

**Town of Sand Lake
Planning Board Minutes
July 17, 2019**

The minutes, as follows, are intended to provide a general summary of the Agenda items and Public Hearings. Quotes presented are not verbatim, nor is all discussion which occurred presented herein. This document should not be relied upon as a transcript of the actual proceedings. The transcript of this meeting has been recorded and is available at the Town Hall.

CALL TO ORDER: Arthur Herman, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 7:30 PM

MEMBERS PRESENT: Ralph LaMontagna, Mary Ellen Trumbull, Michael Groff, Rick Giolito, Jonathan Bernstein, Craig Crist

MEMBER ABSENT:

OTHERS PRESENT: Ed Brzozowski, Scott Blair, Mike Fogarty, Nancy Perry, Karol O’Sullivan, Russ Blair, Wayne Mortimer, Ed Patanian, Dee Erickson

RECORDING CLERK: Laura Fedoreshenko, Clerk for the Planning Board and ZBA

Minor Subdivision and Boundary Line Adjustment Applications-Karl Farm and Public Hearing

E. W. Birch Builders & Construction, Inc.
3975 NY 150
West Sand Lake, NY 12196

Tax Map #158.-1-26.11

Lot Size: 74.91 acres

Lot TBD: 3.55 acres

AR – Agriculture/Residential Zoning District

Remaining Parent Lot – 71.36 acres

A Minor Subdivision Application to subdivide one lot from a 74.91-acre parcel of land.

Ed Brzozowski presented and stated the proposed plan is for a one lot subdivision and also a lot line adjustment. Mr. Brzozowski explained that the one lot subdivision is across the street on Route 150 and is an existing parcel that is tied to the Karl Farm’s parent parcel. He then stated that the plan is to also add a 20’ parcel to the existing Lot 3. Arthur Herman (AH) asked Planning Board (PB) members if there were any questions. Mary Ellen Trumbull (MET) expressed that she had thought that the Boundary Line Adjustment for Lot 3 would be addressed at the Public Hearing and not the subdivision for Lot 5A. AH clarified that it was the other way around - the one lot subdivision for Lot 5A would be addressed at the Public Hearing. Ralph LaMontagna (RL) read the Public Hearing notice. At 7:36pm, AH opened the Public Hearing; seconded by MET and all approved. As there were no public comments, AH closed the Public Hearing at 7:37pm; seconded by MET and all approved. AH made a motion to declare this Minor Subdivision as an unlisted action under SEQR, declaring the Town of Sand Lake Planning Board to be the Lead Agency. Seconded by MET and all approved. AH made a motion to give this action a negative declaration under SEQR. He stated the Town of Sand Lake Planning Board, as Lead Agency, has determined from the information presented and ensued discussion, the proposed activities will not present a significant adverse effect on the environment. A determination of non-significance will be recorded and a Draft Environmental Impact Statement need not be prepared. Seconded by Rick Giolito (RG) and all approved. AH then motioned to give this Minor Subdivision approval, as submitted, subject to the following condition: the transfer of taxes and property on Reichard’s Lake Road, identified as Tax Map # 147.1-1-36, to the Town of

Sand Lake be resolved prior to the signing of the Resolutions and maps for this Minor Subdivision and BLA. Seconded by RL and all approved. AH asked Craig Crist (CC) if the Boundary Line Adjustment (BLA) required a separate motion. CC replied that it was his understanding that all impacts for the Minor Subdivision and BLA would be considered together when issuing the negative declaration. PB members agreed with CC in that neither the Minor Subdivision nor the BLA would have any negative impact on the environment. AH then made a motion to grant approval of this Boundary Line Adjustment Application, as submitted, subject to the following condition: the transfer of taxes and property on Reichard's Lake Road, identified as Tax Map # 147.1-1-36, to the Town of Sand Lake be resolved prior to the signing of the Resolutions and maps for this Minor Subdivision and BLA. Seconded by RL and all approved.

