A meeting of the 2030 Comprehensive Plan Update Committee was held on June 28, 2017 at the Chili Town Hall, 3333 Chili Avenue, Rochester, New York 14624 at 6:00 p.m. The meeting was called to order by Supervisor David Dunning.

PRESENT: Supervisor David Dunning, Ron Brand, RLP Plans, Paul Wanzenried, Building Department Manager, James Ignatowski, Architectural Advisory Committee Chair, Steve Tarbell, Traffic & Safety Committee Member & Dorothy Borgus, Resident.

ABSENT: Al Hellaby, Planning Board VC.

Supervisor Dunning: I assume everyone saw the minutes from the last meeting is that accurate, with the exception with the cutoff at the end with our faulty recording device are there any issues, changes or concerns. So are we ok to approve those minutes, any objections anybody?

Dorothy Borgus: Yes.

Supervisor Dunning: Then we will go right ahead to our plan.

Ron Brand: I would like to go back to the initial outline of the plan and Chapter 2 we said we needed to update the population and housing, which I have. I will give you an extra copy for Mr. Hellaby. Basically, if you bear with me we will go through this real quick. You see here in 2010 the population was 28, 625 suggesting a very small increase, however that rate of population increase is six tenths of a percent and is similar to Monroe County's as a whole which is five tenths of a percent. During this period, the Town of Gates was the only community to grow slightly faster than Chili and the Towns of Henrietta & Ogden in population and growth of over two percent. Brighton was flat, Wheatland declined slightly and the population of Monroe County grew by two tenths of a percent from 744 to 747. The Census Bureau estimated that Chili grew by 169 people between 2010 and 2016. That estimate indicates a faster population growth in Chili, estimating the addition of 574 people since 2010. In a projection, Chili will add another 314 residents between 2017 and 2022. I want to look at some of the information in the Building Permit as to see how that relates to these sources of documentation that the number crunchers have. Households has increased to twenty percent in each of the three time periods covered growing from just over three thousand in 2000 to projected to 5,300 by 2022, so that is an increase there. In the number of residents age eighty-five have nearly doubled from the period 2000 to 2010. The number of residents are estimated to have increased by fifteen percent, the number of residents over eighty-five is projected to remain stable through 2022. Another change in population is 1,702 forty-five and sixty-four that age increase the number of people. In between 2010 and 2017 in this age estimate was stable but into the next five years this is projected to decline as they forecast the number of the age under eighteen is also projected to continue to decrease. The number declined ten percent from 7,000 to 6,352 in 2010, does that seem possible that there is ten percent less kids out here. These are the community revitalization people that supposedly gather all the census information that we fill out and send in and then they analysis it. The US Census Bureau got out of that gig. The number of age twenty – forty four declined between 2000 to 2010, they project that is going to increase by 2022. Census Bureau reported the number of households increased by ten percent, which is an indication of the fact that families are splitting up and breaking up

and that things are happening out in the matrimony world that is causing that imbalance there to occur. They estimate the number of households to increase four percent between 2010 and 2017 to 11,709. I will pass this out but what I would like to do is have you read this and compare it to your data is and see how far off they are or we are.

Dorothy Borgus: What is the source of that?

Ron Brand: This is the annual permit reporting from the Town Building Department; it is required under the code provisions right Paul to give annual reports.

Paul Wanzenried: Yes.

Ron Brand: Each year the Town Board also requires it and is used in a number of factors. Going on, the number of family households with no children under eighteen declined nearly 400 between 2000 to 2010 and stood at 3,274 in 2010. Income for Chili households according to the American Housing Survey reports in \$15,000 income brackets for incomes under \$75,000 and \$25,000 brackets for those earning more than \$75,000 adjusting that with the consumer price index indicates that in 2017 an income of \$50,000 a year is the income in Chili. An estimated four percent of the population was living below the poverty line and that includes almost 800 people between the ages of eighteen and sixty- four and 336 of those sixty-five and over. There is the household incomes, the number of households in that range and the total is 11,028 households, and you are showing this is just a continuation of number of permits so it does not give me the total to compare against this we would have to get that information. The 2010 Census reported those 11, 685 that seventy-eight percent are owner occupied and twenty-two percent are renter. If people are concerned about the composition between renting units and owners, you have a good ratio there three to one. Then there are currently 12,107 housing units and the number of housing units are expected to increase to 12,499 by 2022 that is what they are projecting. Now, there is a lot to throw at you quickly but I would like you to take a look at that and see if you have some questions or something and we can do some more research and try and pull some more information together. Here is the Building Department information, you are showing a relatively stable rate of growth in 2016, and then in 2016 you kind of dropped off. What do you feel the reason is for that, you have any thoughts Paul? 338-441, you peeked in 2014 with 58 to 2015 with 62.

Paul Wanzenried: You peeked in 2015 with 62.

Ron Brand: Then you kind of dropped off in 2016.

David Dunning: I would attribute to the availability of residential land I would say that is preferred by the people who build in Chili, the land is scarce and the properties are near nonexistent as far as residential development. So that is what you are likely seeing, then your guess 2017 will improve substantially from what we have seen in previous years based on the one development that is currently under way. That will trickle into 2018 also I believe and beyond.

Paul Wanzenried: That does not account for the cycle either, this accounts that the permits where pulled. Well, x number of permits are pulled between September and December and the builder may be building those into.

Ron Brand: March or April.

Paul Wanzenried: March, April or further depending on and you have to look at the number of apartments to and the changing demographic or psychology if you will.

Ron Brand: The commercial and industrial permits were up and down all over the place there, one year they were 19 and 52.

Paul Wanzenried: It is sick looking.

David Dunning: Which you would expect.

Paul Wanzenried: Right. Also, looking at the housing in 2016 look back to the additions and alterations in 2015 more people are staying in their homes and they are putting an addition on and making due with what they have. You have 183 there, which surpasses any year that we have in front of us.

David Dunning: Paul correct me if I am wrong but apartments is buildings not units correct.

Paul Wanzenried: Yes, I believe that is correct yes.

Dorothy Borgus: If it were units, it would be a more meaningful number.

David Dunning: Correct.

Paul Wanzenried: Well yes, you have Union Square alone you have thirteen buildings at nine units a pop, so you are over a hundred some odd units.

Ron Brand: It is interesting because according to the realtors, this is a sellers' market and people are getting what they are asking for their properties. I would expect that 2017 you would see a spike in building permit activity for perhaps additions and alterations and not necessarily new houses. Although houses that you have down here 33, 28, 58, 62 they dropped off to 13.

Paul Wanzenried: To date I have done five permits for houses, six maybe seven tops and we are in June almost July.

Ron Brand: But that will probably pick up once this project of Bernie's over on Beaver gets the road and utilities in.

Paul Wanzenried: Yes, we have his, you have Carriage House the last section is fourteen over there you have Fallone over there and Bellaqua those are the most active. From an apartment standpoint Union Square phase 2 will kick in here probably in another month in a half to two months.

David Dunning: And the possibility of making of Mayflower.

Paul Wanzenried: And the possibility of Mayflower correct.

Ron Brand: Mayflower is located where.

Paul Wanzenried: Off of Buffalo Road, right where Westside intersects Buffalo Road.

David Dunning: Just East of College Green.

Ron Brand: Okay, yea. Let me kind of go through David Lindsay's information that he has taken a look at the maps that are in the Comprehensive Plan and he has said that the Wetland & Waste maps need to be updated. The Flood Prone Area maps in regards to flood prone areas he does not recall any signifance so he does not think there is a need to change much of anything there. The Transportation Modes map, looking at the DOT appears that there is some discrepancies and that will have to be updated. Utilities Map District Boundaries map have changed, so this needs to be verified and updated as necessary. The Drainage Management map, the boundaries where based on a 1964 study, tweaks are needed by the Black Creek boundary to account for changes in the drainage patterns as a result of development after 1964. Then finally, Physical Development Constraints map is a compilation of other maps that need to be adjusted to account for changes for parks, conservation and Ag districts. Moving on, the next thing we were going to talk about I thought tonight was the changes that have occurred since 2011 to the existing Land Use map.

David Dunning: Which would be Chapter 5 correct. Right.

Paul Wanzenried: As I go back and think about this going back to that 62, you have to look at this at that one development can skew the project, every one of those parcels in Greenwood is an individual lot and I am almost positive that they are included in that 62. I do not know why, but there is more than seven units and they did more than seven units in Greenwood that is all that is labeled in apartments.

