

**Village of Lansing  
Planning Board Meeting  
April 25, 2006**

The meeting of the Village of Lansing Planning Board was called to order at 7:30 P.M. by Chairman Ned Hickey. Present at the meeting were Planning Board Members Doris Brown, Carol Klepack and Maria Stycos; Alternate Member Mario Tomei; Trustee Liaison Lynn Leopold; Attorney David Dubow; Engineer Brent Cross; Code Enforcement Officer Ben Curtis and members of the public.

Hickey appointed Alternate Member Mario Tomei to serve as an acting member tonight in place of absent member Phil Dankert.

- **Public Comment:**

Hickey opened the Public Comment period. As there was no one present who wished to speak, Stycos moved to close the Public Comment Period. Seconded by Klepack. Ayes by Brown, Klepack, Stycos and Tomei. Motion carried.

- **Public Hearing - Special Permit No. 2115 - Greenstate Properties Office Building:**

The first item on the agenda was a Public Hearing for Special Permit No. 2115, Greenstate Properties, to construct an 8,147 sf office building on parcel B of the subdivision of the lot formerly known as 2432 N. Triphammer Road in the Commercial Low Traffic District, Tax Parcel No. 43.1-1-43.1.

Rob Colbert of Greenstate Properties, the owner, stated that he was requesting a special permit approval for Phase II of the project he had begun with the Cardiology Associates Building. Colbert stated the Cardiology Building is currently under construction and is an 8000 sf one-story brick building. The Phase I approval for that building dealt with common elements such as driveways, drainage system, stormwater management, and landscaping. Tonight is for a review and approval of Building II which was shown schematically on the drawings for the Cardiology Building. Colbert stated the site plan has not changed since the Phase I proposal. The proposed building is similar to the first building and is an 8147 sf one-story brick building. It is slightly longer than the first building and the main entrance will be shifted more towards the center of the building. Parking complies with the requirements and this parcel is subdivided from the other. The first parcel will be owned by Cardiology Associates and the second parcel will be retained by Timemon Holding Company which is owned by Colbert.

Hickey opened the Public Hearing. As there was no one present who wished to speak, Klepack moved to close the Public Hearing. Seconded by Stycos. Ayes by Brown, Klepack, Stycos and Tomei. Motion carried.

Curtis stated for the records that he had received the required proof of mailings.

- Hickey noted that in the application letter, Paragraph 3 lists 42 parking spaces but he can only locate 35 spaces.. Colbert responded that there are 7 spaces in front of Ithaca Cardiology Associates which include 2 handicapped spaces. Cardiology Associates has been granted a non-exclusive right for these spaces. The spaces are floaters and will be used by both buildings. Colbert also stated that the spaces are drawn at 10 feet wide but the lot can be striped to meet the Village requirements of 9 feet and this will allow for another 4 spaces. In summary, the 7 spaces are intended to meet the off street parking requirement for the second building. Curtis stated the number of spaces for Building I was based upon the number of doctors and staff; the requirements for Building II are based on one space per 200sf of gross floor area. If Building II became a doctors office, the formula would change accordingly.

Klepack asked about road frontage. Curtis stated there is road frontage of 100 ft. for parcel B and 118 ft. for parcel A. Colbert stated there is a quit claim of record regarding the southerly line of parcel B which would increase its road frontage to 112 ft. rather than 100 ft. Dubow stated if the dimensions of parcel B have changed there should be filing of a new subdivision plat to reflect this.

Hickey stated Colbert will have to go before the BZA because Section 145-42(E)(4) of the Village of Lansing Code

requires that buildings in the CLT District along North Triphammer Road be constructed 25 feet from the road right-of-way. Hickey stated that when the Planning Board approved the first building it noted for the record that the second building was subject to these requirements unless a variance is granted. Colbert stated the driveway was redesigned based upon comments from the Planning Board for a more graceful entranceway. This more attractive entrance would not be possible if of the second building had to be moved to the 25 foot build-to line.