Major Conservation Subdivision Application – Sketch Plan – Karl Farm Phase 2

E. W. Birch Builders & Construction, Inc.
3975 NY 150
West Sand Lake, NY 12196
AR – Agriculture/Residential Zoning District

Tax Map #158.-1-26.11
Total Acreage: 74.63 acres
Lot 4: 1.30 acres
Lot TBD: 1.77 acres
Lot TBD: 1.78 acres
Lot 7: 2.1 acres
Lot 8: 1.25 acres
Lot 9: 1.16 acres
Lot 10: 4.0 Acres

Remaining Parent Lot - 61.27 acres

A Sketch Plan discussion regarding a Major Conservation Subdivision Application to subdivide 7 lots from a 74.63-acre parcel of land.

Ed Brzowski presented a sketch plan and stated the proposed plan is to create seven new buildable lots taken from the Karl Farm parcel. He further stated that they would like to create one parcel and donate it to the Rensselaer Land Conservancy for access and parking to their land locked area in the back. Mr. Brzowski mentioned that the Rensselaer Land Conservancy had access at another point, however it was his understanding that access had not worked out well; thus, they had agreed with Birch Builders for the donation of this parcel. Mr. Brzowski stated that as the donated parcel would be 90' wide, it would allow for the creation of some parking spaces as well as spaces for two school buses for visitation by schools. Mr. Brzowski then spoke of another 13 acres off of Biittig Road that they also wished to donate to the Rensselaer Land Conservancy who are in agreement for receiving it for possible future use. Mr. Brzowski then stated that some of the proposed building lots would be a little over an acre; thus, would not meet the current two-acre zoning requirement. He added that with the seven proposed lots, the shortage from meeting the two-acre zoning code would be in total just over an acre. He explained that this shortage of just over an acre could be absorbed under the new zoning codes for the donation of land. AH asked how large the donated parcels would be. Mr. Brzowski replied that one would be 13 acres and the other 27,000 square foot for a total close to 14 acres and in return Birch Builders would be looking for a compensation factor of 1 point something acres. AH then asked how many lots would meet the current two-acre lot zoning requirement. Mr. Brzowski replied that 3 of the 7 lots would meet code for the required two acres. He added that all lots would meet the zoning code for road frontage and setbacks. MET then asked if Lots 4, 8 and 9 did