David Dunning: Is a townhouse considered an apartment then Paul.

Ron Brand: It should not be because it is not defined as a multi-family structure.

Paul Wanzenried: I would say that number 62 is an anomaly between 2014 and 2015 that is when Greenwood was in. That is why you have fifty-eight and sixty-two, that is what I am trying to say is the reason. One development will skew your results or could skew your results.

Ron Brand: Okay, Paul I am going to ask you to lead us through the Land Use map and the areas of changes. Things that you know that are out there that do not appear on that map.

David Dunning: Can I make a suggestion, in my reading of this chapter it seemed to be that there was a significant amount of changes in this particular. Does it make sense to do this like any other chapter and go page by page and review what we have found for changes rather than do a blanket thing Ron. Anyone disagree.

Dorothy Borgus: No.

David Dunning: So if everyone is there we will start with 5-1. Anyone with questions or concerns.

Dorothy Borgus: I did not have a problem with that page.

James Ignatowski: I did have one small thing on 5-1, I might be reading it wrong but it says "Figure 5-1 on the next page.

David Dunning: The next page should be the map.

James Ignatowski: What you did not want to give me a map.

David Dunning: Maybe, maybe not. Do you have any of the bigger ones Jim? I will have Dawn make sure she gets you copies that is why I brought those out I figured that those would be easier to look at than the ones in your book.

Paul Wanzenried: I have a question, what is "Rural Residential"?

David Dunning: On the map?

Paul Wanzenried: Yes, it is on the "Future Land Use Map" and it is pink but I believe most of that pink correlates to I am not quite sure with you because someone follows this, the 2010 which labels I don't know that color matches but it rural residential. But, I do not have anything in the zoning districts that takes me to "rural residential".

David Dunning: You may not being a "Future Land Use" map it was probably a recommendation for those particular properties based on what the code is today. I am going to guess that was dealing with the five- acre lots and all those kind of things. I think if you read some of the rest of this chapter here, there may be an indication of that, but I am not positive of that.

Dorothy Borgus: A lot of that is farmland but we also recognized that fact that there are a lot of homes sprinkled in there and it was a good thing to call it "rural residential".

David Dunning: So, things here may not exist today Paul.

Dorothy Borgus: We thought that was going to be the wave of the future.

Ron Brand: Rural Residential is a future in the glossary. "A future Land Use Category, that envisions the principal use of land for single-family dwellings detached on lots generally fronting along the highways and at a density of one acre or larger, as further regulated in the Chili Town Code, Chapter 500, Zoning Law.

Paul Wanzenried: Okay and then I am going to go with the "Right to Farm" act that is going to make it either overlap or make it considerably difficult for any of this to happen.

David Dunning: Well, that is why we are here now because we have done some of these others and reading through this chapter myself I found several areas where we have done plans and studies that will effect what we thought back in 2008 when we started this and working on this since 2011 when it was adopted that there has been significant changes in what the town's planning processes have recommended. You are going to find that in this chapter and there is going to be a lot of modifications in my opinion.

Dorothy Borgus: This is going to be a hard chapter to.

David Dunning: Yes.

Dorothy Borgus: We are not going to breeze thru this.

David Dunning: No.

Ron Brand: I would envision now I would like to think that we would start it tonight and not have to wait a month to continue it. I think if we can move it within a couple of weeks' time if possible so that we could keep it fresh and moving along. Otherwise, this could drag out.

David Dunning: Well, let's see where we go but I would say for this exercise not to get hung up on what is currently in front of you look at more of the text and see what we need to change in the text and then this map will change accordingly.

Steve Tarbell: When you printed off that map I noticed from the minutes before that when you were talking about the Rose Hill the classification of the land that is when I raised that question before because mine shows it as a conservation.

David Dunning: That Future Land Use map is not the current zoning. That map is a reference to what at the time we developed this and actually I think it was carried on from the previous the 2010 Comprehensive Plan that a designation of what the town was looking at and what it should become. Right now at the time when it was purchased today, even it is zoned residential. The official zoning map is here, that is what it officially is and the town was looking at and anticipating.

Steve Tarbell: I think my colors are totally different.

David Dunning: It could be your legend should be accurate though.

Dorothy Borgus: But at the time, we worked on this we never envisioned that would be homes down there where they are going up now.

Paul Wanzenried: South of Beaver Road that is for boating.

David Dunning: Yes but it is zoned residential currently. All right anything on 5-2.

Dorothy Borgus: I did not have anything on 5-2.

Paul Wanzenried: I assume that these "substantial amount of well-drained, nearly level, or gently sloping open land remains available in Northern Chili". That would be David Road as we read further into this chapter the areas somewhere East of Union Street, Attridge Road, Union Square and East of Union Street, South of King Road. Is that correct.

Dorothy Borgus: I would say so.

Paul Wanzenried: Okay I am just trying to get my barring's straight. "The southern part of Chili has extensive wetlands and flood-prone lands very poorly suited for intensive development". Development for that one would fall into the "Right to Farm". Is that correct.

Ron Brand: Well you would want to add that in there as one of the reasons why.

David Dunning: 5-2, these are general statements overall in the characteristics of the town when you get into the sub areas you will get into the more specific detail of what each sub areas characteristics are.

Paul Wanzenried: Can someone explain under "Major Assumptions" the first one "increasing energy costs will serve to continue Chili's".

Dorothy Borgus: I have a question mark there on that line too.

Paul Wanzenried: I questioned it too.

Ron Brand: Increasing energy costs, keep in mind that when this was written back in 2008 and 2010 the price of gas was up over \$2.00 per gallon. It was almost \$3.50 - \$4.00 per gallon back then. That statement.

Dorothy Borgus: Is no longer true I think, maybe take it out.

Ron Brand: But today, by the end of the year who knows it is such a volatile. The energy cost, natural gas if they continue to pursue some of the current administrations goals for oil and other natural gas production then this would absolutely is not going to be true.

Dorothy Borgus: I would think that we would take that out of there.

Ron Brand: I do not think that we can say that we know that it is going to continue to increase.

Dorothy Borgus: I do not think so.

Paul Wanzenried: I do not think that you can say that we are going to change our zoning based on energy costs, because that is kind of, what I am driving at. Because of energy costs, we are going to do more dense development or stack people on top of each other or something of that nature.

Dorothy Borgus: I think the thrust of that was that the thinking when people would want to live closer to their jobs in the city and would not want to go out to Farmington and Victor for instance if the price of gas was what it was at the time. That is what the idea was there. But, I do not think it holds now.

Ron Brand: Taking it out does not destroy the value of the assumption.

Dorothy Borgus: No, so we take it out.

Ron Brand: Yes.

Paul Wanzenried: "Increasing attention by consumers towards efficient transportation solutions". What are efficient transportation solutions? I do not think I found that in the definitions either.

Dorothy Borgus: I think when we did that we were thinking bus. There were not very many busses out here six years ago. It is a lot easier if you ride a bus now to get where you want to go.

Paul Wanzenried: I believe that the Planning Board now does actively ask if it is on a bus route or if there will be busses, especially in certain intense developments. Okay, my next question is the next paragraph "continued increase compliance with greenhouse gas reductions will spur new technologies".

Ron Brand: That was the thinking back then, and you're thought. Greenhouse gases are still.

Paul Wanzenried: And technology changes like the wind.

Dorothy Borgus: This still holds true. This statement still holds true.

David Dunning: In your mind, it may be assumed but it is not. It is an accurate statement. It may not be assumed by everyone.

Dorothy Borgus: I mean now we are thinking about solar, wind power and.

David Dunning: Electric, gas, battery, methane, vegetable oil.

Ron Brand: Yes.

Paul Wanzenried: In the next, paragraph "the town's ability to promote the retention of our seniors in their preferred places of residence". Are you talking about an independent living, assisted living what do you mean by promote, how am I going to promote you to retain you as one of our seniors. To retain you as one of our seniors in their preferred place of residence.

David Dunning: We promote that thru affordable senior living dwellings whatever it may be townhouses or condominiums, assisted living or independent living to encourage and promote those types of facilities. That is what that means.

Paul Wanzenried: Right okay, that is what I thought.

