

TOWN OF LLOYD
Planning Board
Special meeting SEQRA
April 6, 2021 7:00 PM

Attendance: Carl DiLorenzo, Franco Zani, Gerry Marion, Charly Long, Bill Meltzer, Sal Cuciti, Scott McCarthy (Chair), Lambros Violaris and Larry Hammond; Board staff Dave Barton, Sarah Van Nostrand, Andrew Learn, and Paul Van Cott

Paul went over the goals of the meeting. Which is to go back over the FEAF Part 2 and make any changes that need to be made, but then to begin to have a conversation regarding whether any of those impacts that have been identified as moderate to large are potentially significant adverse impacts. As seen in DEC guidance there can be moderate to large impacts that are not significant adverse impacts. Based on the project design, mitigation measures that are proposed, the magnitude and importance of those impacts, we may still have large impacts, but that because of their overall magnitude and context of where they are or their importance don't rise to the level of being significant adverse impacts.

Section 1- Impact on Land, the board has identified moderate to large impacts: 1. Construction on slopes over 15%, 2. The removal of more than 1,000 tons of natural material 3. Construction that could last more than 1 year, 4. Concerns about erosion.

Paul mentioned that the DEC for the removal of more than 1,000 tons of materials is focused on mining.

Applicant consultant Andy Willingham mentioned that 42 acres of land will be disturbed. He also mentioned that detailed erosion plan was submitted. The applicant also provided a full landscaping plan for the ALF, which includes 276 shrubs and 297 trees. The applicant advised that they did avoid steep slopes as much as possible. There will be stormwater inspections to keep erosion from becoming an issue. The reason there is so much grading on the site is to make it walkable for all the residents. 66% of the disturbed area is less than 15% grade. 84% of the disturbed area is less than 20% grade. For erosion control they are not going to rely on silt fences, instead there will be drainage swales around the entire perimeter of the project site. Which will be the 1st thing installed on the site. Applicant will use the stormwater ponds as sediment ponds to start with. Any runoff from the site will have to enter one of the sediment ponds. There will be inspections at least weekly from the DEC and Town of Lloyd.

Applicant consultant Kelly Libolt mentioned that they are going to use the company PVE for soil mitigation. Kelly mentioned that PVE tested and found 2 sites that had contamination normally found on farming areas. The contamination is not petroleum based so it doesn't require communication with the DEC. She mentioned that PVE prepared a soil management plan which states that the contaminated soil will be scraped and put into separate piles for testing. Once the results come back PVE will work with the town engineer to develop a plan to utilize the soil. There are 2 different alternatives for the reuse of those soils on site. One is that they would be used as a cap underneath a roadway system or concrete sidewalk. The second alternative is that the material would be removed off site if there was some reason that the material cannot be reused.

Paul asked about soils that are not going to be disturbed or soils that are merely graded will there be any management of those soils to make sure that once development is done that there won't be any human contact with those soils that might be contaminated.

Kelly mentioned that PVE would come up with proper mitigating factors for any areas where there are residences or areas that are being used. She mentioned that the PRRD is only a concept and that if there were issues, they could be addressed at that time, like deed restrictions or mitigating factors. One of alternative mitigating factors is remediating in place which is used for areas that are not being disturbed.

Dave wanted to know how the remediating in place will work. Will it be capped with clean soil and how far away from the houses will that go?

Andy Learn mentioned that yes you would pick how far from the houses to go and put clean soil on top. Can create a plan to show what the town would be looking for and can finalize it once they have more information on the PRRD section.

Franco asked if it would be cost effective to incinerate the contaminated soil? He also mentioned that it can be one of the methods to choose.

Andy Learn said it is an option, but doesn't know how feasible would be.

Kelly mentioned that most of the time when you see soil incinerated its generally petroleum based and not the pesticides that on are this site.

Carl mentioned that the soil report there were 26 sites tested and wanted to know if that was the whole site? The report also mentions that they might have to remove anywhere from 0 feet up to 2 feet of soil below grade surface. He would like to know how much of the site would have to be removed or mitigated?

Kelly mentioned that the process used to test for soil contamination was that they looked at maps to determine where the agricultural uses were. PVE started testing in that area and then went out in a radius. They will go out as far as they can until the samples dimmish. As for the

amount of soil removed it would have to be looked at in more detail when a PRRD application is submitted.

Paul mentioned that it seems that more information will be needed for the PRRD part for soil mitigation. For the ALF part it seems that it is outside of the area of contamination or because of all the paving is there less likely to have exposure.

