

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting
1/16/2018**

A meeting of the 2030 Comprehensive Plan Update Committee was held on January 16, 2018 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, Al Hellaby, Planning Board VC, Steve Tarbell, Traffic & Safety Committee Member, Dorothy Borgus, Resident.

ABSENT: None

David Dunning: We do have two sets of minutes from last month's meeting any concerns. Everyone okay to approve those minutes? Any objections? Okay all right so those minutes are approved. So begin today with Chapter 5, any questions on 5-1.

Ron Brand: I know why this wasn't changed because it was not the original text work. So in other words what I am doing in this is different font.

David Dunning: Anything on 5-2? 5-3 is just a map. 5-5, this should be the last paragraph of the "Major Plan Assumptions", it starts with "Increases in land value and the consumption of developable land will drive development into areas". I question, "having" on that and I do not know why. I read it again now and it looks okay to me so. Anything on 5-6. The only thing I had in there was, I do not know if you see the highlighted changes but where the last highlighted change in that first set is it says "in the adopted Chili Center Master Plan (see Appendix of this document)". The next sentence just did not read right, which is "The costs for will continue to increase". It is under Sub Area 1, it is the third to last sentence. It says "The costs for will continue to increase". I do not know what that means.

Dorothy Borgus: Oh, that is what my note was too. See, it needs work I got.

David Dunning: Do you see where you are Ron?

Steve Tarbell: That is the old 5-3.

Dorothy Borgus: Yes, it is the old 5-3.

Ron Brand: So what this says.

Dorothy Borgus: Right after the red in that paragraph.

Ron Brand: "North Chili community center building could be better used for commercial development in support of the adjacent commercial services".

Dorothy Borgus: Further down than that.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting
1/16/2018**

Ron Brand: The plan recommends that consideration be given to a future community center being developed in the Chili Center sub-area along with other governmental improvements envisioned". "The costs for these".

David Dunning: It just says "The costs for will continue to increase".

Dorothy Borgus: It needs something more.

Paul Wanzenried: The cost for will continue to increase, that is what it is saying.

David Dunning: No, it is not what it is saying. Then it would say, "The costs for which will continue to increase", or "The costs for this will continue" or something.

Ron Brand: It is related to the cost of the community center.

David Dunning: I understand that, but what I am saying.

Dorothy Borgus: There is a word missing.

David Dunning: Right, it needs to be fixed.

Ron Brand: Then just put in this.

David Dunning: That is fine, or "which".

Dorothy Borgus: Or "these" because you are talking about more than one thing. "The community center along with other improvements". So, it would have to be "The costs for these". How about that.

Ron Brand: Okay.

David Dunning: Okay, anything else on 5-6, anything on 5-7.

Ron Brand: This is at the end of Sub Area 1. Okay, Yep.

David Dunning: This would be at the end of Sub Area 1, yes.

Ron Brand: When we get there, I want to inject something.

David Dunning: I am on 5-7 on the new one.

Dorothy Borgus: I have here confusing, where it starts "The Town of Riga Comprehensive Plan is currently being update" that is the paragraph.

David Dunning: Where are you?

Dorothy Borgus: I am on did I jump ahead?

David Dunning: I believe you did. That is not Sub Area 1 still is it.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting
1/16/2018**

Dorothy Borgus: I was all right on 5-7.

David Dunning: Okay, was everyone else okay on 5-7. So Ron wanted to interject something on end of this one.

Ron Brand: What Passero asked of me is to make sure that I have the corrections that we want to see to each of the Sub Area maps because they will compare the Sub Area maps to the Future Land Plan Use map that the two are consistent. So in other words, what we are showing here is reflected on the overall plan. As we go through each of the Sub Areas I want to make sure that, I have understood from the previous what needs to be changed. I have what is identifying the Chili Community Center area here over on Buffalo Road as a public building and labeling it for commercial and leaving it red like it is just to identify it to the reader. Do you understand what I am saying? In other words we just talked about the Chili Community Center to the reader we want to put something on this map legend somewhere in writing to with an arrow that goes to where the Chili Community Center is located. So that they can see.

Al Hellaby: That it is in the district.

Steve Tarbell: In some of those maps, we had little circles.

David Dunning: Why is that relevant to this particular map?

Ron Brand: Because we just talked about in Sub Area 1 converting the Community Center to a business type use.

David Dunning: Okay.

Ron Brand: If someone is looking at this, it may be not as familiar to identify it as the Community Center and where it is located. The same thing for the town owned land along Attridge and CSX rail line is what I have for changes to this map. That would be changed to a municipal color whatever it is.

David Dunning: I don't think we have one.

Jim Ignatowski: We never had one.

David Dunning: A color would need to be added because we do not have that in there now Ron. So but you are right that Attridge Road property, Cornflower, however you want to lay that area that should be a color and if you want to highlight somehow that North Chili property, the Community Center. The problem is that what is going to happen what I can see right now is that the word "Buffalo" is going to fall over the top of it and maybe too small and unrecognizable.

Ron Brand: Well maybe we can change Buffalo and move Buffalo over here and not.

David Dunning: That is fine, just so what do you want from us.

Ron Brand: I just want to make sure that those are the only two or three changes that we as a committee have discussed. You see anything else Paul? Was there anything I am trying to recall, King Road or any other areas up there that.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting
1/16/2018**

Paul Wanzenried: You mean that the town owns.

Ron Brand: No, no that we talked about identifying or changing the colors for this incentive rezoning or is that located on here.

David Dunning: There is not any right now. There is an application for it and that is on Golden Road. Which is going to be here to your far just to the west of that last piece of wetland down there Ron. You will see where the expressway splits the two cul-de-sacs that is Golden Road and it is going to be to the west of that where you have that white area and then that light shady green area.

Ron Brand: All right, we will leave that alone.

David Dunning: I would not do anything with that right now.

Ron Brand: If when this gets ready to go public and a decision has been made then let me know and we will.

David Dunning: It will be likely made at the February Town Board meeting.

Ron Brand: Okay.

David Dunning: As far as I know those are the only two changes right Paul do you see anything different.

Paul Wanzenried: No.

Ron Brand: Okay moving on 5-9.

Dorothy Borgus: Can we just look at 5-7 for a minute. The part that has been eliminated at the end of 5-7 where it starts "This area is under consideration". On our original notes when we met I did not have it noted that we were going to take that out. In fact where we going to take that out I do not understand. I am not sure whether it stays or not. And I had a not that we were going to mention Boon Drive there.

David Dunning: It is there "located adjacent to Boon Drive and the Fed Ex site that remains" that is on the changes.

Dorothy Borgus: Oh, okay that part is there. See "This area is under consideration" is taken out in the draft and I did not have it marked on our original copy as being removed.

David Dunning: What does adjacent mean?

Paul Wanzenried: Next to.

David Dunning: Thank you. So what is left next to, nothing?

Dorothy Borgus: Okay whatever.

2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting
1/16/2018

David Dunning: I think that is why we talked about that because there down the road and “further down the road on Union Street there is land suitable for Limited Industrial that should have stayed”. But not “that it is dependent upon the extension of Paul Road”. But there are other areas along Union Street that are still suitable for Limited Industrial development, quite a bit actually.

Dorothy Borgus: But that sentence taken out is not dependent on what came out before. It is just a statement, “This area is under consideration”. I do not know.

David Dunning: I focused in on “adjacent” though. Because this statement is talking about land located adjacent to Boon Drive. I mean you go across street you have C&M Forwarding with an application in and so there is still need of mention of significant or substantial however, you want to word it opportunities for Limited Industrial along Union Street. There is still a lot of land zoned that way.

Ron Brand: So “Still further south along Union Street there is other land suitable for Limited Industrial development”. Take out “and/or commercial”.

David Dunning: I would say not only along south but even north. We are still talking about Sub Area 1 correct. In Sub Area 1, actually no you know what.

Ron Brand: This is showing along Union Street commercial.

David Dunning: There is nothing there. Where are we 5-7?

Dorothy Borgus: I just question whether that should be removed is all.

David Dunning: Correct me if I am wrong. But why do we even mention Boon Drive and the Fed Ex site in this particular, it is not even in this Sub Area. Am I wrong?

Ron Brand: Yea, you are right.

David Dunning: Am I missing something.

Dorothy Borgus: I was just going back to what was brought up in our other meeting.

David Dunning: The only piece of land available in that particular area in Sub Area 1 would be that corner lot on the corner of King Road and Union Street. Other than that if, you look at the map.

Dorothy Borgus: But then maybe this red should not have been added.

David Dunning: That is what I am saying; I do not think Boon Drive and Fed Ex are in Sub Area 1, so it is irrelevant to the Sub Area.