Ron Brand: That combined with the programs that the town offers the seniors and the facilities that you have created for seniors. All of those contribute to and combine that with your statement Paul that people are staying put they are not moving as they age.

David Dunning: Anything else on that page, 5-3.

Dorothy Borgus: I have a problem with the third paragraph from the top, there is a word missing in the first place. In between 'consumption of developable land will drive development into the areas valuable and "having" irreplaceable natural features". There is a word missing there.

Ron Brand: Yes.

Dorothy Borgus: Okay and then we have the Open Space Inventory. We have updates on some of that; it is going to have to be reworded or modified.

Ron Brand: What areas are identified in the 2030 Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Plan Map and the Open Space Inventory and Open Space Plan. It still holds true that just because we give you these tasks if we come up with any solutions to look at private land trusts to preserve this we have it. To my knowledge, any kind of PDR programs of that nature.

Dorothy Borgus: So you think it is all right.

Ron Brand: I would add the Town Open Space Inventory and Open Space Plan because you have accomplished those.

David Dunning: Under "Sub-Area #1", the second paragraph, really. Please explain I do not recall this one at all. This does not seem like a practical place for single- family detached dwellings but I might be wrong.

Paul Wanzenried: That is the.

David Dunning: There is a large piece of vacant land right across from the church.

Paul Wanzenried: No, go behind where the tower that was just put up and the cell tower was put, the mini storages, there is that large chunk of land there and there is property on both sides of the mini storage or to the north of the mini storage. That is where I took that description to take me, because you would have to get beyond Fed Ex. Fed Ex's property kind of runs north and south, so it would project a line from King Road there and south to Paul Road from there, anything east of that.

David Dunning: You are talking about this area here correct. King Road.

Paul Wanzenried: CSX.

David Dunning: So you are talking about this area east of Union, which is already zoned residential it is already zoned for single-family houses.

Paul Wanzenried: That is what it is saying.

Dorothy Borgus: The concern was there was at one point it was expected that it was going to be apartments. That was the thought at the time.

David Dunning: The Future Land Use indicated multiple residential. So, our Future Land Use considerations conflict with this. Am I right?

Ron Brand: Well if that red area that you just pointed out up there is what you are talking about the plan called for that to be re-zoned and developed for a higher density. You have the text is recommending that the large area remain lower density single-family.

Dorothy Borgus: I do not think it is I do not think that contradicts it.

David Dunning: Well, this instead the committee is recommending in changing a large area, changing not retaining.

Paul Wanzenried: It says, "that the existing Future Land Use Plan Map promotes". It is acknowledging that the map promotes multiple residential. Dorothy Borgus: And that is not.

David Dunning: But the plan says is not a contradiction.

Ron Brand: It is.

David Dunning: So the plan contradicts itself in there, so which is it that we want.

Ron Brand: Well, that is what needs to be resolved because now that we have identified that contradiction we cannot leave it.

Paul Wanzenried: Well, I do not know.

David Dunning: To be honest with you I would really hate to see any more multi-residential anymore in the North Chili area. In my opinion, it is saturated.

Dorothy Borgus: It is saturated. It is only a question of time until they cannot all make it.

David Dunning: I would recommend that we would either just completely remove that statement or change.

Paul Wanzenried: That the Future Land Use map.

David Dunning: Be revised to reflect single-family detached homes. Right?

Dorothy Borgus: Sure, yes that would be that was the intent anyway, that we thought that there were enough apartments in North Chili then and there is more now. So do we take that sentence out from instead?

Ron Brand: No, what I am hearing is that you need to.

Dorothy Borgus: Change the map.

Ron Brand: It is the position of the Future.

David Dunning: That whole paragraph could be re-written as "upon this review of the 2030 Comprehensive Plan and with the developments since its adoption in 2011 a significant amount of multi-family dwellings have been constructed in this area it is recommended by the plan that this area remain residential single-family detached homes. Right.

Ron Brand: That is what I am hearing.

David Dunning: That would be a simple just change of the paragraph, change the wording. Anything else on 5-3 anyone?

Paul Wanzenried: The last paragraph the suggestion recommends should you change the word "recommending" to I mean.

Dorothy Borgus: Where are we, the last paragraph?

Paul Wanzenried: Yes.

Dorothy Borgus: The plan recommends that consideration be given, is that where you are?

Paul Wanzenried: The Chili Center Master Plan already pinpoints or directs us that a new community center should be developed. If we were going to do anything with a community center, the location would be in that area.

David Dunning: So this is still true.

Paul Wanzenried: I guess I am thinking that we are farther along than recommendation. Because nothing has been done or nothing has come to flourish.

Dorothy Borgus: It is all right the way it is.

David Dunning: I think so.

Paul Wanzenried: Okay.

David Dunning: I thinks so, it is a recommendation to the plan even if it is duplicated in the Chili Center Master Plan and further supported. The Chili Center Master Plan is also supporting the 2030 Comprehensive Plan. Anything else on 5-3? 5-4?

Dorothy Borgus: What I had was the last paragraph where it talks about the "Town of Riga Comprehensive Plan", I believe that has been updated and whether it still shows that large area of land you know located between the schools in North Chili and Buffalo Road. That was a problem when we did this because at that point their comprehensive plan showed business right down to the town line to Chili's line. And, we wanted to make sure that was known. Whether it still shows that, I do not know so, I think you have to take; a look at Riga's and see what they have done. It was insane to us that is what they had envisioned. But it is what they had.

Paul Wanzenried: Can we go back up to where it says, "further south along Union Street, suitable for limited industrial and/or commercial development once public sewer service is extended and Paul Road is extended". Now, where is Paul Road being extended?

David Dunning: There was at one time a hundred years ago there was a proposal in and I think actually funding was almost available for bridging the railroad track for Paul Road so that as you came up Paul Road where it turns into King Road, you have that Paul Road extension there that would actually connect by bridge to Paul Road that would take you out to Union Street.

Paul Wanzenried: That is what I meant by the connection.

David Dunning: That was supposed to be the connection and that is what you are seeing here.

Paul Wanzenried: And it does reference that.

David Dunning: That is probably the deadest project that there is out there.

Dorothy Borgus: That is too bad.

David Dunning: Yes, it is unfortunate. I do not have a problem leaving it I mean if at some time powers to the state or the federal government has some type of program that would allow us to put a bridge there I would hate to cut us off and say do not. If you keep the support for it in the comprehensive plan, you will at least have some ground when you go to apply for grants and things like that. Now with the Fed Ex being their property kind of butting over to the back side of that I do not know who because part of this also talked about acquis ion of property and easements in this area to do this. I do not know who still owns the property back there and I do not know with Fed Ex how much where their property line actually lines up. So, this may not be even feasible at all based on ownership of the land. But again, I would be reluctant to take it out because if an opportunity ever exists we would at least like to explore it.

Ron Brand: Yes, you can see it up there on the Future Land Use Plan in those dotted lines, the black dots there east of Union south of King, west of 490 there. Is that correct.

Dorothy Borgus: You can cut off a lot of distance when you want it; the bridge has been bad for a long time. But there was not money for it.

Paul Wanzenried: Okay on the next paragraph, what area is it says, "still further south along Union Street there is other land suitable for industrial and/or commercial development that would not be dependent upon the extension of Paul Road to Union Street".

David Dunning: Fed Ex property and then there is the property that the fire department owns on Union Street.

Dorothy Borgus: That corner.

David Dunning: I think it is in between is it not. Between Paul Road and.

Paul Wanzenried: Yes, it borders the properties on Paul Road.

David Dunning: Just north of Paul Road. Right.

Paul Wanzenried: Then CSX properties on Paul Road.

David Dunning: Right.

Dorothy Borgus: And who is to say that the fire department is ever going to use it.

David Dunning: They have been trying to sell it is my understanding. But I could be wrong.

Dorothy Borgus: Then I think what we should do is leave it, it is suitable for industrial/commercial.

David Dunning: It would.

Dorothy Borgus: It would still be a valid statement.

Paul Wanzenried: The development of that is not dependent upon the extension of Paul Road and Union Street.

David Dunning: Not at all.

Dorothy Borgus: It would not be dependent.

Paul Wanzenried: The last aspect of that paragraph should be removed.

David Dunning: Correct. You all right with that Ron?

Ron Brand: Well it says, "it would not be dependent upon the extension of Paul Road and Union Street".