Andy Learn mentioned that based on the nature of the use itself limits the potential for exposure. Also, he believes that it is outside of the contamination area, plus all the pavement in the area will act as a cap.

Paul asked if the board was comfortable on the mitigation?

Gerry mentioned that Paul had said that the 1,000 tons of material moved concerns mining only, and would like to know the section of law that states that.

Paul mentioned that it came from the DEC guidance and that it's not a regulation. Paul mentioned that it's a minor issue because they are probably going to be taking much more than 1,000 tons off site of just contaminated soil.

Gerry asked if they had any numbers?

Paul said no because once again you are dealing with a conceptual PRRD which is where most of that would occur.

Paul asked if the concerns are the contaminated soil and for that they proposed mitigation measures for. When the PRRD comes in then more mitigation can be looked at. The stormwater will be controlled by a stormwater prevention plan. He said that he is getting at the fact that there are impacts, but the applicant has proposed mitigation.

Scott did a vote on if there were significant adverse impacts to land.

Sal asked what they were voting on.

Paul said that the question was if there were significant adverse impacts to land that haven't been properly mitigated or not looked at further with the PRRD application.

Charly- feels they have properly mitigated and that there will be no adverse impact.

Carl-Thinks there is an adverse impact because they are missing information on the PRRD.

Sal- Votes yes there will be a significant impact.

Larry- I think there is at this time, there are a lot of things that need to be answered before taking a full vote.

Paul asked what information is needed?

Larry said it's all on the PRRD part.

Franco- No significant impacts that cannot be mitigated.

Scott- No adverse impacts at the moment maybe when there is more information on the PRRD then there might be.

Lambros- Yes there will be adverse impacts, concerned about steep slopes.

Gerry- Yes it will be significant impact at this point. Gerry would like more information on the steep slopes.

Kelly suggested that it might be easier on the board to separate the discussion to the ALF part and then on to the PRRD part. Thinks that the board should move forward with discussion on just the ALF. Then when a resolution is close add in something about the PRRD possible issues to be relooked at. This way it could be documented so if and when a PRRD application comes before the town the information missing could be filled in.

Scott asked Paul if that was legal?

Paul said yes, it is legal if all the impacts are considered and that it's up to the board if that is how they want to proceed.

The board agrees to talk about both parts separate.

Paul mentions that the next section that the board had flagged was impacts on flooding. He asked the board to think about the question are the lands where the project is subject to flooding? He mentioned that the DEC guidance focuses on areas located within flood plains. The two issues that the board flagged were; modification to existing drainage, and may change flood water flows.

Kelly mentioned that this land is not subject to flooding.

Andy W. mentioned that have submitted a full stormwater prevention plan and that it meets all DEC stormwater regulations. They are required to have less post-development runoff rate, so the rate has to be less after they develop the site than it is today. One of the requirements is that cannot change drainage patterns.

Sal mentioned that right now on the site it's a diffused percolation, the site is permeable everywhere and they are going to add 20 acres of impermeable surface and increase in slopes and add drainage ponds. He knows that the engineers can do all the calculations and keep all the water in the ponds if the ponds turn out to be feasible. Mentioned that the DEC questions are asking that if there will be a need for stormwater retention ponds or other stormwater management as part of the analyst and if there aren't then it's not significant. Sal is not thrilled with the pond system, but his main concern is that the Twaalfskill flooded the whole town and that it ran down Main Street. He listed this section as a potential hazard or impact.

Franco said as far as Main Street flooding it was due to a hurricane and we don't get a lot of them. He also said that he has no issues with the stormwater ponds. Would like to change the overall answer on flooding to a no. He also asked Andy Learn if he thought the ponds would be able to handle all the runoff on this site.

Andy Learn replied that yes based on their review of the SWPPP prepared it's going to handle it. He also mentioned that most of the time the ponds are way over designed. He pointed out that the DEC guidance says that is the proposed project in a flood plain, and the closest one is the Twaalfskill and they are not proposing any building near it.

Sal asked so that means it technically has to be in a 100-year floodplain on a floodplain map?

Andy Learn said that's how he reads it.

Sal asked Paul if that is also how he read it?

Paul said yes. He also mentioned that all the issues the board has brought up are all about stormwater which was talked about under impacts to land.

Applicant attorney John Furst mentioned that if you disturb more than 1 acre you have to prepare a SWPPP and most likely you will have a pond, which means it doesn't have to be a big project.

Scott said that he agrees changing it to a no. He thinks that extreme storms are one thing, but that the ponds will handle normal ones.