Next, Cross provided his engineering review. Cross stated the traffic circulation, parking and drainage were considered when the first building was reviewed. Cross stated the utilities are not shown on the drawings. Although there are services already on parcel A, there will need to be a pump system to get the sewerage up to the Village's gravity main on N. Triphammer Road. There will also be sewer permits required for both parcels from the Village of Cayuga Heights and estimates of water usage will be required to determine the number of sewer units needed. Colbert stated there was previously a sewer connection to the property. Curtis stated the lateral remains connected to the Village line. Cross again stated the number of units must be determined and calculations done as there will be two buildings rather than one and the size and intensity of use will be different. Curtis stated this could be resolved internally. Cross stated there are no details for the dumpster area and Colbert responded that the structure will be the duplicate of that for the other building and he will provide written details. Cross also noted that a Lighting Plan needs to be submitted for approval of the Lighting Commission and Colbert agreed to this.

Next, the Board did the SEQRA review. On Part A, number 8 should be answered "no" because a variance is required. Then the Board proceeded with Part II. Answers as follows: A - No; B - No; C1 - Drainage, flooding problems and surface or groundwater quality or quantity are subject to approval of the Village Engineer. C2 - None; C3 - None; C4 - None; C5 - None; C6 - None; C7 - None.

Leopold asked about Part A, number 10. Dubow stated that the BZA should be referenced pursuant to the response to Part A, number 8. Curtis made these changes to Part A, 8 & 10 and Colbert initialed the changes.

Stycos moved the following resolution, seconded by Tomei:

**VILLAGE OF LANSING PLANNING BOARD RESOLUTION FOR SEQR REVIEW OF SPECIAL PERMIT NO. 2115 ADOPTED ON APRIL 25, 2006**

**WHEREAS:**

- A. This matter involves consideration of the following proposed action: Special Permit 2115, Greenstate Properties, to construct an 8,147 square foot office building on parcel B of the subdivision of the lot formerly known as 2432 North Triphammer Road in the Commercial Low Traffic District, Tax Parcel No. 43.1-1-43.1; and
- B. This proposed action is an Unlisted Action for which the Village of Lansing Planning Board is an involved agency for the purposes of environmental review; and
- C. On April 25, 2006, the Village of Lansing Planning Board, in performing the lead agency function for its independent and uncoordinated environmental review in accordance with Article 8 of the New York State Environmental Conservation Law - the State Environmental Quality Review Act ("SEQR"), (i) thoroughly reviewed the Short Environmental Assessment Form (the "Short EAF"), Part I, and any and all other documents prepared and submitted with respect to this proposed action and its environmental review (including any Visual Environmental Assessment Form required), (ii) thoroughly analyzed the potential relevant areas of environmental concern to determine if the proposed action may have a significant adverse impact on the environment, including the criteria identified in 6 NYCRR Section 617.7(c), and (iii) completed the Short EAF, Part II;

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED AS FOLLOWS:**

1. The Village of Lansing Planning Board, based upon (i) its thorough review of the Short EAF, Part I, and any and all other documents prepared and submitted with respect to this proposed action and its environmental review (including any Visual Environmental Assessment Form required), (ii) its thorough review of the potential relevant areas of environmental concern to determine if the proposed action may have a significant adverse impact on the environment, including the criteria identified in 6 NYCRR Section 617.7(c), and (iii) its completion of the Short EAF, Part II, including the findings noted thereon (which findings are incorporated herein as if set forth at length), hereby makes a negative determination of environmental significance (“**NEGATIVE DECLARATION**”) in accordance with SEQR for the above referenced proposed action, and determines that neither a Full Environmental Assessment Form, nor an Environmental Impact Statement will be required; and:
2. The Responsible Officer of the Village of Lansing Planning Board is hereby authorized and directed to complete and sign as required the Short EAF, Part III, confirming the foregoing **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**, which fully completed and signed Short EAF shall be attached to and made a part of this Resolution.

The vote on the foregoing motion was as follows:

**AYES: Ned Hickey, Doris Brown, Maria Stycos, Mario Tomei and Carol Klepack**

**NAYS: none**

The motion was declared to be carried.

The Board then reviewed the 10 General Conditions required for all Special Permits as required by Zoning Law Section 145.59E. Regarding Item 9, Dubow stated obtaining a variance from the BZA will be required. Hickey also stated that other conditions for approval of the Special Permit would include verification by Curtis of the required number of parking spaces as well as approval of the Village Engineer for all drainage. A fourth condition will be submission and approval of a Lighting Plan. Dubow also noted that the site abuts a residential zone which requires a buffer, and this was reviewed when the first building was considered.