Paul Wanzenried: Why even have that that is my point why even bring that up.

Dorothy Borgus: Because the previous statement we were talking about it.

David Dunning: Do we need to mention anything with the Fed Ex site in this. Because Boon Drive is new since this plan was done.

Ron Brand: I would do Boon Drive as public.

David Dunning: Yes, it is a town road.

Ron Brand: So you have accomplished.

David Dunning: We have accomplished access to the industrial property that would have benefited by the extension of Paul Road or the completion of the connection of Paul Road by way of access thru Boon Drive.

Ron Brand: The construction of Boon Drive.

David Dunning: Correct.

Ron Brand: So then that is ultimately the language that you need to say here and then that means you go back to that fifth paragraph and reword it as such that it is no longer a feasible extension of Paul Road there. Is that what I am hearing?

David Dunning: From an access to industrial it is all gone, there is nothing left over there.

Dorothy Borgus: No, but if you extended the road, if you could put the bridge back.

David Dunning: Yes but it is all farms.

Dorothy Borgus: But that does not mean that it could not be sold off for building.

David Dunning: But it still has access from Paul Road. It just does not have access all the way thru to Union Street.

Dorothy Borgus: There is increase interest in it.

David Dunning: I do not know maybe, maybe not. I do not know that I would change anything other than some of the addition of that property has been resolved. I would still like to leave the possibility of the connection in there somehow.

Ron Brand: I will give it a shot wordsmithing.

David Dunning: Anything else on 5-4? 5-5 is the map, 5-6.

Dorothy Borgus: I have "the scale of commercial development would be moderately small" I had a note saying is there room for this.

Paul Wanzenried: Where are they going?

Dorothy Borgus: That is what I mean where would you put it?

Ron Brand: Well at the time, there was land.

Dorothy Borgus: Yes but no more.

Paul Wanzenried: Well that is not commercial developments, LI back in there. You take the Faust property and go north to King's Crossing there is a couple of residential houses.

Dorothy Borgus: See what we are talking about is the land between the Attridge Road and Union Street.

Paul Wanzenried: Yes.

Dorothy Borgus: The master plan had a big plan for that way back when was to have stores in there.

Paul Wanzenried: Along Union Street.

Dorothy Borgus: Yes, to serve all the homes that were going to be built there. That is all gone now to other things there is no room there for commercial development. Certainly no on the scale we envisioned it back then, you are talking about ten acres. There is not ten acres of land there to do that with anymore it is all taken up with other stuff.

David Dunning: Between Attridge.

Dorothy Borgus: Between Attridge and Union, you know where the adult home is and the apartments are and those.

David Dunning: Parklands and Legacy are.

Dorothy Borgus: Yes. David Dunning: But how far south is that.

Dorothy Borgus: It just says between Attridge and Union Street.

David Dunning: Yes, there is still I mean depending on if you look at the sub area south it goes all the way down to the tracks.

Dorothy Borgus: But I think it specifies for Attridge and Union Street.

David Dunning: Understood, but that definition carries on in this subarea all the way down to the tracks. Look at the map Dorothy.

Dorothy Borgus: Where is the room to put any commercial in there?

David Dunning: You still have Faust property and you have those seventy-eight acres.

Dorothy Borgus: It physically does not lend itself to follow commercial.

David Dunning: Do not count on it.

Dorothy Borgus: You would have to move half of the town in there and make it.

David Dunning: Do not count on it. So, you still have that.

Ron Brand: Are those across from the Meadowbrook Apartments?

David Dunning: That and south of that which there is still a good hundred acres or better sitting in there of unused land between Faust and that seventy-eight acres. I think that Faust is thirty some acres.

Paul Wanzenried: Faust is seventy-eight.

David Dunning: No is it really. Seventy-eight acres so you have over a hundred and fifty acres over there.

Dorothy Borgus: We are talking about commercial development we are not talking about big business here; to me commercial development means stores to serve the residential community it says. I am not thinking about businesses I am thinking about stores to serve a mixed residential use is what it says. There is land there but not for the purposes that this was meant to cover.

David Dunning: If you look at the Future Land Use map, it is kind of pinkish up there I do not know what color it is on yours, it might be that pinkish color but that is all showing as General Business. From 490 all the way up to the tracks, although this is north of that. See the future land use there was mixed residential which is pink up there.

Ron Brand: So what is the consensus? Are you going to change this wording somehow?

David Dunning: There is sewer up there. Yes, I think that the language probably needs to change. I do not think that we are defining commercial as general business type.

Dorothy Borgus: I know when we talked about commercial I know what the intent was these small stores. Maybe it is not worded correctly but we did not mean factories and we talked about that we meant small stores to serve the houses that where proposed there at the time.

David Dunning: It is zoned industrial, and there is some residential up there.

James Ignatowski: The last sentence says how big you are supposing it to be, which is ten acres.

Dorothy Borgus: Sure, there is ten acres up there for industrial but there is nothing there for commercial stores, there is just nothing there.

Ron Brand: So what are you saying, what are we changing?

Dorothy Borgus: If you want to talk about industrial then we should say that and not say commercial development because that is misleading. In my mind, the way we were thinking then that commercial is not industrial. It was stores, shops, dry cleaners, bakeries and to serve all the houses that were supposed to be in there now is a lot of apartments and adult homes. It did not turn out the way we envisioned it then.

David Dunning: She is right the Future Land Use shows that as being mixed residential, almost that whole triangle thing if you will is mixed residential. But, she is right if you are defining any commercial in that, fine I am okay with that. I do not have a problem with the definition but if commercial is stores, Seven-Eleven's, mom, and pop grocery store, there is not any land there to do that, industrial could work in there. There is no land there for commercial for general business, restricted business, neighborhood business whatever you want to call it.

Dorothy Borgus: That last sentence is totally untrue, because if you are thinking of commercial as industrial then there is certainly more than ten acres then that whole last sentence should come out. No matter how you look at it that is not right. "The scale of commercial development would be moderately small".

David Dunning: And the tip when you look up at Attridge, when you look at the tip you have Buffalo Road, Union Street and Attridge you have that strip going there. The gas station, the diner right that is all in between that section.

Dorothy Borgus: But this was envisioning more commercial development.

Paul Wanzenried: Here is Buffalo, this is Attridge here, Union Street you take this down to Union Square Boulevard, to Paul right there, and this is King's Crossing down here, New Hope here, Meadowbrook over here.

David Dunning: That 366 and the one below it there that right under the fresh emergency that is town land, which is all town property.

Dorothy Borgus: See when this plan was envisioned back when it was supposed to be all levels of housing it was supposed to be expensive homes, smaller homes, senior homes it was all going to be homes.

Ron Brand: That was based on what was originally proposed.

Dorothy Borgus: Then we envisioned it that they would need some stores along there to accommodate and serve all those new houses. It got used up for other things and there is no land left to do that.

James Ignatowski: That small parcel that is like 336.

David Dunning: The only parcel up in there that could to was your favorite house, the green and white house.

Dorothy Borgus: The one that was torn down.

David Dunning: Nagel's house, was that Nagel's?

Dorothy Borgus: Nagel's, yes.

David Dunning: That is probably the only parcel, what an acre maybe two.

Dorothy Borgus: Maybe.

Paul Wanzenried: This one here.

David Dunning: Yes.

James Ignatowski: It kind of lines up with that red part on the map.

Steve Tarbell: Is it where the greenhouse is?

David Dunning: Just north of that, you have to go to Buffalo Road.

Dorothy Borgus: It is in back of the gas station. But if you are talking about commercial that is really it.

David Dunning: That is it.

Dorothy Borgus: But you are talking here about ten acres of available land.

David Dunning: That last sentence you might want to change to "there is minimal opportunities for commercial development in this area".

Dorothy Borgus: All right how about that.

David Dunning: That does not define what minimal is. Which then will affect the third paragraph.

Ron Brand: Right.

Dorothy Borgus: Before we get there, on the second paragraph it says, "there will be construction of one or more roads connecting the development of the mixed residential area on the Attridge Road side" that is done so there has been. You have to change the tense there, "there has been". I do not know how you want to word it but that is a done deal.

Ron Brand: What is the name of the roads that have been.

Dorothy Borgus: What is the name of that road?

David Dunning: That goes thru Union Square Boulevard. Then you have other roads in there too, they are not town roads.

