  
260 have light reduction at night hours. Overall they are looking to have a very nice visual. Moll asked if the

261 Nissan sign would be lit. Turner said the sign would be internally lit but not flashing. Schickel explained  
262 the sign to be a translucent panel where the light would illuminate the letters. Schleelein said that the  
263 lighting would have to go through the Lighting Commission. There was continued conversation  
264 regarding the lighting.

265

266 Schickel explained the interior floor plan of the first and second floors and how the building would face.  
267 He stated this dealership would be a car dealership with service bays, however it would not have a body  
268 shop. He expressed how crucial the signage would be as it sets back from the highway and there is not  
269 much visibility. Moll asked if the lights would be lit by spot lights. Schickel answered there would be no  
270 spot lights and explained what the Code allowed. He showed a diagram of where the preowned vehicles  
271 would be staged versus the new vehicles and where electric charging stations would be located.  
272 Schleelein asked if any of the signs would rotate. Schickel said no.

273

274 Baker asked about signs being attached to the building versus free standing. There was continued  
275 conversation regarding the sizes of the sign, free standing signs, if the parcel is in a planned sign area, and  
276 directional signage. It was expressed that the most critical signage would be the front three signs and a  
277 pylon sign on the west side of the driveway near the road entrance. Schickel said the Nissan logo would  
278 be a canopy, not a sign. Greenwald asked Scott what the total amount of signs are per building. Scott  
279 said he would double check but believed it to be 100 sq. ft., and he would also confirm this area is not in a  
280 planned sign area. Greenwald said there is a section in the Code book on car dealerships and planned  
281 signage.

282

283 Schleelein asked about the two curb cuts on Cinema Drive. Schickel said the two curb cuts would remain  
284 however they would be moving them. They would have two curb cuts each on Uptown Road and Cinema  
285 Drive. There was continued conversation regarding curb cuts.

286

287 Schleelein expressed there could be concerns with the interaction with Gas Light Village and the  
288 proposed fence, and trees killed due to the fence. She also asked about snow removal given the tight  
289 setbacks proposed. Maguire said they move every vehicle to plow and can stage cars at other locations if  
290 needed. He said they are used to plowing in tight areas and, if needed, they would haul the snow offsite.

291

292 Baker asked if they intend to disturb the current buffer. Turner said no and explained. He said they are  
293 hoping to go through the SEQR and would like recommendations on the buffer. Schickel said he  
294 previously walked the premises with Adam Robbs and Mario Tomei and reviewed the cutbacks and  
295 vegetation. Schleelein expressed concern if the residential side would be disturbed. Schickel said it  
296 would be an improvement to the area and would add additional lighting. There was expressed concern of  
297 the lighting being intrusive to the neighbors.

298

299 Schleelein asked if any of the owners of the abutting properties responded to their mailings and provided  
300 any input. Turner said they have not received anything. Greenwald thought it would be the landlord not  
301 the tenants that were advised, where the landlord might not be as concerned.

302

303 Schleelein asked about the parking lot. Turner said it currently is gravel.

304

305 Cross handed out a list of his observations and comments regarding the parking lot being gravel where it  
306 was previously suggested for overflow parking and not designed for a redeveloped lot.

307

308

**VILLAGE OF LANSING**

309

**ENGINEER'S REPORT**

310 **DATE:** January 29, 2019

311 **TO:** Planning Board

312 **FROM:** Brent A. Cross, Village Engineer

313 **RE:** Maguire Nissan, 35 Cinema Drive

314 **NOTE:** I have reviewed the site improvement plans prepared by Saratoga Associates, dated 1/15/19 for  
315 the above referenced project. I have the following observations and comments:

316

317 .1. The project involves the construction of a new car dealership building and associate site improvements such  
318 as driveways, traffic circulation, parking, and display areas. The site is part of the tax parcel for the  
319 existing Maguire Chevrolet dealership.

320

321 .2. Driveway access to the new dealership is through a "curb-cut" along Uptown Road. The traffic aisles and  
322 circulation pattern appear to be acceptable. There is a secondary access to/from this facility through the  
323 back of the existing dealership parking lot and driveway on Cinema Drive.

324

325 .3. Almost the entire lot will be covered with impervious surfaces from both the roof and the new paved  
326 parking areas. This is a significant increase in run-off associated with the development of this property.  
327 Although the engineers have acknowledged the requirement for a stormwater management plan, they are  
328 proposing to take minimum measures as would be allowed by a "redevelopment project". Such a project  
329 reduces the stormwater regulations to 15% of that of a full SWPPP. Since this site is currently a vacant lot,  
330 with no buildings or pavement (entirely grass/gravel), it is my opinion that this site is not eligible for  
331 consideration as a redevelopment project. I recommend that the Village require that this project be subject  
332 to the requirements of a full SWPPP.

333

334 .4. There are utilities available to this site with the exception of the current moratorium on natural gas  
335 connections. I am not sure what their heating system plan, but I suspect that they have already taken the  
336 lack of gas service into account. One other utility that will need to have consideration is the new sewer  
337 service connection. The engineers shall submit an estimated water consumption to the Village of Cayuga  
338 Heights for determination of the required number of sewer units to be applied to this project.