not meet the minimum zoning requirements, and if Lots 5A, 7 and 10 met the requirements. AH replied that Lot 5A is to be split in half. Mr. Brzozowski agreed with AH and stated that Lots 7 & 10 met the required zoning code. MET noted that Karl Farms would have 61+ acres remaining and asked if there was a way, either through boundary line adjustments or reconfiguration, for the 5 proposed lots to conform to the code. Mr. Brzozowski replied that when Lot 5A is subdivided, one of those lots will meet code as it will be over two acres. Mr. Brzozowski apologized for not having the latest revision of the sketch plan map and indicated that it would either be 2 or 3 conforming lots. Mr. Brzozowski mentioned that an Area Variance would be needed for which RL clarified that would be needed for Lot 5A and Mr. Brzozowski agreed. MET clarified that the non-conforming lots would be 4, 8 & 9 and AH replied that is where the donation of land to the conservancy would come into play. AH then stated that the compensation factors for the donation of land would need to be researched/reviewed further. RG then referred back to Mr. Brzozowski's earlier statement where it was indicated that the amount of donated land would not cover all shortages and asked if that is why an Area Variance would be needed. Mr. Brzozowski replied he would not be looking for an Area Variance as they would be complying based on the land conservancy program's compensation factors to cover the shortage. CC mentioned that it would be up to the Building Inspector to determine if an Area Variance was needed rather than the PB. AH asked CC if he was familiar with the compensation factors for the donation of land. CC replied that he would have to look it up and restated it would be a determination by the Building Inspector. RL then stated that Birch Builders would get a credit of up to 40%. RL added that from when he has read, Birch Builders would have a 30% density bonus which would give them 1½ additional lots. He then asked if that meant that those 1½ lots did not have to meet the two-acre minimum. CC replied that he would defer to the Building Inspector for a determination. RL replied that he was ok with that response and added that Birch Builders would be entitled to something for keeping part of the land non-developed. AH agreed and stated that Birch Builders would be able to place 1½ lots on the same acreage. RG added that the PB did not have an exact calculation on the number of compensated lots based on the conservation program for the donation of land. RL referred to information from Monica Ryan who had determined that Birch Builders would be ok for up to 7 lots based on the land to be donated to the conservancy. RL then stated that he is fine with lots under the conservancy program; however, for Lot 5A he continued to see a need for an Area Variance as he unsure as to how it is to be divided. Mr. Brzozowski apologized for not having the latest revision of the sketch plan map. RL replied that the version of map he was reviewing reflected 3.55 acres for Lot 5A which had been created at a previous PB meeting. RL stated it was for this reason, that an Area Variance could be needed to divide Lot 5A. RG replied that for the Lot 5A, Birch Builders could divide and have one conforming two-acre lot; yet unsure what would be done with the remaining land. AH commented that Birch Builders was also donating the 27,000 square feet to the conservancy. RG replied that 27,000 square foot would cover the other 5 lots and the divide of Lot 5A would be an additional lot. Mr. Brzozowski stated that upon a previous review of the proposed plan with Monica Ryan, the compensation was being calculated by square footage versus lots. He added that while they may be short a total of 40,000 square feet, the donation of 13+ acres would allow them to gain it back as a result of the compensation factor and allow the 7 lots which would include Lot 5A. MET asked Mr. Brzozowski if he would be coming back to the PB with a more accurate rendering. Mr. Brzozowski apologized again to PB members for not having the latest map and agreed to bring it next time. He added that he realized that the proposed major seven lot subdivision would not be resolved in one night. RL asked for hard information on when the property would be donated to the Town of Sand

Lake. AH replied that the property would not be donated to the Town until such time as he had received final approval for this plan. CC replied that no donation of property should be done until such time as an application is approved. AH asked PB members if a site visit was needed. AH then asked about the clearances and leach fields for that many usable lots, as proposed. Mr. Brzozowski responded that PB members could do a site visit and that the leach fields and distances would be good. CC asked Mr. Brzozowski if he minded if PB members walked the property. Mr. Brzozowski responded that would be fine and added that the Land Conservancy had asked to walk the 13-acre parcel. RG mentioned the land being donated to the conservancy in which parking spaces were mentioned and asked if Birch Builders would be creating the parking lot. Mr. Brzozowski responded no. He added that the land conservancy folks told him that they would apply for federal grant monies for that purpose; and if granted, would then have to follow the requirements set forth in the grant for creation of the parking lot. MET asked if Mr. Brzozowski would be back to the PB for which he responded yes. AH added that the Town's review engineer would also need to review the future site plan maps to ensure all is in order. Mr. Brzozowski asked who the Town's engineer was at this time. AH responded it was Hank Labarba. CC suggested to Mr. Brzozowski that he meet with the Building Inspector to go over all the computations as it would be a great help to everyone. Mr. Brzozowski responded that he would and mentioned that as the conservancy program was fairly new to all and not utilized yet, it would be a learning curve for all. AH asked PB members if a site visit was needed. RG and MET responded that they would be interested in doing so. RL responded that he agreed to a site visit and added that PB members needed to be further informed on the land conservancy and what it means to be better prepared. CC clarified that a site visit would not mean a board meeting thus members would need to go on their own as three attending at once would equate to a board meeting. AH then asked Mr. Brzozowski what would be a good time to show the lots to which he asked what days/times would work better for PB members. MET and RG stated they could meet with Mr. Brzozowski on Friday, July 19 at 10AM at 3975 Route 150. AH and RL agreed to meet with Mr. Brzozowski on Monday, July 22 at 6PM.