Ron Brand: I have a bigger question than that in looking at this it looks to me as though Sub Area 1 needs to be extended down further. If you look at Sub Area 2 that is right at the interchange at the expressway. So you have a void between that area. See what I am saying.

Al Hellaby: You are missing something.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting
1/16/2018**

Ron Brand: This is missing.

David Dunning: Oh, wow that is a pretty big chunk.

Ron Brand: That would be that we did not see it seven years ago. I don't know what the heck it must be my new glasses.

Dorothy Borgus: Right, could be. A second look is always better.

David Dunning: Well Sub Area 2 is the Chili Avenue corridor, so it would make more sense to extend Sub Area 1 correct.

Dorothy Borgus: Yes.

Ron Brand: Absolutely because the only thing that we are showing here on Sub Area 2 is just a little glitch of commercial right at the exit.

Dorothy Borgus: The corner right.

David Dunning: Yes and they are not both to the same scale are they.

Paul Wanzenried: They are close you have to go to Sub Area 4 to see what you are picking up.

David Dunning: Awe there you go Sub Area 4 picked it up Ron.

Paul Wanzenried: Sub Area 4 picks up the area you are missing.

David Dunning: Good catch Paul.

Ron Brand: Yea but.

David Dunning: We carved out Sub Area 2 as the Chili Avenue Corridor, and I believe for very specific reasons.

Ron Brand: Yes, that is why you have the dotted line, maybe what would help here is to have something that says, "see Sub Area 4 map".

David Dunning: You know what would have helped.

Paul Wanzenried: On Sub Area 1?

Ron Brand: In other words.

Paul Wanzenried: Or would you rather just jostle the maps so that they conform, I would go from this Sub Area 1 is the CSX North, and then Sub Area 2 begins with Sub Area 4 and that covers the west side of town. Then we move east.

Ron Brand: Yes so in other words what you are saying.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting
1/16/2018**

Paul Wanzenried: So that the maps co-inside with the Sub Areas and chronology or however you want to word it.

Ron Brand: So take this layer off the map.

Paul Wanzenried: No that is not what I am saying.

David Dunning: No, I think what Paul is saying is what you currently have labeled is Sub Area 4 make that Sub Area 2.

Paul Wanzenried: Right.

David Dunning: So that when you flip that page to the next one you have the next location and make them flow chronology.

Paul Wanzenried: Or geographically.

Ron Brand: Okay.

Dorothy Borgus: So we are changing Sub Area 4 to Sub Area 2.

Ron Brand: Then Sub Area 2 becomes Sub Area 3.

David Dunning: Actually, you might even want to bury that at the end because that is a specific corridor. It was the Chili Avenue corridor is all that was.

Paul Wanzenried: And that probably crosses.

David Dunning: That crosses a lot of Sub Areas so either make that one the first one and the rest of them follow that or make that the very last one either way. But take it out of the middle.

Paul Wanzenried: Right.

Ron Brand: Okay.

Dorothy Borgus: So now on Sub Area 1 we are going to add a municipal category was that the end of that discussion.

Ron Brand: Right.

Paul Wanzenried: When you get to Sub Area 2 and Sub Area 5, 5 pretty much follows the Black Creek if I am looking at this correctly. As it crosses through town. Sub Area 2 pretty much follows Chili Avenue as it criss crosses the town, so those two would be probably suited on the back end. Because you are talking about a street, you are following a street and following a geographical or stream or a watercourse and how that impacts assuming that Sub Area 5 talks about and that is what Sub Area 2 talks about.

2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting
1/16/2018

David Dunning: Both of those Sub Areas traverse other sub areas, so you are saying instead of making it confusing put them at the end so that it does not interfere with the other sub areas.

Paul Wanzenried: Correct.

Al Hellaby: How confusing are you going to make this to people that want to go back and say okay here is the new master plan and I want to compare it, what was here, they are going to have a hell of a time relating this with you changing all these districts around.

Paul Wanzenried: And I think you formally label it as Sub Section 2 or 3, something that will tie.

David Dunning: Yes editor's notes.

Paul Wanzenried: Something that will tie that.

David Dunning: Yea like they do in the codebook.

Paul Wanzenried: For the.

Jim Ignatowski: Or do you include one page that would include on a smaller scale all the districts on it.

David Dunning: I like that too. Are you saying what I think you are saying if you take the overall map like the full size map and you identify all of the sub areas, you section them off so that people can see where all the sub areas are?

Jim Ignatowski: Yea.

Ron Brand: That is what we did do back in 2000 was it, then when we got into 2008 – 2009 we decided to break them up.

Dorothy Borgus: Right.

David Dunning: But have both, Jim is saying to have both. You would still have your defined, your picture or snapshot of the sub area but then show something with the overall.

Jim Ignatowski: It is just so that people have an overall view of what is happening so that they are not flipping between pages to try to find the correct sub area.

David Dunning: Right I think that is a good idea.

Ron Brand: Okay so that will mean once we get the sub area maps agree to and renumbered I will have to go back and renumber the text to follow.

Dorothy Borgus: Right.

David Dunning: That should be fairly easy though right that is just a header or change and contain within but that is a find and replace.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting
1/16/2018**

Dorothy Borgus: Which brings us back to my original question on 5-7.

David Dunning: As it pertains to sub area 1, none of this pertains. Oh, it states “Still further south” it is identifying land further south.

Dorothy Borgus: See by adding the red it changes the intent of the way it was originally written.

David Dunning: Could this say, “Still further south in Sub Area, which would then be 2” so it is understood that this is not in the same sub area.

Dorothy Borgus: That works for me.

Ron Brand: Yes.

David Dunning: I mean that statement is still true, “This area is under consideration at the present time by the Planning Board for a Limited Industrial use”. That is true today; it was probably true when we did this because there was another proposal over in that direction. But do we need to keep that in there.

Dorothy Borgus: I like it in there I think.

Ron Brand: It does not hurt to have it in there.

David Dunning: So we are going to take the strike throughout correct from “This area is under consideration at the present time” we are going to leave that.

Dorothy Borgus: How about the next paragraph, that is true to.

David Dunning: That is very true.

Dorothy Borgus: So you take the all that strike out and that would remain from the last paragraph.

David Dunning: Some of that is redundant.

Dorothy Borgus: Well I read it about ten times, yea I guess it is.

David Dunning: None of it is dependent upon.

Ron Brand: The extension of Paul Road.

Dorothy Borgus: So maybe leave the last paragraph there struck and leave the sentence in.

Steve Tarbell: Well there is only one paragraph in the old 5-4 and they kind of added to in here into the new 5-7. The old 5-4 there was only one paragraph talking about that.

Dorothy Borgus: Right.

Steve Tarbell: For some reason there is two and it shows one crossed out.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting
1/16/2018**

Ron Brand: Right.

Dorothy Borgus: That is because you and I have a different version somehow of the original book that everyone else has got.

David Dunning: So what are you saying leave the original strike through on that one paragraph and then unstricken the paragraph below it.

Dorothy Borgus: Unstricken the one that says “This area is under consideration present time”.

David Dunning: And then what about the next paragraph.

Dorothy Borgus: Just strike that it is a repetitive. So leave it struck.

David Dunning: Okay, anyone else. Okay 5-9.

Dorothy Borgus: One it talks about the future land use map in the red, fourth or fifth line down. Are we talking about Riga’s map because we are talking about Riga’s Comprehensive Plan?

Ron Brand: Right.

Dorothy Borgus: Whose future land use map are we, we need to clarify that.

Paul Wanzenried: The whole paragraph is about the Town of Riga.

Ron Brand: Do you want to say “Their future land use map”?

Dorothy Borgus: Yes how about that that would do it. Now have we seen the Riga Comprehensive Plan update that it states that it no longer identifies North Chili as meeting the commercial needs, have you seen it.

Ron Brand: I have seen it from the standpoint of having worked on a project over there, having been told by the committee that they are in the process of updating it.

Dorothy Borgus: Oh, okay.

Ron Brand: Now you go to their website last I looked there was not anything there.

Dorothy Borgus: Okay.

Ron Brand: I asked when and they don’t know when I mean it was done in reaction to a project over there.

Dorothy Borgus: Oh okay as long as we know that is a true statement, I did not think that they were that far along with their plan.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting
1/16/2018**

Ron Brand: What they had Dorothy was a comprehensive plan that recognized the Churchville-Chili campus and around that campus had a recommended a pattern of residential development and there was two applications out there, the first one was shot down because it was not consistent and the second one they pointed out that this is what the comprehensive plan is saying so how can you say it is not consistent. At that point, they said we are thinking of updating the plan or we are thinking about a moratorium. The application was already in so it was a long unnecessary process.

Dorothy Borgus: So in the next paragraph, I got confusing question mark in the margin. We are still talking about Riga's plan then.