Dorothy Borgus: They are only talking about through roads so that would be the only one right Union Square Boulevard.

David Dunning: I believe that is the only one that comes up and it comes up round and out correct or it connects to Linnea Lane or something.

Dorothy Borgus: Attridge to Union, so I guess Union Square Boulevard.

Ron Brand: So you are going to say that there has been construction on Union Square Boulevard.

David Dunning: That has been there.

Dorothy Borgus: Was not there, it did go thru.

Ron Brand: Did it go all the way thru in 2008?

Dorothy Borgus: You could come in from Attridge, because my mother-in-law was over there in Union Square.

David Dunning: I know Slattery walks his dog there every day.

Dorothy Borgus: No, see that many years back.

David Dunning: Yes, he did not live there then.

Dorothy Borgus: There may have been some kind of a rough trail or whatever you probably could have driven on it. It was not a paved road like it is now; you had to come in through Attridge back then. Or, you can put that it was finished rather than constructed how is that.

Ron Brand: Just the construction of Union Square Boulevard has allowed the connection of the development of this mix residential area to Attridge and Union.

Dorothy Borgus: There you go. My question on the third paragraph would be has that been done.

David Dunning: "The existing multi- family residential zoning near Attridge Road will have to be changed to single-family". No, it is being developed correct.

Dorothy Borgus: I was thinking about the first sentence.

David Dunning: "The town's official zoning map will require several changes to conform to the 2030 Plan". Oh yea. Dorothy Borgus: Okay.

David Dunning: There is no question there has got to be some changes to that zoning map. Rezoning's are captured and periodically update the map.

Dorothy Borgus: Okay. Again, the tenth sentence is wrong it has been done there is already a multi-family residential near Attridge Road.

David Dunning: It is saying it will have to be changed to single-family.

Paul Wanzenried: Are all those on Union Square single-family?

David Dunning: Not all of them no. There is a mix there.

Paul Wanzenried: When you get south of Union south or east however you want to look at it. You get into the cul-de-sac those are all duplex's.

David Dunning: Then the changing of the industrial zoning along the CSX Mainline we will have to change to single-family near Attridge. That is now town owned.

Paul Wanzenried: So, we would get rid of that.

David Dunning: Yes, I would think. It would be identified as municipal property now correct.

Dorothy Borgus: Right.

Ron Brand: For what purpose.

David Dunning: For the purpose of town owned land.

Ron Brand: It is not encumbered by parkland.

David Dunning: no, it was not acquired, obtained, or deeded as parkland. Paragraph four does that even apply anymore.

Paul Wanzenried: That is what I said where?

David Dunning: This is saying it is an impediment.

Paul Wanzenried: This is saying that the project had been secured from the State of NY but the roads where never built.

David Dunning: That is still accurate.

Paul Wanzenried: There is an impediment.

David Dunning: No, there is no impediment anymore because it has been developed. You have Boon there, Fed Ex.

Ron Brand: So take that sentence out.

Dorothy Borgus: Take the impediment out.

Paul Wanzenried: Well, why does the impediment still not exist? If the state wants to throw Boon and Fed Ex x number of dollars to put that extension for the bridge to connect the road.

David Dunning: No more land outside of that farmland back there that you can access from Paul Road Extension.

Paul Wanzenried: It is my understanding that this is talking of CSX.

Ron Brand: It does recommend the Paul Road extension between King Road and Union Street.

Dorothy Borgus: That was something I never understood because the people that own that farm.

David Dunning: It is not Ford.

Dorothy Borgus: Well that was not their name. But, you see that farm from 490 I never understood that but he would not sell and part with their land and I never understood how the emanate domain never went in there but that is what went wrong because those people would not sell.

David Dunning: That is the pumpkin people that own that.

Dorothy Borgus: No. This is the one you see if you go up 490 and look to the right just before you go over the railroad tracks. That is not Ford's; he was retired from Kodak or something at one time. But I never understood why if the government needed the land they just could not take it. The one right there 1250 and then he owned the land south of Paul Road also.

Steve Tarbell: How many acres was that?

Dorothy Borgus: It was a lot. He owned the other side of Paul Road too, it is all one farm.

Paul Wanzenried: I think he owns 1191, and this.

Dorothy Borgus: He owned a lot of land.

Ron Brand: But he never put it into an AG District.

Paul Wanzenried: This is Fed Ex now. There is the Water Authority.

Dorothy Borgus: Right, but he owned all the rest of that.

Paul Wanzenried: Boon is out of the picture, it would be Fed Ex would have been a big player.

Dorothy Borgus: I guess the statement as it stands is still true, whoever owns it, and it is going to be a problem.

David Dunning: That is even zoned industrial isn't it?

Dorothy Borgus: I think the paragraph is just fine the way it is.

David Dunning: Okay I am good.

Paul Wanzenried: The area south of King Road is this area correct is that the farm?

Dorothy Borgus: Yes.

Paul Wanzenried: Do we have any intentions of extending sewer into that area.

David Dunnng: What would be north of King Road?

Dorothy Borgus: That would be south. It says "the area south of King Road that needs the sewer feasibility study".

David Dunning: Both north and south of King Road, east of Union Street. "Additional single-family development is expected on both north and south sides of King Road". Where on the north side?

James Ignatowski: I thought we were on the paragraph above.

David Dunning: Oh are we I am sorry.

Paul Wanzenried: This is all (PDR) here, the Fallone brothers, King's Forest.

Dorothy Borgus: See Paul the book reads "the area south of King Road that needs the sewer feasibility study".

Paul Wanzenried: Okay, south of King Road would be there is 1250 here, more farmland, there is a house there at the corner, this I believe is that storage place, cell tower is right here on 61, 59 I believe is vacant, this is the storage facility, and then there is this parcel here. This is 51 & 45 I believe is Tony Camile(?), and then that is the yellow house there and 60 I am not sure if it is 60 or 30 is Forest property. Because this Ford for your reference is this guy right here.

Dorothy Borgus: Yes, he is right on Paul Road right.

Paul Wanzenried: Ford's farm and then he farms this here, and this here.

Dorothy Borgus: I do not know who owns that. It is not good farmland because it is low down by the railroad tracks.

Paul Wanzenried: It is reasonably high low.

Dorothy Borgus: So I do not know what you don't like there.

Paul Wanzenried: I do not have. Dorothy Borgus: Oh, you do not have a problem with that.

Paul Wanzenried: No.

Dorothy Borgus: Oh, okay.

David Dunning: I did not either.

Dorothy Borgus: I think it is fine.

David Dunning: The font needs to be fixed.

Dorothy Borgus: Yes, the font needs to be fixed we have two different.

Paul Wanzenried: I just asked a question about the sewer feasibility.

Dorothy Borgus: Oh, I see.

Paul Wanzenried: That is what my question was.

Dorothy Borgus: Then the next paragraph I have re-do paragraph.

David Dunning: I just do not know on the north side of King Road what you have, that is where the church is the rectory, and BVR is over there, there is nothing anymore on the north side I do not believe. On the south side, there would be that one corner lot across from the church.

Paul Wanzenried: King road starts after the tracts or.

David Dunning: Right at the bridge.

Paul Wanzenried: Right at the bridge.

David Dunning: Pretty much right where Paul Road Extension.

Paul Wanzenried: So, right there, number 30 would be the large, number 2 would be the white house on the corner, then that funky little shape there that goes along 490 and behind BVR so to speak and 30 is undeveloped.

David Dunning: Is that where they are dumping all that stuff right now?

Paul Wanzenried: That is why I say I think it is Jimmy Lapore's because I believe that is where he has dumped most of his dirt.

Dorothy Borgus: With regards to this paragraph here, I have a note that says north side complete. Well it is.

Paul Wanzenried: For all intense purposes it is. Well 30 is available but a Fallone's still has more houses he has just developed Section 6, but there is more to be developed back in there beyond section 6. David Dunning: Really.

Paul Wanzenried: I believe so.