Sketch Plan Discussion Regarding Westfall Village

Edward Patanian

Averill Avenue

Averill Park, NY 12018

A Sketch Plan discussion for next Westfall Village project.

PDD – Planned Development Zoning District

Tax Map #147.2-4-21.1

Lot Size: 19.05 acres

Ed Patanian presented and stated that work is winding down on former approvals and added that there is townhouse lots available, however sales have been sluggish and thus focusing more on the rentals. He explained his proposed plan is to build three 10-unit buildings across from the Café. Mr. Patanian mentioned that he has found that trying to locate retail business that far back from the main road has been extremely difficult due to no visibility. Mr. Patanian proposed to shift some of the commercial density toward the front and try to build some residential density to create the feel of a hamlet in the middle. He stated that while the proposed plans were not final, there are plans for sidewalks and street lighting similar to that of 13 Averill Avenue to try and create a walkable community. He mentioned that his proposed concept came from a project down south and that he planned to change each building's façade a little and have a color variation. He stated that with a larger residential density, it

may help support the current retail businesses. AH mentioned that the original plan was to have retail underneath these three proposed buildings. Mr. Patanian responded that in the code, the use could be either/or. He added that he had found that residents do not particularly care to live above the retail business and has seen the same issue down by HVCC. Mr. Patanian stated that he wished to continue with retail; however proposed location was too far from the main road. He added that trying to compete with 43 Mall is virtually impossible to construct with limited cash flow while trying to continue with comparable rental costs. RL commented that things have changed from the original plan of businesses and apartments. RL asked if the proposed plan for three buildings is to have ten-units each for which Mr. Patanian agreed. RL then asked the purpose of the large parking lot in the back that consisted of 290 spaces. Mr. Patanian responded that there had been in-depth negotiations with Mr. Gamache for a building there which would have required a lot of parking; however, Mr. Gamache had ended up taking the house across the street. Mr. Patanian then mentioned that the original plan had included a supermarket as an anchor store however that idea has since been removed. Mr. Patanian stated that those parking spaces could be utilized as overflow for the Café as well as other retail businesses within that area. He then referred to the site plan map and pointed out where he would end that parking lot. RL then clarified that there would be parking behind the buildings for which Mr. Patanian agreed and added that he would then prohibit on-street parking. Mr. Patanian pointed out that by code he is to have 1 ½ spaces per unit and believes he has 2 spaces per unit. A site plan map was reviewed and discussed in regards to the proposed anchor building being removed and redesign of that paved area. RG asked about the fruition of the supermarket as the anchor building for which Mr. Patanian responded that would be a long shot as there was already a supermarket in town. RG then mentioned that one concern for the large parking lot would be that the residents would not want to look at it from their apartment. Mr. Patanian agreed and mentioned that he has started a design of an outbuilding in that area to store maintenance equipment such as lawn mowers and tractors used on the site. He also mentioned a discussion he had with a gym facility for that area of the site. Mr. Patanian added that there would be beautification of some sort or add landscaping/planters to break up the area with islands. RL commented that is what the codes says to do. AH asked if the plans still included putting in the pool and walking trails. Mr. Patanian responded that the walking trails have been in for years and as for the pool, there was not enough residential density to support it. AH asked how many units were currently there and Mr. Patanian responded approximately 42. He further stated that when the recession hit, he had rented out nine of the townhouses; however, the rent does not support the cost of the pool. Mr. Patanian stated that he is now trying to convert the rental of townhouses into sales. He added that while it is realized a pool is needed, it is just a matter of when it can be done cost-wise. MET asked if a health-related facility had been considered. Mr. Patanian responded that many bigger projects which start off with 100 units have a clubhouse, pool and some sort of gym, however he is trying to get a higher quality private sector facility versus being subsidized. He added that unfortunately he had been counting on the townhouse sales to generate the needed revenue. RL asked how the proposed apartment units were to dispose of their rubbish. Mr. Patanian replied that while none of those details had been included yet, there would be a dumpster enclosed by a fence in the back similar to that done for the other units. RL mentioned consideration should be given to the tenants in regards possible noise from customers who park in the lot and then cross/ walk between the buildings to access the restaurant/other businesses, or vice versa. AH asked if the overflow parking was still to be behind the apartments. Mr. Patanian replied yes and when the front builds out, some of that parking will be needed and can be broken out with islands. He added that he