Ron Brand: Okay the Riga Comprehensive Plan.

Dorothy Borgus: It starts "As additional sanitary sewer service becomes available".

Paul Wanzenried: No.

Ron Brand: No.

Dorothy Borgus: No, now we are talking Chili okay.

David Dunning: It may depend on Riga.

Ron Brand: The 2017 edition of the plan, "the" plan.

Dorothy Borgus: It is us okay. Okay maybe that is all right then no one has a problem with that paragraph.

Paul Wanzenried: Why do we say, "The scale of commercial development would be moderately small of ten acres", why that specific?

Steve Tarbell: Did they take out the word small and new didn't they, the older one had small in there. This newer version does not have small in there.

Dorothy Borgus: You don't like that Paul; you don't like that ten acres.

David Dunning: I am just trying to figure out where it came from.

Paul Wanzenried: Why do I mandate ten acres?

David Dunning: Along Union Square Boulevard and quite frankly I don't know if there is ten acres left available there.

Paul Wanzenried: That is what I am trying to figure out. Where is the ten coming from? As you are going back in.

David Dunning: This would have predated anything Morgan would have done back there.

Ron Brand: "Would be moderately small approximately ten acres" and that was to come out.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting
1/16/2018**

Paul Wanzenried: Yea you rewrote it wrong, "The scale of commercial development would be moderately small of approximately a maximum of ten acres along Union Square Boulevard".

Ron Brand: Right.

David Dunning: We don't think there is a ten-acre lot available back there. I do not know what is available back there anymore. There is our land.

Paul Wanzenried: That is before you get to phase one. That is on the north side.

David Dunning: We own up along Union Square Boulevard coming down in along that creekside and then back around the pond.

Paul Wanzenried: Okay who owns north between Union Square Boulevard and the florist?

David Dunning: Nagel, no, no that is further north. He is just beyond the Speedway.

Paul Wanzenried: That is the only one I could think of that would have them.

David Dunning: We do, the town does. That is where that little kind of drainage area is correct.

Paul Wanzenried: Well you have the as you are coming up Union Street you have New Hope, the white house, then Union Square Boulevard take the left onto Union Square Boulevard. There is vacant land to the north of Union Square Boulevard that pretty much runs from Union Square to the garden shop Shelter Creek.

David Dunning: We own that the town does.

Dorothy Borgus: I thought the town owned that.

David Dunning: The town owns that.

Paul Wanzenried: That is the only parcel and then going on the other side of the street there is a vacant parcel there before that kind of backs up behind the white house.

David Dunning: There is not much there; I mean that corner lot is probably not even developable.

Dorothy Borgus: Who does own that on the south side of Union Square Boulevard?

David Dunning: That is still I believe Rochester Cornerstone.

Paul Wanzenried: I think so yea.

Dorothy Borgus: There sure is not ten acres there, your right.

Steve Tarbell: Would it be listed on the tax bill.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting
1/16/2018**

David Dunning: Yea we could find that part out that is not an issue I just think that particular part needs some massaging of that sentence.

Paul Wanzenried: I would just say get rid of “involving a maximum of ten acres” and say.

David Dunning: Say “moderately small” period.

Paul Wanzenried: “Moderately small”.

Dorothy Borgus: And eliminate the rest of that sentence.

Paul Wanzenried: If you want to pin point it along Union Square Boulevard go ahead but they are going to buy the property from the town to do it.

David Dunning: No that is not developable land.

Dorothy Borgus: It is wet.

David Dunning: Yea well, it is drainage swale.

Dorothy Borgus: Very wet in there.

David Dunning: Yea very, wet.

Ron Brand: Okay so.

Dorothy Borgus: So we are going to take out from approximately on.

Paul Wanzenried: I think so.

David Dunning: Yea and leave Union Square Boulevard, “approximately small along Union Square Boulevard”.

Dorothy Borgus: Okay we will take out this part here.

David Dunning: Anything else on 5-9, 5-10. The only questions I had on this particular one was on that second paragraph that starts with “The 2030 Plan still recommends the Paul Road Extension between King Road and Union Street”. This states that this was funded, but never built; well it was never funded and never built. There was a promise of funding it at one time but that promise never materialized, there was never any official funding made available.

Dorothy Borgus: Then maybe we should just take that sentence out and you could leave “The impediment to the completion of this project is the resolution of property acquisition rights along the planned route”.

David Dunning: I do not know if it is even responsible to leave or recommend that extension still go in at this point.

Ron Brand: That is what we are here for.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting
1/16/2018**

David Dunning: I know that is my thought that is only my opinion.

Dorothy Borgus: Why would you say that?

David Dunning: I say that because imagine all of a sudden they said okay we want to take Stewart Road and we want to redo that bridge and open that up to thru traffic again. Would you be happy about that? It would not be the best thing to happen to your property, so you have all these people on Paul Road that have been living on a dead end street for how long or Paul Road Extension.

Dorothy Borgus: I was thinking that maybe most of them did not like it to being on that dead end.

David Dunning: No, they love it.

Ron Brand: No traffic it is like living in a cul-de-sac.

David Dunning: Exactly, that is exactly what it is. That would be my issue is protecting the people that bought their homes in there more so than anything else. Do we really need that other cut thru right there adding additional traffic that close to the expressway in and out?

Dorothy Borgus: Well my thinking it was it would take the pressure off Union Street.

David Dunning: It would take the pressure off King and Union intersection no question. It would break it up a little bit but what is it going to do to it down at Union Street and Chili Avenue or Union Street and the expressway. What is it going to there, because now you have a pretty good separation the way, I am not a traffic guy I am just trying to think.

Paul Wanzenried: It would elevate the congestion at Union and Chili.

David Dunning: Why?

Paul Wanzenried: Because it would be quicker to go up to Paul Road and get to Wegmans to go down Paul Road than it would be to come back down and go around to Chili Avenue., logistics.

David Dunning: I disagree.

Dorothy Borgus: I guess my thought would be I see Paul's point.

David Dunning: So you would say coming off 490.

Paul Wanzenried: I am not coming off 490, your starting point is the bridge at the fore bridge or where we are going to put the bridge over CSX. In other words, those Paul Road residents in order to get to Wegmans are going to do one of two things. They are going to come out go down to the Union Street and Chili Ave or go up to King Road. They are backtracking one, whereas here they could just go up and catch Paul Road zoom down Paul Road.

David Dunning: If the bridge was there.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting
1/16/2018**

Paul Wanzenried: If the bridge was there and others i.e.: Davis Road those are the only people you are serving with this bridge the Paul Road residents and David Road.

David Dunning: Oh no if you go to that intersection of Union Street and King Road we will say at rush hour not that we really have a rush hour per say here but when it is busy it is tough coming off of King Road and onto Union Street there is no question that the traffic gets backed up pretty far it is worse than Chili Avenue and Union Street intersection. So now all of a sudden you are going to create another way for these people to go that people are going to head south, they are going to come down Paul Road go across the extension and increase the traffic in that neighborhood for those people and they don't care about going to Wegmans, they don't want any more traffic in front of their house. Getting to Chili Center is not their concern, they would not want more traffic going in front of their properties and that would increase a lot of traffic because that would break that right up. It would break that up significantly.

Dorothy Borgus: See I guess I was thinking in terms if you were looking for more building lots in Chili.

David Dunning: It would not create any unless we take farmland away.

Dorothy Borgus: Unless you took farmland away.

David Dunning: The Fed Ex took up part of it, right Fed Ex went into part of the land that where the bridge would have gone.

Ron Brand: The other thing that you just need to keep in the back of your minds is if something where to go wrong with that bridge over the road on Union Street.

David Dunning: Like the train that did not derail but stopped that one day, oh it somebody and was stopped for hours.

Dorothy Borgus: You really do not have an infrastructure over there that is adequate you get one little glitch and have nothing.

Paul Wanzenried: Where at Union Street.

Dorothy Borgus: Yes.

David Dunning: Yes, if you get into an accident at the intersection of the expressway or a fire or something car fire, there has been car fires over there on the bridge, the Fed Ex truck rolling over the top of a Toyota coming around the corner. But no, you are right.

Dorothy Borgus: I just think we eliminate a potential there that we would regret later.

David Dunning: I think it is.

Al Hellaby: I agree with you David I don't think it will ever come, the money will never come. But the statement is there does it do any harm just to leave it.

Ron Brand: Well I think you need to clarify that it was not secured, that it had been promised but never delivered.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting
1/16/2018**

Dorothy Borgus: Yes, if that is not true we should take that out.

David Dunning: Yea, to me it looks like we got the money and just did not do it.

Ron Brand: So do you want to change that.

David Dunning: Massage it if you want, but if the plan still wants to not dismiss the bridge but not necessarily make the recommendation.