Charly agrees that it should be changed to a no. He would like to know if the swales are going to be in the SWPPP.

Paul said yes.

Andy W. said that the swales and ponds will be built first to catch any runoff from the construction.

Sal said that he doesn't have a strong opinion on this question. He is just concerned about the Twaalfskill possibly flooding the area or the pond closest to 9W flooding.

Franco doesn't think there will any issues with flooding.

Carl agrees with Franco that there won't be any issues with flooding.

Board agrees that the flood section should be changed to a no.

Kelly went over the mitigation for endangered and threatened species. For the Indiana Bat it will be that they won't remove trees from April to October. For the bog turtle they are going to avoid the creek. As for the plant there haven't been any observed in the area.

Scott said that he thinks that should be changed to a no as well.

Franco agrees that it should be changed to a no as well.

Gerry would like to know when the studies were done and how long did it take.

Kelly said that she would get the date of the initial walkthrough as for the 2nd one it was done last week. As for how long it took, she cannot answer that.

John mentioned that he believes that there is 10.5 acres of open space preserved around that creek.

Paul asked in relation to the ALF were there any concerns on plants and animal habitat?

Carl said no.

Paul asked if the restriction of tree cutting was enough mitigation for the bat?

Sal said yes as it's a common restriction.

Paul asked what the board thought about the potential for endangered or threatened vegetation?

Gerry asked if there was a map on vegetation?

Kelly said that they have one.

John mentioned that they did a resource map that shows all the proposed open space areas for the PRRD. He said that its about 18.8 acres.

Sal said that he would like to see the map as most of the land preserved was on the edge of the site.

Andy W. showed the map and explained that most of the 18.8 acres preserved was around the creek and the steeper slopes. It was also created to provide a buffer around the site. The green space doesn't include the lawns between the houses or the recreation area.

Sal would like to see more land preserved near the creek.

Kelly mentioned that the map for this section is to show that they are preserving the habitat of the bog turtle. The map shows distance wise that they are not affecting the creek where there is potential habitat for the bog turtle.

Paul asked if the board thought more land should be preserved above the creek.

Sal said he is fine with the ALF part of the project, but for the PRRD he feels the creek should be protected not just for the bog, but also because it's a part of the Wallkill biodiversity area.

Paul said, so it's not an issue of protecting the bog turtle habitat as it is a question of open space relating to the biodiversity area.

The board agrees to change it to no for the ALF part of the project.

The next section is impact on agricultural resources. The board had flagged two areas: 1. Is the soil grouping for prime for agriculture. The other had to do with the acreage of land converted from farmland to non-farmland.

Kelly mentioned that there were farmland soils found, but the site isn't actively farmed. None of the adjoining properties are actively farmed. The soils that are considered prime farm soils were found to have elevated levels of metal and pesticides. The area of the project is zoned for the type of use they are proposing.

Paul mentioned that there isn't any mitigation proposed for this section as they are taking former farmland and converting it. He also mentioned that looking at part 3 is where the magnitude and importance comes into play. He also said that this area is now zoned for residential not agriculture anymore.

Franco asked when the last time this property was farmed?

John said that he thinks it's been at least 2 years since the property was farmed.

Franco thinks that 8d should be changed from a moderate to large impact to no or small impact.

Sal asked why Franco thought that.

Franco replied that it's not actively farmed, so in his opinion you are not irreversibly converting farmland to non-farmland.

Scott asked is this project in compliance with the comprehensive plan?

Franco said yes.

Scott said that if the comprehensive plan is requesting someone to do this project, then it shouldn't have a negative adverse impact.

Paul mentioned that this project complies with the zoning of that site and with the town's comprehensive plan.

Sal said according to the DEC handbook they want to conserve farmland and from the soils found this site is prime farmland, and feels that it should be conserved.

John mentioned that one of their points against this is that there is contamination in the soils. He doesn't know if it is viable as an agricultural resource or not because of the contamination. He also doesn't think that there will be any impact on surrounding farms from the conversion of this one. As this project sits on the only 2 agriculture parcels.

Sal mentioned that the whole area is agriculture parcels.

John asked if there were any active farms in the area? He also asked is this project going to impact any farms in the ag. district?

Franco said no it won't. He mentioned that there was a farm to the west on the other side of 44/55 that is still being farmed. Another farm is the old Paladino farm to the south which is now Apple Wood, doesn't think it is farmed anymore. Those are the closest farms.

Gerry asked is there anywhere in section 8 that says it has to be an active farm?