had intentionally designed it so there could be pedestrian flow between buildings with lighting and a textured crosswalk to buffer the speed. He also mentioned that he had previously requested that the Town post a speed limit of 30 mph for which he awaits action to be taken. RL asked if the overflow parking area would be lit for which Mr. Patanian responded no and stated that the overflow parking area is not being expanded. RL then clarified the question by asking if the area behind the apartments would not be lit for customers leaving the retail businesses. Mr. Patanian responded that the design was not done yet. RL suggested thinking about the lighting for safety purposes. Mr. Patanian responded that he would like to come in with a building design and rough concept of what is to take place in order to have a better idea for the final plan to be developed. He added that it is unknown down the road what is to be built in the front of the property and how much parking it may require. He also explained that the area of overflow parking is rarely used at this time as parking for the Café has been along the street and other on-street parking has been restricted as their entrances are either in the rear or on the side. RL asked Mr. Patanian if he agreed that folks visiting a local business would expect the parking lot to be lit. Mr. Patanian agreed and added that he would like to first get the design down so nothing would need to be taken down later. AH asked if the plan was to keep the front section for commercial. Mr. Patanian replied that he wished to receive the PB's ideas at this point. He added that he would like to allow circulation between the buildings to allow leeway for future plans and not isolate folks; thus, the parking lot would not be completed separately but rather have a buffer with landscaping and sufficient lighting. RL mentioned that consideration may want to be given for residential parking versus overflow parking and added that could be done with signage to alleviate resident's parking spots being used by others. Mr. Patanian agreed and added that there are some resident parking signs up currently as he had an issue with folks attending baseball games and parking wherever. Mr. Patanian explained that while other amenities could be placed at the site, he has been researching other areas first so as to not take an excessive risk or overextend himself due to the insufficient density at this time. RG referred to the site plan map and asked if the parking lot currently existed. Mr. Patanian responded that area was gravel at this time. RG asked what Mr. Patanian's research has revealed regarding folks wanting to live on the main drag versus further in. Mr. Patanian responded that he had not done much research on that particular topic however noted that his concept is labeled as a "neo-urbanist" way of living. RG commented that the proposed plan reflected constructing a residential building across from a bar/restaurant and indicated some folks may not want to live across from that type of business. He added that this may be something to explore as there would be other areas on the site for the residential building rather than the main drag. Mr. Patanian expressed that the retail business that far back from the main road has proven not to be successful. RG asked if the current bar/restaurant would go away. Mr. Patanian responded that it was struggling for that reason and has heard that folks did not know it existed despite his placement of the largest sign allowable. Mr. Patanian added that the concept of a walkable community is so residents can walk to access such businesses as the restaurant which normally closed between 10-11pm. RG clarified that he did not see it as a negative; however, wanted to point out that some folks may not be looking to live across from such a business but rather a quiet community that is within walking distance to the business. Mr. Patanian responded that he envisions a mix of both worlds for tenants. He added that these three proposed buildings would be done in phases rather than all at once. MET mentioned that she continued to see a health facility or workout room and possible pool as a plus seeing as those amenities would be off the main road and may possibly attract younger folks. RG mentioned that the situation was sort of a catch-22 based on his previous involvement on a similar project in another state.