Dorothy Borgus: Is that true about the impediment to the completion of this project is the resolution of property acquisition rights.

David Dunning: That I could not tell you. It could have been, because you had Vascele and then you had.

Ron Brand: Yes, you would have some imminent domain issues to contend with.

David Dunning: It is quite possible I just do not think that the money was ever there. I think that Susan John promised it and just couldn't deliver it.

Dorothy Borgus: Well if that can be reworked, rewritten or reworded in some way and still leave mention.

David Dunning: Okay, leave consideration but not necessarily don't lose sight of it but don't necessarily make it a recommendation.

Dorothy Borgus: Yes, I think that is what we should do there.

Ron Brand: I can put something. "Important highway construction project had been previously promised from the State of NY but funding for the road has never realized". Then you can say "Another impediment to the completion" instead of "the completion".

Dorothy Borgus: That is good, I am just happy leaving that in there.

Steve Tarbell: I have a question on 5-10, is there a reason why they took out "south" where it says "additional single family residential development is expected to continue on the north side" then they took out "both & south" and on the old one it had both and the north and south of King Road. Should "south" have been left in?

David Dunning: I think that is reversed I think "north" should have been crossed out and "south" should have been left in because south of King Road would be that corner lot on King and Union which has a single garage sitting on the property. That is available for residential development.

Paul Wanzenried: Doesn't the fire department own that.

David Dunning: No that is, King road not the tracks you are looking south of the tracks that is the fire department between Paul Road and the tracks that is the fire department, Paul Road Extension I am sorry.

Al Hellaby: The north side already has that track up there right.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting
1/16/2018**

Paul Wanzenried: Yes.

David Dunning: I don't know if there is anything on the north side of King Road. That is where you have Gilead and Roberto, Cassandra, right.

Paul Wanzenried: King Forest, they are still building back in there.

Steve Tarbell: So that should be reversed.

David Dunning: I think so.

Dorothy Borgus: I think it should be.

Ron Brand: The area north of King Road.

David Dunning: The area north of King Road there is some single lots available in a subdivision, but south of it the only thing I can think of south of King Road that is in this sub area we are talking about. Are we on Sub Area 2 now or Sub Area 1?

Steve Tarbell: We are still on one.

David Dunning: In sub area, one the only land that I am aware of anyways that is available is that corner lot.

Paul Wanzenried: It comes off King Forest entrance there Roberto isn't it?

David Dunning: All that is developed. You have the church on the corner on the north side, you have the church on the corner and then you have all that other stuff that is already developed.

Paul Wanzenried: No there is that blank square there.

David Dunning: That is Perna's that is a pond back there. It is behind Meadowbrook.

Dorothy Borgus: I don't see where there would be anything.

David Dunning: That is a pond back there.

Paul Wanzenried: Well you have that long parcel; I am assuming that the rectory is incorporated in that pink square correct.

Al Hellaby: I believe it is.

Paul Wanzenried: Purple sorry not pink.

David Dunning: No because it is zoned residential.

Paul Wanzenried: Then the next parcel that is next to the purple that runs between Meadowbrook and King Road is the rectory.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting
1/16/2018**

David Dunning: Likely.

Paul Wanzenried: Right? The next parcel is the abandoned house. Now you are saying that is wet back there.

David Dunning: That spot I believe that is where the pond is. I wish I could get Google Earth on my phone. I believe there is a pond back there because I think kids go fishing back there.

Paul Wanzenried: There is a pond there so there but is not the whole lot there.

David Dunning: But I do not think it is developable. I think that is where that whole neighborhood drains into.

Paul Wanzenried: Okay we can say no.

David Dunning: It would be landlocked.

Paul Wanzenried: He is landlocked now.

David Dunning: Right. So you could not put a house in there.

Paul Wanzenried: Then he goes and buys that dead house.

David Dunning: If he has, sixty foot.

Paul Wanzenried: It could increase and creates his entrance in.

David Dunning: If he has a sixty foot right away.

Paul Wanzenried: Is it sixty or forty?

David Dunning: Sixty. Sixty for a roadway. Oh, you are just thinking for a driveway, forty foot then for a driveway.

Jim Ignatowski: When it came to Sub Area 1 we talked about development on the north side what about all that white space that near the word CSX in back of all the sub divisions.

Dorothy Borgus: It has probably been built up since this map was.

Paul Wanzenried: No actually, it is not.

David Dunning: That is Marino that is the backside of Marino right.

Paul Wanzenried: That is the back side, this is the back side of Marino that is owned by Fallone, this right now is being developed here they have approval for that and have a couple of houses going up in there so there is Lucia and Christina Drive that is the extension of this road here that comes back in. This here is owned by some guy that is off San Pebble.

2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting
1/16/2018

David Dunning: That wholesome odd seventy-seven acres is some woman who lives in Florida who bought it and we are trying to get ahold of for another issue. That is very wet that is wetlands likely undevelopable Jim.

Jim Ignatowski: I was just looking at the map and noticed spurs going into it that were not contiguous of one point so I considered using that.

David Dunning: That is off San Pebble, San Pebble ends right there at part of it.

Paul Wanzenried: Marino comes back in tees right here and tees here and the thing.

David Dunning: And that will continue out.

Paul Wanzenried: The thinking was is that the two would connect those houses back in there.

David Dunning: Eventually they will.

Dorothy Borgus: So we are back to the original point is that “north” should have been crossed out and “south” should have been left.

David Dunning: I think anybody else.

Ron Brand: The point is how do you want that changed the area north of King Road?

David Dunning: No leave “south” strike out “the north” and unstricken the “south”.

Dorothy Borgus: So it will read “Additional single family residential development is expected to continue on the south side of King Road east of Union Street”.

David Dunning: Yes.

Dorothy Borgus: That is fine.

Ron Brand: On the south side.

David Dunning: Yes.

Paul Wanzenried: It is highly unlikely.

David Dunning: Well not necessarily that one lot on the corner they are trying to sell that.

Jim Ignatowski: Residential development is a little bit different from a residential lot.

David Dunning: Yea but she could put five or six houses on that lot easily.

Paul Wanzenried: Who owns the next three parcels down going south?

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting
1/16/2018**

David Dunning: I could not tell you I don't know. I can't even picture what they are.

Paul Wanzenried: Everything below the word King.

David Dunning: No, I can't.

Dorothy Borgus: I am good with 5-10 other than that.

David Dunning: Okay 5-11.

Paul Wanzenried: We should note that this is not going to be Sub Area 2. Are we still recommending, never mind I like what is in red. You should strike out everything above it. It should read, "The Future Land Use Plan Map recommends the town hire a traffic consultant".

Steve Tarbell: Do you have to mention what the areas are or not.

Dorothy Borgus: It kind of spells them out doesn't it?

Steve Tarbell: It says, "to address all of these intersections". What intersections are you talking about that is what somebody will say right?

Paul Wanzenried: Fine then add at the bottom of where it says, "county governments to make the recommended improvements to the four spot shown on the sub area map, blah, blah blah".

Ron Brand: That is fine with me.

David Dunning: Okay, anything else on that one.

Paul Wanzenried: "Chili Ave and Chestnut Ridge spot improvement recommends the installation of a traffic circle", the feasibility of that happening in is what.

David Dunning: Same as the feasibility of one happening at Chili Avenue and Beaver Road.

Dorothy Borgus: It is not going to.

David Dunning: Or one happening at Archer and Beaver.

Dorothy Borgus: It is not going to happen.

David Dunning: Right.

Paul Wanzenried: Correct.

David Dunning: It does not change the fact that it was a recommendation or a consideration as a traffic calming method.

Paul Wanzenried: My point is that you are making a statement above that we hire a town consultant.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting
1/16/2018**

Ron Brand: A traffic engineer yes.

Paul Wanzenried: Right you are going to point out that this spot recommends the installation of well we do not know what the recommendation is because we are hiring a town traffic engineer to give us a recommendation.

Dorothy Borgus: Then you would have to eliminate the next paragraph too.

David Dunning: Well I might go back to.

Paul Wanzenried: Well we are going to get through four paragraphs before it is done because they go and label out all four spots.

David Dunning: Well then I think what Paul just said initially was you might want to just lead off and reword this just a little bit but strike everything except that what is in red and then leave the last paragraph. Because the rest of it all deals with intersection improvements, signalization, all the things we are supposed to study, correct Paul is that what I am hearing from you.

Paul Wanzenried: Yes, basically what I said is that you start “The Future Land Use Plan update, the first one, two, three, four words and then start once you get passed land use go down to the red”. “The Plan Update recommends the town hire” and then that is it. All these other ones are based all these descriptions are based on what we have heard in the past and why are putting those in there if you are going to hire an engineer to tell you what you want.