Klepack moved the following resolution, second by Brown:

**VILLAGE OF LANSING PLANNING BOARD RESOLUTION FOR SPECIAL PERMIT NO. 2115 ADOPTED  
ON APRIL 25, 2006**

**WHEREAS:**

- A. This matter involves consideration of the following proposed action: Special Permit 2115, Greenstate Properties, to construct an 8,147 square foot office building on parcel B of the subdivision of the lot formerly known as 2432 North Triphammer Road in the Commercial Low Traffic District, Tax Parcel No. 43.1-1-43.1; and
- B. On April 25, 2006, the Village of Lansing Planning Board determined that the proposed action is an Unlisted Action for which the Board is an involved agency, and in performing the lead agency function for its independent and uncoordinated environmental review in accordance with Article 8 of the New York State Environmental Conservation Law - the State Environmental Quality Review Act (“SEQR”), the Board (i) thoroughly reviewed the Short Environmental Assessment Form (the “Short EAF”), Part 1, and any and all other documents prepared and submitted with respect to this proposed action and its environmental review (including any Visual Environmental Assessment Form required), (ii) thoroughly analyzed the potential relevant areas of environmental concern to determine if the proposed action may have a significant adverse impact on the environment, including the criteria identified in 6 NYCRR Section 617.7(c), (iii) completed the Short EAF, Part 2; and (iv) made a negative determination of environmental significance

(“Negative Declaration”) in accordance with SEQR for the above referenced proposed action and determined that an Environmental Impact Statement would not be required; and

- C. On April 25, 2006, the Village of Lansing Planning Board held a public hearing regarding this proposed action, and thereafter thoroughly reviewed and analyzed (i) the materials and information presented by and on behalf of the applicant in support of this proposed action, including information and materials related to the environmental issues, if any, which the Board deemed necessary or appropriate for its review, (ii) all other information and materials rightfully before the Board, and (iii) all issues raised during the public hearing and/or otherwise raised in the course of the Board’s deliberations; and
- D. On April 25, 2006, in accordance with Section 7-725-b of the Village Law of the State of New York and Sections 145.59, 145.60, 145.60.1 and 145.61 of the Village of Lansing Code, the Village of Lansing Planning Board, in the course of its further deliberations, reviewed and took into consideration (i) the general conditions required for all special permits (Village of Lansing Code Section 145.59E), (ii) any applicable conditions required for certain special permit uses (Village of Lansing Code Section 145.60), and (iii) any applicable conditions required for uses within a Combining District (Village of Lansing Code Section 145.61);

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED AS FOLLOW:**

- 1. The Village of Lansing Planning Board hereby finds (subject to the conditions and requirements, if any, set forth below) that the proposed action meets (i) all general conditions required for all special permits (Village of Lansing Code Section 145.59E), (ii) any applicable conditions required for certain special permit uses (Village of Lansing Code Section 145.60), and (iii) any applicable conditions required for uses within a Combining District (Village of Lansing Code Section 145.61); and
- 2. It is hereby determined by the Village of Lansing Planning Board that Special Permit No. 2115 is **GRANTED AND APPROVED**, subject to the following conditions and requirements:
  - A. **The granting by the Village of Lansing Board of Zoning Appeals of the necessary area variance related to the Commercial Low Traffic District front yard build-to standards and related requirements provided for in Village of Lansing Code Section 145.42, subsection E(4)(b), approval of which variance(s) the Village Planning Board recommends to the Village of Lansing Board of Zoning Appeals.**
  - B. **Confirmation by the Code Enforcement Officer that the offstreet parking provided complies with the requirements of Article V of the Village of Lansing Code.**
  - C. **Approval of a lighting plan for all exterior lighting by the Village of Lansing Lighting Commission.**
  - D. **Approval by the Village Engineer of storm water management, site work and traffic circulation.**

The vote on the foregoing motion was as follows:

**AYES: Ned Hickey, Doris Brown, Maria Stycos, Mario Tomei and Carol Klepack**

**NAYS: none**

The motion was declared to be carried.

Curtis noted that the next BZA meeting is May 16th.