Paul mentioned that it is more than 10 acres and there are prime soils on site. The question really is whether the conversion would be a significant adverse environmental impact? In the context of not affecting other farms, the context of the zoning of the land, the context of the contamination and the context of the other areas of the town that are specifically zoned for agricultural purposes.

Scott said he feels that it is not a negative adverse impact based on knowing that the comprehensive plan is what we are dealing with also and it weighs in on changing the property style.

Franco agrees that there will be no negative adverse impacts.

Carl wants to know where everyone stands on part a which is the soil classifications for prime farmland.

Sal mentioned that type 2 and 3 soil classifications are on this site. Which are valued farmland soils.

Kelly mentioned that there is no question about there being impacts on farmland soils, the question is, is there any significant adverse impacts or is there more mitigation required.

Gerry said that he thinks there is a large impact.

Sal thinks that the plan could have protected some of the orchard or vineyard as a mitigation measure. He feels that there will be a large impact.

Charly thinks there will be no impact.

Lambros is in the middle, but is leaning toward no impact.

Larry thinks that there will be no impact.

Impact on agriculture resources changed to a no.

Paul mentioned that the next section is impact on aesthetic resources.

Kelly mentioned that the board flagged this section has having impacts because the project might be visible from scenic or aesthetic resources. She also mentioned that Don had done a visual analysis of viewsheds from the top of the property out. Then reversed the views to show what could be seen from those areas looking at the site. They have also, included a street view of other parcels up and down 9W.

Don went through the pictures and gave the board an idea of where the site will be seen. The site can be seen from the toll plaza (entering into Highland), the overpass, on either side of the self-storage on 9W, Bridgeview development.

Gerry asked how come they haven't shown the board a rendering of what the project will look like?

Don mentioned that they have done at least 7 renderings and believes that they have all been submitted. The focus of them being on the ALF part. They have also submitted elevations of the accessory buildings. There was one of the PRRD showing what the cottages and clubhouse would look like. They haven't done a rendering of what the site would look like from the toll plaza.

Gerry said a rendering like that would be helpful.

Kelly mentioned that for the ALF they have provided the information needed, but as for the PRRD they would provide more information when the 2nd SEQRA review happens.

Scott mentioned that most of the pictures shows the face side of the site, so there's not much construction going on the slopes of the site. What we will be looking at is the top or the crest of the hill with maybe rooftops and trees. Isn't that, right?

Don replied yes that is correct. You could see approximately 20 SFD and the clubhouse.

Paul said the concern is that even with the conceptual piece of the PRRD that the impacts in terms of visibility are still significant adverse effects?

Sal said yes as the slope of the mountain is fixed and with that much development you will have to put drainage or buildings on the slope. With a smaller development you could put the drainage off the steep slopes. He also mentioned that the more you put on this site the more the impacts start to hit. There is so much development on the crown that it's taking away the screening and the ability to set the project back from the viewshed.

Paul mentioned that in terms of having enough mitigation for any impacts, the board would like to see other alternatives?

Sal said yes.

Carl agrees with Sal.

Franco thinks 9ci should be no to small impact. Also, thinks that 9cii should be no to small impact as well. Due to the fact that you will probably see less than 10% of the project site.

Gerry thinks it will be a large impact as you can see the site while driving.

Scott said that he agrees with Franco. He believes that seeing houses is better than seeing the Phoenix cable building. Also, said he doesn't see this as a significant adverse impact.

Bill said that he drove across the bridge and he mentioned that adding a few houses to the viewshed won't be a large impact. He feels that it will be better than what you can already see.

Charly said that he feels it should be changed to no.

Larry said if they keep off the steep slopes you would only see the ridge line.

Lambros said that with all the development on the steep slopes it will stick out, but he feels that there could be worse things to look at. Feels that if they decrease the density on the steeper slopes that would alleviate some of the concerns that board has.

Paul asked the board if visual impacts were a concern with the ALF part or is it just the PRRD?

Carl said for the ALF he has no concerns.

Sal mentioned that the ALF is at a lower elevation.

Franco thinks 9d should be changed to no or small impact. For 9di most people are driving and looking at traffic not at buildings around them.

Scott also, believes it should be changed to a no.

Gerry feels that it will be a large impact as it's a large building and people will see it while travelling.

Sal feels that changing it to a no to small impact means the board won't be able to request mitigation measures for visual impacts.

Paul replied that even if the board changes the answer to no or small impact that the board can still require the applicant to mitigate the issues. Changing it just means that they cannot request anymore information from an EIS.

Board moved on to next section.

Paul said the next section would be on transportation.