David Dunning: I think the first paragraph is relevant, I think you are right on the second all the rest of it except for the last paragraph where you can incorporate all of this somehow into this statement you don’t need to point out all the areas that we already know that are issues.

Dorothy Borgus: You know I redid that when we did the original this other plan though. Is because we wanted to call specific attention to those points.

David Dunning: To those intersections.

Dorothy Borgus: The committee felt very very strongly about that.

David Dunning: Then can we use and that is fine. Then can we still recommend that we do a traffic study.

Dorothy Borgus: Oh yea.

David Dunning: And in that say, these are an example of the known.

Ron Brand: Four of the previously identified intersections included.

David Dunning: See that is why we pay you.

Dorothy Borgus: That is fine as long as they are spelled out.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting
1/16/2018**

Paul Wanzenried: You cannot say previously identified. Where are you identifying am I missing something.

David Dunning: In this plan, that this plan previously identified or that the 2030 Plan originally identified or however some other wordsmithing in there that. Then strike everything except for that last paragraph which has nothing to do with the traffic or anything it is just development, which is still true.

Paul Wanzenried: That area of concern in Sub Area 2 “involves those parcels fronting along the north side of Chili Avenue between Beaver Road and the CSX Railroad crossing”.

Dorothy Borgus: You are talking about the last paragraph.

Paul Wanzenried: See I am not quite sure it “involves those parcels fronting along the north side of Chili Avenue between Beaver Road and the CSC Railroad”, how did I get to the north side of Chili Ave where Beaver Road intersects CSX.

David Dunning: You are not looking at that, it is between Beaver Road, so when you pass Beaver Road it is across the street.

Paul Wanzenried: It is this parcel right here, okay. That is really the only parcel right.

David Dunning: Yes.

Dorothy Borgus: Then it says, “There are a number of large parcels of land which have interior portions that are not developed”.

Paul Wanzenried: Um, there is vacant land between when you come out on Beaver to Chili and you look to the right that is vacant.

David Dunning: On the north side? That is someone’s property, there is nothing on it but it belongs to that yellow house or whatever it is doesn’t it.

Dorothy Borgus: I don’t know who owns it.

David Dunning: That is where that other drainage swale goes through right there right. The guy has the mud truck that parks it there once in a while I believe that the house right there is the owner of that property I do not think it is a vacant lot. I think he has a double lot, I could be wrong you could look that up though.

Paul Wanzenried: Okay I can.

David Dunning: Okay anything else there, anything on 5-13. I guess we are starting with Sub Area 3 then. Or whatever it will be.

Paul Wanzenried: I would just like to voice my distain at the word “hamlet”.

Ron Brand: We understand Macbeth.

2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting
1/16/2018

David Dunning: I have to agree with him I don't quite like. It makes us sound like Mayberry RFD or something like that you know.

Steve Tarbell: It makes me feel at home back in Wyoming County with the hamlets.

Jim Ignatowski: Is it identified anywhere ever on a road sign.

David Dunning: No but according to Mr. Brand in order to have a road sign of that nature on an expressway like a North Chili, or West Chili or Chili Center that it was identified at one point as a hamlet in order to do so.

Ron Brand: Absolutely.

David Dunning: If I recall correctly.

Ron Brand: That is correct.

Jim Ignatowski: On any of the maps that we have gone over is that ever specified in that is it actually called a hamlet.

Ron Brand: Is what.

David Dunning: I doubt that you would ever find a single piece of documentation that indicates that a hamlet exists in the Town of Chili. It is a challenge go ahead Ron prove me wrong.

Ron Brand: You know there was Scottsville Road before us.

Too many speaking at once inaudible.

Paul Wanzenried: Clifton is the closest thing to a hamlet.

David Dunning: But that is not even a hamlet. I doubt there is a single piece of document piece of paper that those are hamlets.

Ron Brand: I again come back to you and say careful you are treading on historical thin ice here.

Dorothy Borgus: We do have to retain some of the things that we have inherited.

David Dunning: I just have never seen it anywhere in any of the documentation of the things I have been through I have never seen anything that called out a hamlet.

Jim Ignatowski: I included an old, old map as part of the code for the Architectural Advisory Committee I think they showed it as a town post office and not a hamlet.

Too many speaking again inaudible.

Steve Tarbell: Bliss in the Town of Eagle they have a post office that is a hamlet.

David Dunning: But those are towns.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting
1/16/2018**

Ron Brand: Clifton has a post office.

Steve Tarbell: No but that is the Town of Eagle.

David Dunning: Bliss is.

Steve Tarbell: Bliss is the Town of Eagle, the Bliss post office you get a Bliss postmark on valentine's day.

Too many speaking at once inaudible.

Paul Wanzenried: Adams Basin is a hamlet.

Dorothy Borgus: Clifton is not the only one.

Ron Brand: Bushnell's Basin is a hamlet.

Steve Tarbell: Bliss is a post office but it is in the Town of Eagle it is a hamlet.

David Dunning: I never knew that. All right we will continue that argument another day. We are on 5-15 now. Anyone anything, 5-16. I did not have any issues there anyone else.

Paul Wanzenried: On 5-17, do we not start off.

David Dunning: We are not on that yet, 5-16. All right 5-17.

Paul Wanzenried: What is at the top of 5-17?

Dorothy Borgus: "Hamlet" and it is crossed off. Chili Center is not a hamlet I mean you think of a hamlet you think of Clifton.

Paul Wanzenried: Thank you.

Dorothy Borgus: Here we go with these round bouts again in that first paragraph.

Paul Wanzenried: You state that there are three safety spot improvements, yet you crossed out one so that would leave that there is only two.

Dorothy Borgus: He is right.

Ron Brand: Okay so which way is right two or three.

David Dunning: It is two. I think we determined back when we did the Chili Center Master Plan that you could not do both Beaver/Chili & Scottsville/Archer because they were too close to each other and you would be having other issues with streets or something like that for the round-a-bouts.

Paul Wanzenried: They just signalize Beaver and Archer so why would they put a round bout in there.

2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting
1/16/2018

David Dunning: That has been a signal there for a long time.

Paul Wanzenried: Why would they put a round a bout in there.

David Dunning: Right. I think that is why we probably crossed it off.

Dorothy Borgus: So I guess we just change that to two.

David Dunning: Just two.

Dorothy Borgus: We are still thinking about round bouts, really.

David Dunning: Don't include me in that conversation because I do not like them at all.

Paul Wanzenried: I guess why don't we just get rid of "In addition to the Chili Center Master Plan's recommendations" start there. I would just say that "In addition to the Chili Center Master Plan's recommendations," then go down to where it is red "These safety spot improvements should be considered as part of the recommended Transportation Master Plan during the next thirteen year period and as determined by the transportation engineers findings, studies" or something like that you have to kick it back to that transportation engineer that we are hiring back two sub sections ago.

David Dunning: But you want to leave these identified two spots, leave those in there.

Dorothy Borgus: Yes, you have to name them.

David Dunning: Correct, so you want to take out the "recommendation" of what that improvement should be and leave the "safety spots" that need improvement and then rely on your "These safety spot improvements should be considered as a part of" or these safety spot areas or whatever it should be.

Dorothy Borgus: You have to identify them.

Paul Wanzenried: Right identify the locations.

David Dunning: But take out the solution.

Paul Wanzenried: But take out the descriptions or solutions.

David Dunning: Correct, are you okay with that Ron.

Ron Brand: Okay identify the locations.

David Dunning: Retain, keep and retain the locations but illuminate the recommendation "the round-a-bout" and rely on the study, our transportation master plan. In the very last paragraph that needs to be changed because American Packaging now owns part of that actually owns all that property between the old Case Hoyt building and the Beaver Road Extension. They bought it all.

Dorothy Borgus: I did not know someone asked me that the other day, as an additional piece or they bought that originally.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting
1/16/2018**

David Dunning: No, they bought the additional piece afterwards.

Steve Tarbell: Where it says “for use 20 years”, should we at least add five more years to that since it has been it was over twenty years in 2011. Should we add five more years to it?

David Dunning: I think that it is an irrelevant statement completely.

Ron Brand: So what are we going to do with this “Finally”?

David Dunning: “Finally, the large area of land between the CSX Railroad on the north and Beaver Road on the south is recommended to remain Limited Industrial”. Where it says that statement “This area has been recommended for Limited Industrial use for over 20 years and to date, two parcels of land have been developed for this land use category”. Take that out, leave it out. Recommend to leave it Limited Industrial, done end of story that is what I think.

Dorothy Borgus: Okay.

David Dunning: It is not relevant anymore to talk about.

Jim Ignatowski: I think that whole paragraph should go because it is all ready, how would you change that, unless they sell the property and the buildings are demoed.