**Colonial Veterinary Hospital Subdivision** - Sketch Plan:

Hickey stated the next item on the agenda was a Sketch Plan review for the Colonial Veterinary Hospital Subdivision involving the adjoining Edwards property. Previously the Board discussed the parking and drainage difficulties on the existing Colonial site. There have been negotiations between the applicants and Don Edwards for a parcel of land to the south of St. Josephs Lane which abuts this property. The parcel under discussion would be subdivided from the lot known as 34 St. Joseph Lane. 34 St. Joseph Lane would retain enough land to meet all Village zoning requirements. Curtis stated the Planning Board must classify the subdivision and that it meets the criteria for a minor subdivision. Cross and Dubow have noted that the asphalt and road right-of-way depicted on the survey map do not coincide. Cross stated St. Josephs is straight to the end and the ROW kinks at the end. Dubow stated the Board would need to review the original dedication of the road to the Town of Lansing, which predates the formation of the Village, to determine which lines are correct. Dubow stated the issue to the Village is Parcel B which may be conveyed to the Village and may be subject to the road encroachment. Dubow stated this subdivision may rectify the problem since the Village would possibly own both pieces. Hickey also stated the house on the north side is for sale and the survey map shows the ROW half way up the driveway.

Klepack moved to classify this as a minor subdivision. Seconded by Stycos. Hickey noted Parcel B would be conveyed to the Village or consolidated with the Colonial Veterinary Hospital parcel to provide for resolution to drainage and parking issues. Dubow noted there will be no parking on this conveyed parcel. Curtis asked if this would become a Village park. Dubow stated this would need to be reviewed in the Special Permit process particularly with regard to the buffer requirements. Ultimately this can only be conveyed to the Village if the Board of Trustees accepts this parcel of property. Hickey stated the next meeting of the Board of Trustees is May 1st and since he will be in attendance, he will ask the Board at that time if they would be willing to accept this specific property. This would be an informal acceptance. All in favor of motion. Motion carried. Upon timely submission of a final plat, the Planning Board will schedule the Public Hearing for its May 8<sup>th</sup> meeting.

**Colonial Veterinary Hospital** - Continued Discussion:

Rod Kearn, Landscape Architect, made the presentation. First he explained that, at its current level, the parking lot was about eight feet below the level of adjoining residential property to the east. The resulting slope or berm, enhanced by the proposed landscaping will have the same effect as the fence proposed by the Board at the last meeting and would be aesthetically more appealing. Kearn stated the landscaping along N. Triphammer Road will be a formal arrangement. The plantings along the entry drive would provide a more informal and natural looking setting. There would be ginkos and multistem birch as well as flowering dogwoods. The fence discussed at the last meeting would not be necessary. As mentioned earlier, Kearn has reviewed the site and grading and found there would be a slope about 8 feet high and the car headlights would shine into the embankment. This embankment would be planted with ground cover. With the embankment and existing shrubs, Kearn stated there would be no need for the fence. Hickey asked for more information about the embankment and Kearn responded that it would result from the excavation necessary for the parking area and to provide for proper drainage. Cross asked how this was depicted on the drawings. Kearn stated it was shown best on sheet 5 and explained the design to Cross and the Board. The Board discussed the planting of various vibernums and their resistance to damage particularly by deer.

Cross asked about sheet 2 which is an enhancement of the surveyor's map with test pits shown. Cross asked if any were done. Kearn responded that they had not yet been dug. Cross said he hoped they did not hit bedrock before the 8 ft. depth. Hickey remembered a swimming pool in the back area.

Next, the Board reviewed the checklist provided by Kearn. The first item was review by the Village Engineer. Cross stated the Board has his written review indicating the driveway and internal traffic circulation appear to be adequate. Secondly, for drainage, there is a suggestion to bury a rock filled detention trench of some sort for underground storage of water. Cross stated this is an approved option in the stormwater regulations but one has not been installed in the Village yet. Cross is hopeful there is another option like shifting the storm detention to the northern parcel which is being purchased from the Edwards. Cross is concerned about maintenance of an underground facility. Dubow stated the Board needs to discuss the required 75 foot buffer strip requirements and the possibility of a variable width buffer strip and using the park area being acquired as a buffer and the idea of having a detention pond in that area. The Board will need to address this and the Board does not presently know any dimensions for detention requirements.