He added that retail was the last to come into that project as to ensure there was enough residential density to help the retail along. Mr. Patanian responded that the area next to 13 Averill Avenue (Café and Edward Jones) is where the gazebo is located and is meant to be like a town square and gathering area. He then added if another retail business was to come in, that area would be the better place however realizes that he would need to make the back of the building attractive for the tenants. Mr. Patanian then elaborated on discussions he had with fitness facilities and found that they tend to move into older unused building at little cost; thus, very difficult to build a brand-new facility for his situation. RG asked if there were plans to build closer to the road. Mr. Patanian replied that is what he planned to do after building up more residential density. RG commented that he wondered if a move of the Café to the front section facing Route 43, would make it more successful. Mr. Patanian expressed that he does not understand how folks do not know the Cafe exists in its current location seeing as he has a very large sign for it. He added that he believed folks may think they are entering into a private area for which RG agreed. Mr. Patanian then shared that the mix use is struggling as the existing six-unit rentals and the apartments above the retail results in smaller rents which makes it difficult to try and have enough resources to cover repairs as the buildings age. He mentioned that he began putting up garages as folks indicated that is what they wanted; and while that had made a small difference, those rents are high to help cover the costs. MET asked if Mr. Patanian was aware of how the over-55 community down by Route 4 was doing. Mr. Patanian responded that he knew the realtor and heard that it was a struggle to fill. He added that he had found that any age-restricted facility around the area seemed to have the same issue. AH then asked if the proposed plan was just for the one strip along Averill. Mr. Patanian responded yes and would be phased in. AH then asked about the setback for the proposed buildings for which Mr. Patanian responded he believed it would be 30' to be uniform with the Cafe including same landscaping and lamp posts. AH stated that it appeared that the commercial buildings were being pushed towards the front and asked if there would be more apartments behind the ones that are proposed. Mr. Patanian responded no, not at this time. AH mentioned if retail does not come in, what then? Mr. Patanian responded that he would be unsure as he had met with other apartment builders and found there are not any local case studies on how many units can be built before the saturation level is hit. AH stated that he believed Mr. Patanian should move forward with the final plans and noted that the allotted number of units was 110. Mr. Patanian responded he currently has 42 plus the townhouses and could provide the PB with a total count. RL asked that some hard plans be provided for which Mr. Patanian agreed.

Referral from Town Board for Recommendation Re: Rezone of Town Property

Town Board referral for a recommendation for a change in zoning designation of four parcels (approximately 15.92 acres) from R-Residential to HMU-Hamlet Mixed Use:

- Town of Sand Lake **Tax Map #159.-1-34**
- NYSEG **Tax Map #159.-1-33**
- NYSEG **Tax Map #159.-1-32**
- Main Care (formerly Ackner Fuels) **Tax Map #159.-1-31**

Nancy Perry presented and stated that at the July 10, 2019 Town Board meeting there was a desire to change the zoning designation of the above mentioned four properties from Residential to Hamlet Mixed Use. She added that the approximate acreage for those properties is 15.92 acres. Ms. Perry explained that the intention would be to subdivide the Town's property and sell a portion which