David Dunning: Thank you.

Paul Wanzenried: You still have the parcel that borders Archer as LI, as are the parcels.

David Dunning: But that is not this.

Paul Wanzenried: That goes in that sub area right.

David Dunning: Yea I guess you are right.

Paul Wanzenried: Those parcels that.

David Dunning: That one parcel.

Paul Wanzenried: All those residential houses on Beaver Road Extension are LI.

David Dunning: Oh, true.

Paul Wanzenried: The only parcel that is not, is the triangle.

David Dunning: Yea the poor guy that bought that house learned that quick. Talk about a bank-financing nightmare. He was trying to get a mortgage and his house is zoned LI if his house burns down guess what you can't build another house. It is zoned LI it is not permitted.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting
1/16/2018**

Paul Wanzenried: The paragraph about the one we are looking to delete you have to separate “Subarea” to “Sub Area”.

David Dunning: On the second to last paragraph “The Chili Center Subarea”, it should be “Sub Area”.

Dorothy Borgus: It runs together “Chili Center Subarea” “Subarea” is one word.

Steve Tarbell: The original one has a hyphen in it.

Ron Brand: So you want a hyphen in there.

David Dunning: Well it is not one word.

Dorothy Borgus: Back to the last paragraph what are we doing with this. We are going to leave the first sentence is all right up to the word “industrial” right?

Ron Brand: Right.

Dorothy Borgus: Are we going to put a period there.

Ron Brand: Yes.

Paul Wanzenried: Well, unless you want to add another landmark saying “the land between CSX Railroad on the north, Archer Road to the east, and Beaver Road to the south” but you should also say that is Beaver Road Extension and not Beaver Road, because I do not believe the triangle is LI.

David Dunning: It is Neighborhood Business.

Paul Wanzenried: It is NB, so you would have to change that to Beaver Road Extension.

Dorothy Borgus: And you want to put Archer Road.

Paul Wanzenried: To the east.

Ron Brand: “A large area of land between the CSX Railroad on the north” and then what did you want in there Paul.

Paul Wanzenried: “CSX Railroad on the north, Archer Road to the east and Beaver Road Extension to the south is recommended to remain Limited Industrial”.

Ron Brand: Now is there something else in there.

Dorothy Borgus: “Is recommended to remain Limited Industrial” period.

Paul Wanzenried: I think that is it.

Dorothy Borgus: Then I think you can eliminate the rest of that paragraph cant you.

2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting
1/16/2018

David Dunning: Yes. Anything else on 5-17, 5-18.

Dorothy Borgus: In the first line on page 5-18, we have “Subarea” again. We need a hyphen or something.

David Dunning: What does that mean that first one? “The plan also recommends in this Sub Area #3 that Beaver Road Extension at the east end align with the property line of the American Packaging property under development”. It would be the west because Archer Road is on the east end. But what does that mean still.

Paul Wanzenried: Because it crosses it.

David Dunning: What crosses it?

Paul Wanzenried: Beaver Road Extension crosses American Packages property.

David Dunning: So.

Steve Tarbell: That was an extension to that last paragraph that we were going to delete some of it. That is the way I took it. See it was not in the old plan so they added it to that paragraph that we were just going to delete half of it that was added.

David Dunning: Just that little piece.

Paul Wanzenried: You see it right.

David Dunning: Yea. We can stop cutting that then.

Dorothy Borgus: I looked at the map and I could not see it at all.

David Dunning: It is a real small piece. So I guess I still don't know what that means.

Paul Wanzenried: I am not sure that really exists, I would have to go back and look at American Packaging site plan to verify.

David Dunning: So I still do not get what this is saying. I do not understand.

Paul Wanzenried: How are you going to align the property line and the road?

Ron Brand: Are you saying the road extends across the property line.

Paul Wanzenried: Yes.

Ron Brand: Of American Packaging and there is no right away record there.

Paul Wanzenried: Not that I can remember I do not know if there is any easements or anything it is just been that way since.

Ron Brand: Day one.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting
1/16/2018**

Paul Wanzenried: Right.

Ron Brand: So you're calling for an intersection improvement or eliminating that as a connecting.

David Dunning: So, but it is the road not the triangle.

Paul Wanzenried: Correct.

David Dunning: But the road is the road it is a town road. American Packaging's property line can't cross that boundary.

Paul Wanzenried: I debate the validity of this statement.

David Dunning: I do not understand the statement.

Paul Wanzenried: Exactly.

Jim Ignatowski: I have no record of that ever being asked to be put in there.

Steve Tarbell: I don't either.

Ron Brand: Well it was written down.

Steve Tarbell: Just take that out do we need that in.

Paul Wanzenried: The map shows it though.

David Dunning: I don't know what it means.

Steve Tarbell: It looks like it was a part of that last paragraph that we were going to delete.

Dorothy Borgus: Why don't we just leave it out?

David Dunning: Yea, second look at it I would say omit.

Ron Brand: That is fine.

Steve Tarbell: The part under it too or does it stay.

David Dunning: No that stays I think. No wait.

Dorothy Borgus: Why is "unchanged".

Ron Brand: A different font, I don't know I just noticed it.

David Dunning: That is the other thing we need to change on this particular map too Ron that PNOD north of CSX that is not a PNOD, it is marked off on this map as PNOD north of the CSX tracks just west of Archer that is not PNOD.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting
1/16/2018**

Ron Brand: What should that be there?

David Dunning: Municipal.

Ron Brand: Does that go out to Paul Road as well.

David Dunning: No, the PNOD does encompass that one lot that is highlighted in yellow and I believe that is it.

Paul Wanzenried: I want to say it is just that yellow part.

David Dunning: Yea it is that other part right that is the church's property there, which was proposed I think for PNOD but never got it or is it a separate lot. We would have to look that up. You would have to look that one up Paul. You would want to verify that, that maybe PNOD.

Al Hellaby: That is a separate lot wasn't it part of where they were going to develop that Lowe's or something.

David Dunning: That is where the church wanted to sell that piece of land over but that piece I believe is a separate lot and I believe it may be PNOD. But that part on the south side is definitely not.

Ron Brand: Okay.

David Dunning: And then that statement "Elsewhere in this sub-area the new development would be single family residential".

Al Hellaby: I think that originally they were talking about that Zueber property that was supposed to be a housing track in there so now that is gone.

David Dunning: Right, unless someone offers us some good money.

Ron Brand: So in other words take that out.

Dorothy Borgus: What that "Elsewhere".

David Dunning: Yes, there is no place left to build a house there.

Paul Wanzenried: There is always incentive zoning.

David Dunning: For what?

Paul Wanzenried: Somebody could go across Archer in that LI and change that to, say they want to put houses up in there.

David Dunning: You could do that.

Paul Wanzenried: But that is the only parcel that that could happen.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting
1/16/2018**

David Dunning: Yea or we could rezone Beaver Road Extension. If somebody wanted to that in the LI and incorporate the whole thing and change it all over. That would get rid of the issue with the people's houses. Anything else on 5-18.

Ron Brand: Well um, on this Sub Area map south of Beaver Road right now where Bernie's thing is this says Agricultural Conservation.

David Dunning: That is based on the Future Land Use Map and not the Zoning Map. This is based on the Future Land Use Map.

Paul Wanzenried: But the color should be changed.

David Dunning: Yes no doubt.

Ron Brand: This parcel right here.

Al Hellaby: Correct.

David Dunning: It will change as a part of these changes; I am just saying that the map that was generated was generated off the Future Land Use Map and not the current Zoning Map.

Ron Brand: Right.

David Dunning: But that is on one of the other sub areas not this sub area.

Ron Brand: Yea, but I am saying if we do not change it on this map and we go to the other sub area map because it is down here.

David Dunning: That is why I think Jim's suggestion makes the most sense early on when you make that overall map of all the sub areas and then you do your kind of cut, paste kind of thing, and cut them out. Then you will have it all changed.

Al Hellaby: This sub area should lap up to here anyways.

David Dunning: Change the overall map, notch out your sub areas as a whole map and then cut and paste the individual maps right.

Jim Ignatowski: I should be able to take every map and cut it out and put it together then everything should line up.

David Dunning: Exactly.

Jim Ignatowski: It just needs to be double-checked on that.

Paul Wanzenried: No overlap.

Ron Brand: Well there is now.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting
1/16/2018**

Jim Ignatowski: That is my suggestion what is your suggestion.

Paul Wanzenried: No, no.

David Dunning: Anything else on 5-18.

Dorothy Borgus: There is one sentence in the paragraph that starts “The 2030 Plan recommends continued Commercial Development”, that paragraph the second one, the sentence starts with “Concern” does that sentence make sense. “Concern over the development of the frontage along Union Street, the interior lands and how to integrate those into a planned corridor approach”. It does not make sense. Sub Area 4, the second paragraph, right in the middle of that paragraph. But there is words missing or something in that sentence. “Concern”.