Curtis stated the applicants are proposing to substitute the berm for the buffer requirements on the east side. Dubow stated the Board must consider the intent of the buffer to screen versus the effect of a detention pond in the same area north of the Vet Clinic. Cross is concerned that with anything underground it is hard to determine if it is performing properly. Hickey stated the southwest corner of the circle has an existing large drainage area with cattails which might form a natural detention area. Cross feels if this could be utilized to provide storm water detention rather than an underground structure that would be preferable. Again, Dubow stated the Board must balance the screening function and the storm water management function. Hickey stated the Board does not have enough information and recommended that Cross work with the applicants on the buffer strip, as well as the drainage issues, and then the Board will continue this discussion at the May 8th meeting at which time the Board will know the intentions of the Board of Trustees with regard to accepting the proposed park land. Dubow stated there are specific requirements which also need to be met for a buffer strip and the Board Members should review this information for the May 8th meeting.

Klepach asked about the berm. Kears stated it is shown on the grading plan sheet 5.

Item 2 states that the fire chief Scott Purcell has reviewed the plans and feels the design is satisfactory although Curtis has not received written confirmation of this yet. Item 3 indicates the driveway has been expanded from 20 feet to 24 feet to allow for easier movement of vehicles. Item 4 states that there will be a 25 foot setback for parking on the eastern boundary. Dubow stated a variance would be required for parking on the northern boundary which has no setback. Dubow stated there would also need to be a variance for the buffer strip. Item 5 is about site utilities. Cross stated that it looked like the utility services cross. Kears stated they were at different elevations and would not run into each other. Kears stated the sewer line could possibly be moved further to the east and placed in a paved area rather than a landscaped area. Cross will review this further. Item 6 regards site lighting. Hickey stated the Lighting Commission will review this. Kears provided cut sheets to Lighting Commission member Leopold. Kears will provide a new Lighting Plan with revisions and showing all exterior lights. Item 7 regarding Greenway Trails can not be resolved at this time. Item 8 for the dumpster location was discussed. Hickey was under the impression that the location was to be at the north end of the property rather than at the southern end. Kears responded that the trash truck could easily use this southern configuration. Trash would be picked up twice a week. This configuration also would not interfere with parking. Kears stated in the current site, staff must park in front of the dumpster which has necessitated that pick-up be in the early morning hours. Since there will be not be parking issues, the pick-up time can be moved to later in the day when the noise is not a problem. Curtis recommended a condition of approval be that trash pick-up be between 10AM-5PM. Item 9 for delivery vehicles has been changed so delivery will be by UPS cube trucks rather than 18 wheelers parking on N. Triphammer Road. Item 10 is about parking spaces and there are 33 regular spaces as well as 2 handicapped spaces. Dubow stated the Board will need to reaffirm that there are sufficient parking spaces. Hickey and Curtis will verify this. Items 11 and 12 are about grading and stormwater management and these items will be resolved with Cross. Item 13 is in regards to fencing and the embankment will be utilized instead. Cross asked about fencing to the north side. Dubow stated this will be discussed further and resolved as part of the review of the buffer. Item 14 pertains to the landscaping. Hickey recommended all plants be reviewed for susceptibility to deer damage. Tom Ross spoke about the plantings for the drainage area as preferable to a fence. Curtis stated it need not be a long fence but could be short sections of fence mixed with landscaping such as that approved for the old 3-d/Eye Building on Craft Road. Hickey stated a creative solution utilizing the existing pond could be proposed. Cross stated a drainage/buffer solution might be an option. Dubow stated once the property is acquired then an easement for a trail could be provided to the Village. Hickey stated the Trustees must decide first whether to accept the property and then landscape issues, the detention area, and buffer strip issues can be addressed. Dubow noted the design of the path would take the walkers through the Colonial Veterinary Hospital parking lot.

Hickey stated he will be at the Board of Trustees meeting on May 1st. Dubow stated the applicants need not be present at the Board of Trustees meeting. Leopold felt there would probably not be a decision made at that meeting until more information is available. Hickey stated his position will be to add this piece to the Village inventory. Hickey stated the applicants will need to have information available to go out in packets prior to the BZA meeting on May 16th. Hickey also noted that a final plat would be required for the May 8<sup>th</sup> meeting.