339

340 .5. I presume that there are specific exterior lighting needs that they will have to provide a photometric plan for  
341 consideration by the Village's Lighting Commission.

342

343 There was conversation regarding the existing gravel parking lot and the fact that it will be replaced with  
344 asphalt and the impervious area will be significantly increased. Maguire explained how that parking area  
345 was used when it was owned by Cooke versus how it is being used now since the Maguire dealership has

346 acquired it. Schleelein said a full stormwater SWPPP addressing runoff should be required. Turner spoke  
347 of their design for stormwater and has a full Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). He said he  
348 would provide a summary of the green area and the area that will not be developed. Maguire added future  
349 improvements to the Chevrolet/Cadillac store could add improvements to the existing stormwater.

350

351 McCauley asked when they anticipated the renovations to the Chevrolet/Cadillac store. Maguire said  
352 they have just recently acquired the land so the intent is next year. Turner said they are on a real strict  
353 timeline however understands there are hurdles and would like this to be looked at as a whole site, not a  
354 subdivision, and advised if any additional information on the redevelopment is needed they would  
355 provide.

356

357 It was asked what the distance between the buildings would be. Turner said it would be approximately  
358 150 feet which allows significant buffering. He stated he understands this proposal will need to go in  
359 front of the Board of Zoning and Appeals (BZA) and asked for recommendations. Schickel asked if they  
360 needed to clear anything with the Planning Board regarding signage before going to the BZA. Scott said  
361 since the SEQR has been reviewed the process of the BZA could be pursued. There was conversation  
362 amongst everyone regarding the process.

363

364 Turner asked if the Public Hearing would remain open. Schleelein answered yes. Maguire said they  
365 could use this as an opportunity to reach out to the tenants of Gaslight Village to explain their project.

366

367 McCauley asked if there would be any loud speakers or amplified communication for the public to hear  
368 from the outside. Maguire said that could be optional, however most communication used is hand held  
369 ie., cell phones.

370

371 Ingraffea asked what the HVAC systems would be in the building. Schickel said propane tanks or  
372 electric. Schleelein mentioned there is a natural gas moratorium in the Village. Conversation on this  
373 topic continued.

374

375 Baker asked if they had a plan B if they did not get a variance on the setbacks. It was answered they did  
376 not have a plan B at this point.

377

378 Ingraffea asked if they would be installing any solar panels. It was answered not at this point but it could  
379 be a possibility in the design.

380

381 Scott said had recently heard from Scott Doyle from the County regarding the recommendations for the  
382 Nissan project regarding energy possibilities for the new building. This information was triggered by the  
383 GML-239 that was turned in last week. The recommendations are basically the same as the City's for the  
384 Maguire Ford Dealership in Ithaca. Maguire said that might be a great fit for this location.

385

386 Cross complimented their presentation and stated it was very clear.

387

388 Turner asked for recommendations for discussion with Gaslight Village and if there was anything they  
389 could do to help to move this forward.

390

391 Schleelein asked about noise and if there would be any overnight car deliveries. Maguire said, very  
392 rarely.

393

394 Schleelein said the BZA meets periodically and does not know when they will meet again. Turner asked  
395 if they should put in an application to meet with the BZA. Scott said he would provide them the  
396 information.

397

398 Schleelein asked if they would be coming back to the next Planning Board meeting. It was answered,  
399 yes.

400

401 **Approval of Minutes:**

402

403 **October 23, 2018:**

404 Moll moved to accept the minutes of October 23, 2018. Seconded by Baker;

405 Ayes by; Schleelein, Baker, Greenwald, McCauley, and Moll.

406 Nays: None:

407

408 **October 30, 2018:**

409 Baker moved to accept the minutes of October 30, 2018(as amended). Seconded by Moll;

410 Ayes by; Schleelein, Baker, Greenwald, McCauley, and Moll.

411 Nays: None:

412

413 **Other Business:**

414 Schleelein advised the Planning Board members of a New York State Planning Federation conference  
415 held in Lake George at Bolton Landing on April 30, 2019 and asked if anyone would be interested in  
416 attending.

417

418 Schleelein asked Troy if meeting minutes that were not listed on the agenda can be approved. Troy said it  
419 should not be an issue.

420

421 Ingraffea advised the members that the SEQR form has been recently updated.

422

423 Greenwald said she would not be in attendance at the February 11<sup>th</sup> Planning Board meeting and possibly  
424 the 26<sup>th</sup>. Baker said he would not be at the Board of Trustees meeting on March 4<sup>th</sup>. McCauley stated  
425 he would most likely miss both meetings in May.

426

427 **Adjournment**

428 Baker moved to adjourn at 9:46 PM. Seconded by Greenwald.

429 Ayes by: Schleelein, Baker, Greenwald, McCauley, and Moll.

430

431 Minutes taken by: Tammy Milliman, PT Clerk