David Dunning: That is Paul Road not King Road. Paul Wanzenried: No, no that is King Road because I am on the other side. I am going west. Ron Brand: West and north aren't you. Paul Wanzenried: That is correct. David Dunning: Oh, okay I am sorry. Paul Wanzenried: Right now, he is developing in here. Dorothy Borgus: I did not know that he had all that land there. Paul Wanzenried: Yes, he has a boatload of land back in there. Dorothy Borgus: Is that not really low. I had a notion that was wet. Ron Brand: Way on the edge. Paul Wanzenried: This end here he runs into it. He still has all this to develop. James Ignatowski: That is quite a few houses. Paul Wanzenried: There is these big parcels here too and this is undeveloped. James Ignatowski: Who owns that? Paul Wanzenried: A couple out of Florida. Dorothy Borgus: Well you are getting into wetlands here. Paul Wanzenried: Yes, this is the wetlands in here. Here is where Mayflower is going to go. David Dunning: Where they think they are going to go. Dorothy Borgus: So what about this paragraph then. David Dunning: I think it is fine then. Dorothy Borgus: It is fine then the way it is. David Dunning: I would say so. Dorothy Borgus: You are going to leave north and south in there. David Dunning: Sure, because it is true.

Dorothy Borgus: North and south.

David Dunning: It is true based on the area the subarea.

Dorothy Borgus: Okay.

Ron Brand: Would it be clearer to say that "additional single-family residential development is expected to continue on the north side of King Road and possible the south side", because we do not have any.

David Dunning: Just that corner lot.

Paul Wanzenried: This 1250, 1196, 55, I do not know who lives at 93 I think that is not really anything other than a swamp. This parcel puzzles me here only because from what I can see it is landlocked. 147 how do I get to it.

Ron Brand: Maybe that is why it is undeveloped.

James Ignatowski: You would have to purchase 175.

Paul Wanzenried: Yes, I think so. I want to say that 215 is where that red garage is all by itself.

Dorothy Borgus: Yes, I think you are right which it looks pretty bad, which is why it always looks so strange because it is a strip. Nothing else could go on there.

David Dunning: Well then, what is 175 is that the house that is there?

Dorothy Borgus: It is that red.

David Dunning: No, it is not, that red storage place is right there on the left there correct.

Paul Wanzenried: This right here.

David Dunning: But the people that own that own 175, they own that house.

Dorothy Borgus: Oh, okay.

David Dunning: The only reason that I know that is because they came in wanting to know if they could put a McDonald's on that corner.

Dorothy Borgus: What the corner of King Road.

David Dunning: At 215 there. So maybe they own the rest of that.

Dorothy Borgus: So are you going to change the wording on that then. I think what you said sounds pretty good. So that paragraph is okay with the re-wording that Ron was going to give it right.

James Ignatowski: Yes.

Dorothy Borgus: The next paragraph seems to be true.

Ron Brand: Do we want to say single-family residential detached.

Dorothy Borgus: Where are you Ron?

Ron Brand: "Additional single-family residential development is expected to continue on the north side of King Road east of Union Street". "Additional land south of King Road in this area remain available for residential single-family development".

Dorothy Borgus: Yes, I think that is good.

Ron Brand: That sound all right.

Dorothy Borgus: Yes, that sounds good. I guess the next paragraph remains true.

David Dunning: But that is already zoned R-15, am I wrong.

Ron Brand: It is zoned R-15 but the current pattern is larger than R-15. Right?

David Dunning: Correct, but this is saying, "that zoning should be changed to normal single family residential to remove all impediments to development". Normal to me would have been R-15, R-20.

Ron Brand: Take normal out of there. I do not like that.

David Dunning: I never like the word normal.

Ron Brand: You can say two family residential is R-15.

David Dunning: Yes, single family residential.

Ron Brand. Period. Take out.

Dorothy Borgus: Take out "remove all impediments to development".

David Dunning: Yes. The rest would be true I believe. 5-7?

Dorothy Borgus: In the second, paragraph the third line.

Ron Brand: Hold on so on Sub –Area Map #1, the only change to Sub-Area Map #1 is the commercial general business is that all right as shown along Union.

David Dunning: Well, the Sub-Area does not show it around Union it shows it mostly around Buffalo Road with a little spot where the Shelter Creek is I believe.

Ron Brand: I am seeing that over there, why am I seeing it here.

David Dunning: That is Shelter Creek that little red spot.

Ron Brand: Yes.

David Dunning: That is Shelter Creek.

Ron Brand: So that is okay.

David Dunning: Yes, we are not going to take it away from them. That down there is not part of the Sub-Area.

Ron Brand: I just want to get it into the record that Sub-Area Map #1 is fine the way it is.

Steve Tarbell: Did you say areas 3, 4, and 5 have not improved much.

David Dunning: The map will need to change to show well that is already recommended as residential but if we down here ought to add to this is do we have a municipals properties designation in the legend.

Ron Brand: Well it is municipal thought for what purpose.

David Dunning: For municipal property.

Ron Brand: It is going to remain vacant or conservation.

Dorothy Borgus: You are talking about the former kindergarten the community building.

David Dunning: No, no we are talking about the Cornflower property. Attridge Road from Attridge Road to along the tracks east.

Dorothy Borgus: Oh, okay.

James Ignatowski: The town owns that so that would not be any part of it and it needs to be taken out of the gray area basically.

David Dunning: Right.

Ron Brand: What map are you looking at?

James Ignatowski: Sub-Area #1.

Dorothy Borgus: Sub-Area #1 down in the lower left corner.

Ron Brand: That is what I asked if there were any obscure.

James Ignatowski: That is what I was talking about after you had said.

David Dunning: No your fine.

Dorothy Borgus: You could add that to the legend if there isn't any municipal categories there.

Ron Brand: So it is that.

James Ignatowski: It is that little strip at the bottom.

Ron Brand: It goes over like this and back down kind of a strip over there.

James Ignatowski: Yes.

Ron Brand: It looks like several acres.

Dorothy Borgus: It pretty much comes up to the end of the road there.

David Dunning: See where the cul-de-sac is there Ron the very kind of L shaped lot there that is town owned.

Ron Brand: All the way across the wetland over to the east property line there.

David Dunning: All the way over to the yes. Actually it goes into Riga just a little bit, we own a little bit going into Riga.

Dorothy Borgus: Going east how far does it end.

David Dunning: It ends right at the line you see the property line there that is already there. You will see actually I take that back you see the little wetland area I believe we go all the way over to the next area there.

Dorothy Borgus: Pass that little wetland.

David Dunning: Correct.

Ron Brand: 370.

David Dunning: We own all of 370 and you notice that 370 wraps around 366 also which is up to Attridge Road and in Riga.

Ron Brand: Okay I got it.

Dorothy Borgus: So the cul-de-sac is on town land too.

David Dunning: Correct it is.

Dorothy Borgus: Now if you are going to put municipal property on this map then you ought to designate the recreation building there. Are you going to add that?

David Dunning: Do we want to add that? I mean we probably should. Don't you think?

Ron Brand: What else Dorothy.

Dorothy Borgus: Well it was the old school next to the plaza.

David Dunning: If you go up Buffalo Road.

Dorothy Borgus: Buffalo Road next to the.

Paul Wanzenried: It is the current recreation center.

Dorothy Borgus: Right, so if we are adding a category for the new land we should include the rec center.

David Dunning: 4400 Buffalo Road. Although it is not well defined on this because of, the red kind of hides it because it is in a GB zone.

Ron Brand: Community Center.

Dorothy Borgus: Right.

Ron Brand: There is a North Chili Community Center.

David Dunning: It is the Chili Community Center. Who has these Chris?

Ron Brand: I do not know.

David Dunning: Who colored these before Passero?

Dorothy Borgus: Passero did.

David Dunning: That is right I should go back and see if we own those I do not know.

Dorothy Borgus: I would hope we did for what we paid.

Ron Brand: Sub-Area #2 page 5-7.

Steve Tarbell: The paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 have not included any since then, did you know of any speed up or is it just dollars holding back for any of these projects. It always seems like it has to do with getting on a list and if money is available.

Ron Brand: This was of concern I know of several people in that area that used to have to go thru that intersection and it was always a nightmare especially in the morning with school busses and in the afternoon.

David Dunning: To answer your question is these are State and County roads, where as we do not have the authority and our plans indicate that we would like these but we have yet to get any cooperation from either indemnity to get something done.

Steve Tarbell: So it is the same answer as last year it is about the money.

David Dunning: Well I think that the answers we get a lot of time from the State and the County is that these are not failing intersections based on their evaluation. That is the answer that we get.

Steve Tarbell: Is there any way to make these a little more serious than they already do in this. I mean they kind of spell it out but. It seems like what I know in the last year being involved in these intersections it seems like nothing has been done since 2011 for sure.