**Homewood Suites Landscape Plan:**

Hickey stated he has never received plans as thorough as the Landscape Plans document submitted by Homewood Suites. Bret LeBlue of Trowbridge & Wolfe Landscape Architects made the presentation for Andy Sciarabba of TG Miller the project Engineers. LeBue stated the plan includes many deer resistant shrubs. There have been some revisions since the original proposal with some plants removed from the interior courtyard area. There is extensive planting on the exterior with flowering shrubs such as spirea, hydrangea and lilacs, as well as evergreen pines and larger oaks and honey locusts. On the western edge, the large Norway maples would be difficult or impossible to save as their root systems will be cut in order to relocate them and they are on a steep embankment. They are also on the County's list of invasive species. The Board decided that these trees can be removed and not be relocated on the site. Instead, 10 additional new red maples which are fast growing will be planted. Smaller trees on the site will be retained. Klepack recommended that new deciduous trees have calipers of 3.5-4 inches instead of the 2 – 2 ¼" shown on the plans. Hickey asked about shrubs in the divider on the raised islands and recommended some trees be placed in the island. Hickey stated since the applicant would be saving on the relocation of the large trees on the western edge, that some of the money saved might be put into larger deciduous trees and trees in the island. LeBue stated the budget for landscaping is presently around \$130,000.

Klepack moved to accept the Landscape Plan for Homewood Suites as discussed with the increase in size of trees as well as trees planted in the island. Seconded by Tomei. Ayes by Brown, Klepack, Stycos and Tomei. Motion carried.

- **Open Space Plan Update:**

Hickey stated this will be tabled until the next meeting.

- **Approval of Minutes** - March 28:

Stycos moved to approve the minutes of March 28th as revised. Seconded by Tomei. Ayes by Brown, Hickey, Klepack, Stycos and Tomei. Minutes approved.

- **Reports:**

*Board of Trustees:* Dubow stated the Board adopted the proposed local law amending frontage and area requirements in the Commercial High and Low Traffic Districts as well as the Human Health Services District.

*Bolton Estate Trails:* Hickey reported that Board members received a memo from member Dankert regarding the trails he and Stycos walked with his friend Tom Reimers from the Cayuga Trails Club. Stycos stated the trails were marked on a map and they checked each one. Trail 1 is the farthest to the north and goes along the gorge. Stycos stated it is very challenging to hike. The recommendation is to have it remain undefined and be used as a seasonal trail. Klepack would like to see it marked. Hickey stated the trails could be marked and difficulty noted. Trail 2 is under the power lines and not recommended for a trail as it is very steep and less appealing because of the power lines. Moderating the steepness with platforms would be an expensive option. Trail 3 follows the road and would lead to the same location as Trail I and would be easier to walk. Klepack would like to see a trail other than walking down the road which is used by trucks to access the pump station; Trail I would provide such an option. Hickey stated the Village would obtain two trails with Trails 1 and 3. Stycos stated a bridge would need to be built. Dubow stated this would ultimately be an issue addressed by the Board of Trustees. Hickey stated this information will be filed in the Bolton Point files for later discussion.

*AIA Sustainable Communities Presentation:* Curtis stated he and Stycos attended a meeting sponsored by the Southern Tier Chapter of the American Institute of Architects. They heard a presentation by Peter Garforth who spoke on energy and sustainable communities around the world and how the USA compares with other developed countries. The USA is very inefficient in their use of energy. Stycos stated there are alternative and innovative ways to conserve energy. Patrick Jackson, a Corning executive, explained that Corning, like many large corporations uses a lot of energy and given current market conditions, it makes sense to manage that energy use more efficiently. To date they have been successful reducing energy consumption and incorporating renewable energy sources into their mix. Another presentation was made from about integrating energy uses. Lexie Hain of MotherPlants in Enfield spoke about green roofs which are cooler, help manage storm water, last a long time and are environmentally friendly. Curtis and Stycos stated the technology is there and much more can be done and is being done in other countries.

**Other Business as Time Permits:**

Hickey stated more and more people are using Wood Thrush Hollow Trail. Dubow stated this was discussed at the Board of Trustees meeting and the Village has made significant progress in having Northwoods Road conveyed to the Village for reconstruction this building season.

Hickey asked about the Dart Subdivision. Curtis did not have additional information to provide and a formal application has not yet been submitted. Cross asked about the Crossmore Subdivision. There was also no additional information about this either. Hickey stated there is being progress made on the Bolton Point Road and Dubow stated Crossmore may be waiting to have this resolved before proceeding.

Dubow recommended the Board review the buffer strip requirements in Zoning Law Section 145-24 prior to the next meeting.

-

**Adjournment:**

Klepack moved to adjourn at 9:45 P.M. Seconded by Tomei. Ayes by Brown, Hickey, Klepack, Stycos and Tomei. Motion carried.