Jim Ignatowski: Yea, what is the “concern”?

Dorothy Borgus: What is the “concern”, who concerned?

Ron Brand: Okay so you want to say “Concern over the development of just the frontage along Union Street”. Without the “interior lands and how to integrate those into a planned corridor approach”.

Dorothy Borgus: There is no verb then either. It is not a whole sentence.

Jim Ignatowski: Maybe it should say, “Another concern is the development of frontage along Union Street”, or whatever.

Dorothy Borgus: Yea maybe that would do it. You see the sentence Ron.

Ron Brand: Yes, I see it.

Steve Tarbell: In the old one there is a whole sentence removed just before that.

Dorothy Borgus: I know I have that listed on here that in the real old one that the wording is different.

Steve Tarbell: That was all removed.

David Dunning: I think I understand what it is getting at. What you really have happening over there is similar to Scottsville Road you have not cohesive approach to the development along Union Street. You have retail there, you have industrial, warehouse, storage, some residential, used car.

Dorothy Borgus: I think the suggestion was “another concern” or “there is concern” over the development, that makes it a sentence then. “There is concern over the development of the frontage along Union Street”.

David Dunning: What was the concern Ron do you know?

Ron Brand: What the concern was not just develop the frontage lots or the frontage portion of these deep lots without taking into consideration what may happen in the rear portions of those lots. In other words, frontage development along Union Street just for commercial sake with what do you do behind it.

2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting
1/16/2018

Dorothy Borgus: The thought is good it is just that something needs to be put into that sentence. It should be “there is concern” or “another concern is”.

Jim Ignatowski: It is grammatical.

Dorothy Borgus: It is grammatical it is not an issue of do we agree.

Ron Brand: “Of just the frontage portion of these lots along Union Street, but the interior lands as well and how to integrate those as well into a planned corridor”.

Dorothy Borgus: At the beginning of this sentence Ron, you still have to add something you just cannot start off with “concern”.

Ron Brand: No, there is concern.

Dorothy Borgus: There is concern.

Ron Brand: “There is concern”.

Dorothy Borgus: Okay all right.

Ron Brand: “There is concern over the development of just the frontage portion of these lots along Union Street”. Okay, “without considering the interior lands and how to integrate those into a planned corridor approach”.

David Dunning: Anything else on 5-18.

Paul Wanzenried: Are we extending the sewers?

Dorothy Borgus: Yea, I am looking at that right now the last paragraph. Here we go again, “Paul Road should be extended”. I mean I do not have any problem it kind of agrees with what we were talking about with the bridge but.

David Dunning: What is the question Paul?

Paul Wanzenried: The second to the last paragraph.

David Dunning: What is the question?

Paul Wanzenried: Are you doing a feasibility study?

David Dunning: Actually um, on the drainage or are we talking about sewers?

Paul Wanzenried: It addresses both.

Dorothy Borgus: Sanitary it says.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting
1/16/2018**

David Dunning: In essence I will use the quotes, there has been somewhat of a study kind of done when they did the proposal for the hotel and office park and gas station there at Jim Brown's place. They did study the sewer and the layout and how the sewer would have to run so there is documentation, which we have that shows what would have to happen there in order to do anything for any type of extensions. If this statement supports that while it is not an official study we undertook a developer did.

Al Hellaby: Didn't they extend some of that sewer down by just north of Higbie's, they were doing a lot of work on that down there.

David Dunning: I think that they did it up to Boon actually. I think Boon has it now because they took him off he tapped into the sewer because he was able to get rid of his septic. But I think that is as far as it goes to Boon. The next step would have been to go under the tracks up to the fire departments property, east along the backside of peoples property's, then south out that vacant or the fire departments property I think up to Paul Road Extension. That is how they were zig zagging to get over to Brown's property. So does anything need to change there Paul.

Paul Wanzenried: Well do you still recommend that a study be done.

David Dunning: I would not take it out.

Ron Brand: Before you did anything you would want to have your engineer's take of this study that you are referring to, to see if there is something there that perhaps was done just for the benefit of the developer and not necessarily the town.

David Dunning: Actually, let us backtrack that up a little bit, because I think Paul might be right. A study may not be something we should do because the town, the municipality, town, village, city, whatever can no longer the fund the installation of sewers or sewer projects for private development.

Paul Wanzenried: I remember you saying that, that is why I brought it up.

Dorothy Borgus: Then we should take that out of there.

David Dunning: Correct, yea.

Ron Brand: I understand what you are saying; I don't read that in here.

David Dunning: Well this says we should do sewer feasibility study, "recommendation that a" I get the drainage part of it I don't have a problem with that. But the sewer feasibility study why would we even undertake that if we can't fund it anyways.

Dorothy Borgus: It says you should be prepared, "be prepared".

Ron Brand: So you want this to say "The recommendation that a drainage evaluation and plan be prepared".

David Dunning: Take anything that has anything to do with.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting
1/16/2018**

Dorothy Borgus: You don't want a general plan do you? "Consequently, the recommendation that a drainage evaluation be prepared".

David Dunning: No because a plan would be subject to whatever is going to go in there to tie into it and how they are going to do it and not us. We are not going to develop a plan.

Dorothy Borgus: So you take general plan out.

David Dunning: Yes.

Dorothy Borgus: I would think so.

David Dunning: Anything to do with drainage I think you are fine.

Dorothy Borgus: So take out "and general plan be prepared". So it would read "the recommendation that a drainage evaluation be prepared which covers this area".

David Dunning: All you have to get rid of is that part on "sewer feasibility study".

Dorothy Borgus: And then on the next sentence you have to get rid of "planning" too haven't you. The last sentence "In part, the drainage evaluation and planning" take the "and planning" out.

David Dunning: No, I would say drainage you are still planning, drainage is still us unless it is a private development which they would manage that but drainage would still be us for the general area.

Dorothy Borgus: So, we are taking out "sewer feasibility study and a".

Ron Brand: Right.

Dorothy Borgus: Then on the next sentence "and general plan" is coming out as well.

Ron Brand: Right.

David Dunning: Okay, thank you Paul for your persistence. Anything else on 5-18.

Al Hellaby: You have a few more of the "Subarea" floating in around here.

Ron Brand: Yea.

Dorothy Borgus: I have a note here not the same as my book.

David Dunning: On which on Dorothy.

Dorothy Borgus: Right at the top the top paragraph at 5-20. It is entirely different print I mean different verbiage on the old plan.

Steve Tarbell: They have traffic increases that is what is different.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting
1/16/2018**

Dorothy Borgus: Yes, it is different.

Steve Tarbell: They added, “traffic increases”.

Dorothy Borgus: The part about the used car dealer and everything is not even in mine.

David Dunning: In this one.

Dorothy Borgus: Not in mine but then we have come across this before. I don’t know how that could happen it is not anything like that paragraph on 5-12 in the original book.

David Dunning: That is interesting.

Dorothy Borgus: I don’t know how they can be different.

Steve Tarbell: That used car dealer was added.

Dorothy Borgus: Where, when, because I have the original book.

David Dunning: Could that just be not highlighted as one of the changes.

Steve Tarbell: The whole paragraph has changed.

Dorothy Borgus: That is right the whole paragraph has changed.

Steve Tarbell: My note says we were only supposed to add “and, traffic increases” from my notes.

Dorothy Borgus: Right but then from there on.

Al Hellaby: What is the adopted date on the bottom corner Dorothy?

Dorothy Borgus: 11/2/2011.

Al Hellaby: That is the same date.

Dorothy Borgus: I know then how could it be different.

Jim Ignatowski: Dorothy you have a white binder, there were two that were put out one was white and one was black. I have a black I have a white one at home and I wonder if that is what the difference is.

Dorothy Borgus: This is the official.

Jim Ignatowski: There are two officials I have a white at home and a black at home.

Dorothy Borgus: How could that be?

David Dunning: Well we just gave you a binder we had.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting
1/16/2018**

Dorothy Borgus: No, no it is what is in the binder that is not the same.

David Dunning: You are not seeing that are you Jim.

Jim Ignatowski: What is that?

David Dunning: That what is in the binders is different.

Dorothy Borgus: It is different.

David Dunning: The black one and the white one that you have.

Jim Ignatowski: I will check when get back but I have two.

David Dunning: They could be in different binders.

Dorothy Borgus: No, it is the content is not the same.

Steve Tarbell: We ran across this before.