David Dunning: Nothing has been done in forever.

Dorothy Borgus: That is the note I had there too.

Steve Tarbell: Is there any way to make it a stronger message than what we have in there.

Dorothy Borgus: That is what I wrote here strengthen need that is what I wrote in the margin. Maybe we should emphasize that a little more.

David Dunning: Ron correct me if I am wrong here but don't we have as one of the recommendations and it was not in the current time frame I do not believe, but wasn't it to work this roadways map and land. Was that not one of the recommendations?

Ron Brand: Yes.

Dorothy Borgus: That is what we were going to call it.

David Dunning: I do not remember what exactly what it was I may be using the wrong language but. There was a recommendation to do something.

Ron Brand: Prepare and adopt a major overlay district.

David Dunning: No.

Ron Brand: Spot safety improvements for identified intersections and that needed to be in the areas of concern.

David Dunning: I cannot answer your questions Steve I do not know.

Steve Tarbell: I understand what the State and County does I was just wondering if there was any way we could in case something came up that there is some discussion or leverage about getting some work done that we already had that in there in our comprehensive plan that these are pretty serious intersections and you take care of.

Ron Brand: You could strengthen this by saying this spot improvement originally identified in 2011 and still remains.

Dorothy Borgus: A danger, Union and Chili Avenue is a danger.

Ron Brand: See what I am saying.

David Dunning: Can we resolve this and maybe touch on a bit what Steve referred to by doing some kind of a traffic study of our own that the town performs a traffic study on these specific areas that we have identified in the comprehensive plan. We hire a consultant to come in like they do for developers.

Steve Tarbell: I think there has been some already done.

David Dunning: There has been some.

Steve Tarbell: I never have seen them.

David Dunning: The last major study that the town performed was back when they did the Ballantyne Road Corridor Study. That is old not necessarily outdated but the information there is old and may not be irrelevant to today's conditions based on current developments and whatever else has happened since. But maybe the recommendation goes into some of those actions high priority and moderate and medium actions that we the town engage a consultant to do a study on our problem areas if you will and all those areas of concern. Point out the specifics and then you get. I think that is as strong as you can possibly get.

Steve Tarbell: We did the intersection by the Fast Trak by the Barnes and Noble bookstore in Henrietta that is similar to what needs to be done.

David Dunning: They have money to invest in Henrietta and in Greece but they have very little money for Chili.

Steve Tarbell: Chili and Union is the perfect example as to what that intersection needs.

David Dunning: Yes and the lack of improvement over there is also an impediment to development in that area. There is some commercial property over there.

Dorothy Borgus: It is not going to go anywhere with that kind of a mess.

David Dunning: Right. However, there is also some geographic impediments over there as far as trying to widen or do anything different with that road. You drop between Byrne Dairy and that other side there that east side of the road just drops off.

Steve Tarbell: You need a right turn lane, where it is broken up they are using it as half-and-half now.

Ron Brand: But you know there are some other areas too not necessarily, Chili Avenue and Chestnut Ridge, you have Chili Avenue and Beaver where it comes together there.

David Dunning: Well Chili and Chestnut Ridge, Chili and Beaver, there is Chili and Union, Old Chili Scottsville and Chili Avenue. Times and especially when American Packaging comes in we could see some concerns there. Archer and Beaver would it suffice and be adequate to add then that traffic study or a study of the problem areas.

Ron Brand: In other words on page 6-5 where you have ongoing actions where you are talking about "spot safety improvements for identified intersections" you want to move that up.

David Dunning: Oh is that there, move that up to high priorities then. I thought it was. Yes move that up to high priority and we will put a date on it.

Paul Wanzenried: Where did you find that?

Dorothy Borgus: 6-5.

David Dunning: I am working on the budget now what do you think it will cost me Ron.

Paul Wanzenried: Wait we were getting rid of that because it was in the medium action compare areas of concern road systems map.

Dorothy Borgus: I had written under "C" omit.

Paul Wanzenried: Which is a high priority action item, so it has already been moved up.

David Dunning: We did move it up.

Paul Wanzenried: I have in my notes that an additional action that "C" is the spot safety improvements for identified intersections. My notes say see areas of concern. Because in areas in concern is the high priority elements that is where we would identify those areas of concern.

David Dunning: Okay then that is what we need to do. If we have moved that up already then that is fine.

Dorothy Borgus: But even in the narrative, it would not hurt to move this up a bit.

David Dunning: Right I agree I think that the narrative should say something and refer to it too.

Dorothy Borgus: I mean this Chili and Union was a huge issue back in 2011 and here we are in 2017.

David Dunning: All they did was band-aid.

Steve Tarbell: They did not spend very much they just put a band-aid on it that is what we were told.

David Dunning: I do not know what the costs where David would know more about that than I do.

Dorothy Borgus: I do think Ron we have to beef up the narrative about those intersections; however, you want to wordsmith it.

Ron Brand: Just preparing an area of concern road systems map does not necessarily get at. David Dunning: No but also to what I am saying is that Dorothy is right beef up the text here and add it to that whereas it is recommended that the town consider hiring a consultant to provide the necessary data or information to perhaps seek State, County and Federal funding to improve intersections, improve areas of concern.

Steve Tarbell: Would that consultant have access to the County and any studies, there are some recent ones that were just done.

David Dunning: Oh yea. The traffic people who do these studies have access to a lot.

James Ignatowski: When I looked at the map and some of the proposals some of them are calling for a traffic circle based off the land ownership and the geography is this something that could be expected to be done.

David Dunning: Round bouts depending on the location may or may not be able to be done.

James Ignatowski: Right.

Steve Tarbell: Because of the land issue.

James Ignatowski: It is like the one that is.

David Dunning: Chili and Beaver they talked about that I mean that still could be done, because it is just the church that has the property and we could move their signs.

James Ignatowski: You keep bringing up Union and Chili Avenue based on the geography that is there what can be done that has not been done now is my point.

Dorothy Borgus: They could widen it if they did not do a traffic circle.

Ron Brand: You have such a blind area when you come south.

Dorothy Borgus: And if you are going east right down to the hill and down to the corner, two hills both ways. That might be something to write in there to if Union and Chili is the one I am thinking about specifically but due to the topography of the land it is a failing intersection not only east and west but north and south as well.

David Dunning: Due to the topography, it is somewhat prohibitive.

Dorothy Borgus: Something should be done and anyone that does not believe it should sit and watch those tractor-trailers go up over the curb to try to make that turn and people back are backing up over the hill to get out of the way.

Steve Tarbell: The rep for the County understands the needs and.

David Dunning: Both of those are State roads.

Steve Tarbell: You have to get on the list and get those done. David Dunning: There is an engineering issue with the Union and Chili no doubt.

Dorothy Borgus: No doubt.

David Dunning: Engineering is tough like Dorothy said because you have the hill coming one way you have the drop off going the other way, where do you get the land and how do you reconstruct and resolve that.

Dorothy Borgus: Well they redid the can of worms.

David Dunning: Okay moving along. So, we just get something in there Ron for getting that study. Anything else on 5-7?

Dorothy Borgus: The second paragraph there is an extra word in the second paragraph, the third sentence it says, "there is another one is in Sub-area #3" we have to take out "is". There is an extra word thrown in there see it.

Ron Brand: Where are you seeing that?

Dorothy Borgus: The second paragraph, the third sentence it begins "there is another one". See that? And then it says "is", "is" needs to be taken out.

Ron Brand: Yes.

Dorothy Borgus: Then on the last paragraph, midway thru it says, "This intersection improvement is warranted only if there is a Chili Center Master Plan component created" that we need some updating on that sentence. We have a master plan now.

Ron Brand: Do you recall off hand what the master plan says.

David Dunning: It does not address this. I do not recall that it addresses this at all.

Dorothy Borgus: The master plan does not identify the problem.

David Dunning: I do not believe so.

Dorothy Borgus: Okay is it all right then?

David Dunning: We can go back and look at that.

Paul Wanzenried: What is the last paragraph? "Creation of a new signalized intersection where Paul Road intersects with Chili Avenue south of the Paul Road/Chili Avenue/Coldwater Rod intersection". Is that not already done? Is that in front of Town & Country? I guess I am just not sure where.

David Dunning: I believe is this not Greenwood?