included the old highway garage. She stated that after a discussion with the Town's Planner, it was believed that a Hamlet Mixed Use designation would allow the greatest flexibility for use by potential buyers. She added that it was also believed that the selling of the old highway garage and request for a zoning change represents responsible economic development in the Town, which is part of the comprehensive plan, as well as preserving of historical buildings. She then mentioned that both she and Dee Erikson toured the old highway garage which dates back to the 1930s and while it is a beautiful building on the outside; it leaves much to be desired on the inside and if left untouched, would cave in. She stated that the plan would be to keep the highway garage intact as much as possible as it is of historical significance to the Town and that would be one of the restrictions placed on any sale. She then explained that the parcels of land in that area form a sort of triangle; thus, rather than just propose the zoning designation to Hamlet Mixed Use for the Town's parcel, the properties of NYSEG and Main Care should be included to more accurately reflect the use. Ms. Perry stated that she was only introducing this proposal and the PB did not have to give an immediate recommendation. She explained that the next Town Board meeting would be scheduled for August 14, 2019 which would include a Public Hearing on this topic; thus, there would be another PB meeting in between for discussion/recommendation to be provided. Ms. Perry stated that letters were sent to both NYSEG and Main Care/Ackner regarding the proposed change to the zoning. RG asked what happens to the solar panels, if sold. Ms. Perry responded that the panels would belong to the Town as a subdivision of that property would be done down the road and the Town would keep the parcel that the solar panels were on. AH asked the size of the Town garage property. Ms. Perry responded that would be something they would be working with Kevin McGrath in order to decide how large a parcel to keep for adequate maintenance access and then much should be included with the garage to keep it commercially viable for adequate entry/exit. She added that the Town has heard some interest in the garage parcel. She further explained that the Town wants to ensure that a proposed business be appropriate for the area and surrounding residents; thus, envisioned the commercial parcel as having limited parking available. RG asked if parcels utilized by NYSEG and Main Care belonged to the Town and rented to them. Ms. Perry responded no as those businesses owned the properties. RG then asked if those businesses had to allow the zoning designation change. Ms. Perry responded no because as a municipality, the Town can make the change; however, those business had been asked to comment on the proposed change. RL asked what the property had been zoned. Ms. Perry responded that it had always been zoned residential. RL replied that such zoning was not reflective of the actual use. Ms. Perry agreed and added that as the area always had some commercial businesses this proposed request was not odd. She also stated that the change of the zoning would also true up with the comprehensive plan. RL asked that with this change, the Town would be looking to preserve the garage and make it a viable for building before it is too late which Ms. Perry responded absolutely. RL noted that Ms. Perry indicated there has been some interest in the garage property. Ms. Perry agreed and added that there has been a few people interested however she was not at liberty to state who they were. Ms. Perry reiterated that garage building is beautiful however does need work to preserve it. MET noted that there are 11 trees around the solar panels that need to be taken care of. Ms. Perry agreed and stated that the Town had reached out to the landscaper who will be replacing those trees which had died within a year. MET then asked if the trees were under warranty. Ms. Perry replied yes and mentioned that those trees had been received under recommendation. RG asked if the utility poles that were laying out belong to NYSEG. Ms. Perry responded yes. MET asked if a buyer would be restricted from what they could do with the garage building. Ms. Perry responded that the Town would want the

historical character to be preserved so a restriction will be placed that the building remains the same on the outside. She added that the sale of the building and property would then place it back on the tax rolls versus the Town having to continue to carry it with no action being taken. RL commented that a sale would probably embellish the area by the addition of some new landscaping. Ms. Perry agreed and indicated that the parties that had reached out with interest have been very responsible developers. RL stated that he did not see the proposed plan as negative but rather as economic development, preservation and a better reflection of how the land is used. RL added that it would be good to hear from the public for which Ms. Perry replied that would be take place at the Town Board meeting on August 14. RG asked if it was the Town's desire for it to be a commercial property. Ms. Perry responded that she believed it would be commercial based on the interest received; however, having it zoned as Hamlet Mixed-Use would allow it to be used as residential thus provide the most flexibility. AH added that by including Main Care, Hamlet Mixed-Use zoning would make sense as a part of that business runs into the residential area of Huntley Road. Ms. Perry agreed and added that is where it would end. JB commented that he did not see a need for Ms. Perry to return and suggested that the PB recommend it. RG asked JB if that was a motion. JB replied that he would make it a formal motion and was seconded by MG and all approved.

MINUTES – June 5, 2019 – MET motioned to approve the June 5, 2019 minutes, as submitted. Seconded by RL and all approved.

ADJOURNMENT – AH motioned to adjourn the meeting at 8:42; seconded by Michael Groff (MG) and all approved.