Dorothy Borgus: It actually goes back even to the before I see now that under Sub Area 4, under “The 2030 Plan recommends continued”. Even that paragraph is different. The one we have reads, we are talking about again about making sure that we just don’t use frontage you know. And in that paragraph in the old one it says “West Chili the intersection of State Routes 33A and County Route 260 will continue to be an exception to the opportunities listed above, this intersection continues to operate in a poor condition and any increase in land use intensity that generates additional traffic through this intersection will need to be carefully be evaluated”.

Steve Tarbell: I have that in mine right here.

Dorothy Borgus: I don’t think it has to do with anything with the binder color.

Ron Brand: I mean I am following this with what I have, the first Sub Area “This sub-area continues to be a mix of residential, commercial”.

Dorothy Borgus: That paragraph is the same. It is the next one that is different.

David Dunning: Yea.

Ron Brand: As with the boarding?

David Dunning: “The location makes future requests such uses likely, especially as North Chili grows and traffic increases” Such uses can be served by on-site sewage disposal systems and need not post significant problems if their size and type”. That is not even here. No that is here, nothing about the car dealer.

Steve Tarbell: That is on the next page.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting
1/16/2018**

David Dunning: No that is a part of that.

Steve Tarbell: Oh, down I meant.

Dorothy Borgus: It is odd.

David Dunning: No the car dealership is not on here.

Ron Brand: There is something wrong then with the disc that I took as the basis.

David Dunning: Well we did not make any changes.

Paul Wanzenried: It is almost like dare I say that this is a draft of days gone by. In other words, this is a draft of when you were coming up with the 2030 plan.

Ron Brand: It could be.

Paul Wanzenried: Because somehow I am reading am reading everything that Dorothy is reading and in my comp plan, it does not compare to my notes.

Ron Brand: All I got was a note from Dawn and the cd was in here, when I am done, I have to give it back. Perhaps there is another disc then, by error I got the wrong disc.

Dorothy Borgus: We ran into that when we were going through the original chapters, going through the chapters the first time. It was especially a problem in Chapter 5.

David Dunning: Those first one, two, three, four paragraphs are not consistent with what is in the current comprehensive plan. It is the first four after that they are fine.

Dorothy Borgus: I know it.

David Dunning: Only those four paragraphs are different. I need to get you I will verify what is 5-12, one, two, three, four on 5-20.

Dorothy Borgus: "The location makes future requests for such uses likely" that is.

Steve Tarbell: And the next one is different too.

David Dunning: Which one.

Ron Brand: The major constraint to develop.

Dorothy Borgus: Right that is different too.

Steve Tarbell: Then the next one "The existing" starts out different.

Ron Brand: So that whole page is different.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting
1/16/2018**

Dorothy Borgus: Well let's see.

David Dunning: The first one, two, three, four on 5-20 of the update those first four are not the same and need to be looked at.

Steve Tarbell: And then there is one inserted "the neighborhood commercial" that is added in between.

David Dunning: That is what I am saying. That is what is a part of the first four paragraphs.

Dorothy Borgus: No, it is at the bottom of the old 5-12.

David Dunning: On 5-20 on the new one, the first one starts out "The location makes future requests", all the way down to that paragraph, the next one, the next one, and the next one, those need to get looked at because the next one "The other significant concern" is correct on this and it starts on it starts on 5-14, as well as the "Single family residences" that is correct on the current comprehensive plan. Okay right.

Ron Brand: I do not have to my knowledge a copy of the adopted 2011 plan in full.

David Dunning: You wrote it.

Ron Brand: I know. I think I was given a cd.

David Dunning: We will go over that.

Dorothy Borgus: On 5-20, I have a sticky on here that says where did this page come from.

Ron Brand: All right so for us to continue with the rest of this chapter is.

Paul Wanzenried: I think you have to revisit Sub Area 4, the whole thing start from the beginning because I am not reading anything that is matching up.

David Dunning: Okay.

Dorothy Borgus: Maybe that would be a good thing rather than trying to figure out what is the same and what is different and why it is different.

Ron Brand: Quote un quote if Sub Area 4 is wrong then 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 are going to be wrong likely.

Dorothy Borgus: Maybe not.

David Dunning: Take a look.

Ron Brand: Okay.

David Dunning: I will make sure we verify you have this as adopted.

Ron Brand: I am pretty sure I don't.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting
1/16/2018**

David Dunning: It is okay I will make sure you have it. It is fairly large but we will get it to you.

Ron Brand: Okay. I will give it back.

David Dunning: No, you can have it. I don't care about that it is public information. I don't disagree though I think this is a good time cut this off then.

Ron Brand: Well fine, I like to do two things then. I have maps out.

David Dunning: I don't know what you want to do with these.

Ron Brand: Dawn was going to print those out to give to the members.

David Dunning: This is only the one map.

Ron Brand: There is more than one map.

David Dunning: No there is only one map the Physical Constraints, it is all the same map.

Ron Brand: There is more than one map isn't there.

David Dunning: No its only one map it is the Physical Constraints map.

Ron Brand: No but there was another one I sent her.

David Dunning: She only printed out this and the chart. All I got was this Ron.

Ron Brand: Okay what I.

David Dunning: But what I got from Passero today was the big maps.

Ron Brand: And what I sent to her.

Steve Tarbell: On Sub Area 5 do the second, third and fourth paragraphs get deleted.

David Dunning: I don't have any of that.

Steve Tarbell: Was that in your notes.

Ron Brand: Dawn had it pretty sure.

Dorothy Borgus: Is that on the old one or the new one.

Steve Tarbell: On the old Sub Area 5 there is like four paragraphs, it looks like two, three, and four was removed.

Ron Brand: Those are the big ones.

Steve Tarbell: I did not have those in my notes.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting
1/16/2018**

David Dunning: I don't have little ones, what do you want to do with these.

Various talking inaudible.

Paul Wanzenried: They are all struck through.

David Dunning: Hold on a second what are you guys working on now. I just want to make sure we are all on the same page.

Al Hellaby: A question they had on Sub Area 5.

Steve Tarbell: Sub Area 5 paragraph two, three and four I did not have in my notes that they were going to be removed.

Dorothy Borgus: And they are still there.

Steve Tarbell: No, they are removed in the new, but I did not have them in my notes.

David Dunning: Oh, okay. We will go to that when we get back. We are going to pick up on, we are going to make sure that Sub Area 4 is done or redone as necessary. We will review the rest of the sub areas in the meantime before the next meeting make sure that everybody gets any corrections that need to be made ahead of time.

Ron Brand: All right. I will give them a revised sub area by hopefully new maps and new sub areas.

David Dunning: So we will get that done for the next meeting. We will pick back up on four, what is currently called four, so what do we want to do with these Ron.

Ron Brand: What I would like to do with these is to leave them for Paul to sit down with David and make sure that Passero has captured and then if they are correct (inaudible someone rolling paper) then it will reflect the bigger maps and be sent to everyone.

David Dunning: I would like to make a slight suggestion if I could and I can call who is running this over at.

Paul Wanzenried: Dan Savage.

David Dunning: I can call Savage on this I guess what I would like to do is get a copy of the pdf of each one of these or does Dawn have one of these.

Ron Brand: What you have there should be.

David Dunning: I understand but for us individually to be looking at it is we are not each going to have a copy of this.

Ron Brand: Okay that is fine.

**2030 Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting
1/16/2018**

David Dunning: Unless you all want, it and I can make that happen if you think you need it.

Dorothy Borgus: Do they have their work done Passero.

David Dunning: No, there is still going to probably be some changes and things we have the future land use we are going to have to look at.

Ron Brand: But they are not going to do the future land use as I said earlier on until we refine each of the sub areas.

David Dunning: Right.

Ron Brand: And then there is one other map that Paul is working on that shows the areas that have developed since the 2011 plan with a listing of what they were and the year they occurred in so that we can see where the trend is going. Now that is an additional map I don't know we will have to look at it to see if it merits or warrants changes. It is something in the next seven to ten years you should be able to duplicate and see where I think it is very helpful to see how the evolution of the town is going. I have one other thing to pass out I did not send it electronically and that is the draft of the executive summary to date.

David Dunning: Does that have any changes highlighted on it or are there any.

Ron Brand: They are in bold. I can send them to you electronically and they will be in red, but for some reason the printer did not print it out.

David Dunning: Can you send it to me electronically please so I can keep it with the rest of them.

Ron Brand: Absolutely. What I am trying to do here is basically talking about how you get from today to the year 2030 with mixed sequences in planning periods that in 2030 you embark in a new 20-year plan with policies to guide decisions through each of the new planning periods that you identify. That is why it is so important that you understand this process as I pass this onto you.

Dorothy Borgus: I bet six is different too.

David Dunning: I am going to look at four, five and six and just make sure.

The next meeting of the committee will be TBD.

Meeting adjourned at 8:02 pm.