Paul Wanzenried: Is that what that is?

David Dunning: I believe so. Greenwood at Wegmans and if Greenwood proceeds with their retail element over there that a signal was warranted there.

Steve Tarbell: Yes.

David Dunning: Is that what this is referring too.

Paul Wanzenried: It is the intersection that intersects with Chili Avenue South that confuses me.

David Dunning: South of Paul Road/Chili Avenue/Coldwater Road intersection and that is about southeast.

Steve Tarbell: As soon as the project is completed then there is plans for a stop light.

David Dunning: As soon as the project started.

Ron Brand: So how are you saying you want this reworded? Where Paul Road intersects with Chili Avenue east of the.

Paul Wanzenried: The creation of a newly signalized intersection southeast of where Paul Road intersects with Chili Ave.

Ron Brand: That will do it. Can you go up to that map.

Paul Wanzenried: So right here, so I think it has to say "a new signalized intersection southeast of the Paul Road/Chili Avenue/Coldwater Road intersection". Right here is the commercial development Howlitt's, so somewhere in here.

Steve Tarbell: It is at the entrance to the Wegmans.

David Dunning: It is right at the Wegmans entrance.

Ron Brand: So why don't you say that. At the Wegmans plaza entrance.

David Dunning: Paul Road entrance to Wegmans, the Wegmans complex or plaza.

Steve Tarbell: I just asked that question at the meeting a few months ago and they said that when the project is completed.

David Dunning: It is the commercial aspect of it.

Ron Brand: Where Paul Road intersects with Chili Avenue.

Paul Wanzenried: Get rid of it. Just say, "Where Paul Road intersects with the Wegmans entrance" much cleaner.

Dorothy Borgus: I knew this chapter was going to be slow going.

Ron Brand: This intersection is warranted when; we do not want to tie this to the Chili Center Master Plan. Is it tied to some specific project?

David Dunning: It is tied to a project I do not believe it is tied to the master plan.

Ron Brand: Okay. So this intersection improvement is not only warranted.

David Dunning: It is a condition of their approvals.

Ron Brand: Installed when there is, take out Chili Center Master Plan component and all the rest of that stuff. And just put in there, what is the name.

David Dunning: Greenwood Townhomes.

Ron Brand: Is developing?

Dorothy Borgus: When the commercial part of it is developed.

David Dunning: Correct.

Dorothy Borgus: It is not more homes it is when they do the stores.

Ron Brand: This intersection improvement is to be installed when there is commercial component to the Greenwood Townhomes project.

Dorothy Borgus: Sounds good.

David Dunning: That is fine.

Ron Brand: I say we stop before we get into Sub-Area #3.

David Dunning: Can we, yea can we finish this last paragraph on this page then, because I believe this refers to the property across the street. Which has been sold and.

Paul Wanzenried: I am glad you pointed that out because I had no idea where it was.

David Dunning: I think that is where it is. Is it not, does it not fit that description.

Dorothy Borgus: That is what I thought it was.

Paul Wanzenried: It could be this thought. 3348, 3400, this here is the project to which we not this 3360 is the Mark IV project.

David Dunning: That is correct. That belongs to that one house.

Paul Wanzenried: Right, and then you have all this.

Ron Brand: It is saying there are other parcels beyond Mark IV that has the potential.

Paul Wanzenried: There is nothing beyond Mark IV that has the potential. It is the north side of Chili Avenue between Beaver Road. How do you get to the north side of Chili Avenue and Beaver Road?

David Dunning: Those houses.

Paul Wanzenried: These are the only things I can pull up and think about that are there.

Ron Brand: But that is more than just this one parcel across from the street here right.

Dorothy Borgus: Right.

Paul Wanzenried: Yes sir.

David Dunning: That 3390 is owned by that one house and they have all that acreage. Then 3360 is Mark IV. So what are we talking about?

Ron Brand: I see 3400 and 3348; as well, those are big chunks of land.

Dorothy Borgus: But they are past the project.

Paul Wanzenried: They have houses attached to them.

Ron Brand: I am ignoring the fact that there is a house there I mean you can subdivide that off and have a big chunk of land there that you can see some potential development activity occurring on.

Dorothy Borgus: Some of this paragraph is right though right.

Ron Brand: Yes. Where a mix of residential, restricted business and neighborhood businesses could occur.

Dorothy Borgus: But we would not have restricted business in there right.

Ron Brand: Why would you not restricted business in there.

Dorothy Borgus: Well are we talking about.

Ron Brand: Post Office.

Dorothy Borgus: How many parcels are we talking about here? We do not identify, that is the problem it does not exactly identify where you are considering in this narrative.

David Dunning: I think that if you are talking about the tracks it is 3340, 3360, 3370, 3376, 3388, 3386, 3390, 3398, 3400, 3444 because that would be between Beaver and the 3448 is on the other side of this description.

Dorothy Borgus: Okay.

Ron Brand: That was Winkydinks right Charlie.

David Dunning: Who, I do not know.

Ron Brand: Winkydinks, what was his name.

David Dunning: Not Testa's property?

Ron Brand: No, he was a court constable back for years.

Dorothy Borgus: Who is that?

Ron Brand: He used to live across the street from 3449. You know that troublemaker out there.

David Dunning: I do.

Dorothy Borgus: Winkleholtz.

Ron Brand: Winkleholtz thank you Dorothy.

David Dunning: So you have two parcels in there right that could be potentially subdivided off, they are not very big though. That 3390 is only ten acres.

Paul Wanzenried: At an acre a pop or a half-acre a pop.

David Dunning: Infrastructure, road, sidewalks, lights, sewer, how much a pop. Then try to get a curb cut opposite of Beaver Road.

Ron Brand: Well that would take care of your traffic need for a traffic circle; put a traffic signal in there.

David Dunning: Could you imagine a traffic signal at the end of your driveway.

Dorothy Borgus: How solid is that mental health proposal for that land. Nothing seems to be happening there.

David Dunning: As far as I know, it is still moving forward. I believe the delay is in the permitting process from the State and from the Federal government. It takes time that is my understanding.

Ron Brand: Where are you up here?

David Dunning: That would be 3360.

Ron Brand: The Mark IV project.

David Dunning: Yes.

Dorothy Borgus: It will be an Alzheimer's complex. Okay, anything else with that paragraph or are we done. It looks all right if.

David Dunning: I guess.

James Ignatowski: I do not know if you would get a mixed use of single-family residential dwellings in there.

David Dunning: Well actually, we will because you will have the cottages tied into the memory care facility. So you will have residential mix.

Dorothy Borgus: There is going to be what eight.

David Dunning: Eight or ten cottages there.

Ron Brand: You want to leave this.

David Dunning: I think you can leave it as is probably. I was just a little concerned about I did not think there was that much in there. I guess based on your description.

James Ignatowski: I understand what you are saying cottages but the cottages are not a part of that overall mental health facility or not just anyone can just go in there.

David Dunning: That is correct but it is still residential.

Dorothy Borgus: Are we going to stop here people.

David Dunning: Yes.

Ron Brand: Okay now when do we start again?

Paul Wanzenried: Next week is the 4<sup>th</sup> of July, the week after is Planning Board I believe and there is Town Board on the second Wednesday.

Ron Brand: What about the 18<sup>th</sup>.

Paul Wanzenried: I can do the 18<sup>th</sup>.

David Dunning: I can do the 18<sup>th</sup>, Parks & Rec is that night but that is over at the Senior Center.

Steve Tarbell: What day is July 18<sup>th</sup>?

David Dunning: It is a Tuesday. July 18<sup>th</sup> everyone okay with that?

Dorothy Borgus: Yes, it will take us a while to get thru the rest of this chapter.

David Dunning: Yes it is a tough chapter anything else on this before I shut the recorder off.

James Ignatowski: My only question would be on the map itself or Sub-Area #2 would you like to add the word Beaver to Beaver Road.

David Dunning: Oh. Okay you got that Ron.

Ron Brand: I am sorry what.

David Dunning: On the map, add the word "Beaver" to Beaver Road.

Ron Brand: Sub-Area #2 right?

James Ignatowski: Yes.

Ron Brand: Show me where you are talking. Okay.

The next meeting of the committee will be held on Tuesday, July 18, 2017 at 6 PM in the Main Meeting Room of the Town Hall.

Meeting adjourned at 8:12 pm.