Applicant consultant Ken mentioned that board had flagged letter a that is project traffic may exceed capacity of existing road network. The applicant agrees with the board that the 9W/Mayer drive intersection would be tough without doing some kind of mitigation. He also mentioned that the board flagged letter e which is the proposed action may alter the present pattern of movement of people or goods. He mentioned the road improvements that are being proposed.

Paul mentioned that the applicant has proposed mitigation measures and a traffic impact study. What the study shows it that the quantity of traffic will not change substantially and in some cases might be improved. He asked the board for their thoughts?

Franco mentioned that based on the discussion last month there were 400 cars per day, is that right?

Scott said 454.

Franco said okay let's do 500 cars per day, the biggest traffic times would be 2-3 x a day with the employees going to and from work. He mentioned that most senior citizens do not drive during the rush hours, nor do they drive during bad weather, so if you take 500 cars a day based on a 12-hour day, it would be 42 cars an hour, which equates to less than 1 car a minute. He also, says that its not a lot of traffic and feels that it is not a big impact.

Scott says that he agrees with Franco. His other comment is based on pattern of movement for people and goods. He doesn't see how it would be an impact as the road direction will not be changing. You will have a light that is going to be synchronized with another light.

Gerry doesn't see how this will make the traffic situation that is already bad any better.

Scott said the question isn't whether it will make it better, the question is whether it will be a significant adverse impact. He doesn't believe it's going to be an adverse impact.

Paul said that the question for the board is if this project will have a negative adverse impact on traffic.

Sal asked if they were keeping this part the same or changing it.

Franco said that he would like to change it.

Paul asked the board if anyone would like to change to the answer?

Franco said yes change it.

Sal said he would like to leave part 2 the way it was at the last meeting.

Gerry agrees with Sal.

Scott said change it.

Charly said change it, he feels its not a big impact.

Bill said that he would change it, based on the fact that it would be less than 1 car a minute that it is not a large impact.

Carl said to leave it.

Lambos said to leave it.

Larry said to leave it.

Paul then asked about letter e if that should be changed or leave it as it is.

Scott said change it.

Sal said leave it.

Carl said he doesn't see it as a large impact.

Franco said change it.

Larry said change it.

Gerry said leave it.

Charly said change it.

Bill said change it to a no or small impact.

Paul said that what is left of traffic is a moderate to large impact on the projected traffic increase, so the question is now is it a significant adverse environmental impact based on the mitigation provided and the traffic studies?

Carl mentioned that none of the projects on their own will have a significant impact, but all of them together will.

Sal said there will be about 178 houses, about 360 people that will all be sharing one driveway onto Mayer Dr. plus a 130 bed ALF. He feels that there are too many houses up there that will be adding to traffic that it will be a significant impact that is not fully mitigated.

Gerry said he feels it will be a significant impact.

Scott feels that it won't be a significant impact as they have proposed mitigation measures and that the traffic study included all the other projects in that area.

Larry thinks its going to be a significant impact. As they will be putting a lot of homes though a common entrance.

Franco said it will not be a significant impact.

Charly said that he feels it won't be a significant impact.

Lambros thinks that it will have a significant impact on traffic.

Bill feels that the mitigation is enough.

John said that the board should focus more on the people who will live there than the number of dwellings as seniors don't drive as much as other people.

Ken mentioned that not all of the residents up there will be driving at the same time. He also said that without mitigation yes there would be an impact, but he feels the light will help not only the project, but also the residents who already live there.

Paul said the next section is impact on energy.

Kelly mentioned that the parts the board had flagged were b and d. She mentioned that the engineer did a load analyst at peak and for the PRRD part it would be 36.8 KW hours. For the ALF part it would be 1,408 KW hours.

Paul asked the board if there were any thoughts on energy?

Carl asked if Central Hudson had signed off on the energy usage of the project yet?

Kelly said they provided a letter from Central Hudson that said they would provide electricity and natural gas to this site.

Carl said so then there won't be any issues with that.

Kelly mentioned that the letter is a will serve letter.

Paul asked if the board considered either of these parts to be a significant adverse environmental impact?

Franco asked Andy if there was any clarification of part b will they need to create an energy transmission system or not?

Andy mentioned that they are not creating a new transmission system and believes that the will serve letter answers that. The letter means that there are no concerns about transmission or service to the site.

Franco said that question should be changed to a no to small impact.

Scott said it should be changed to a no as they are keeping everything the same.

Paul said even if you leave them moderate to large impacts, based on mitigation and the information that the applicant has provided will this be a significant adverse environmental impact?

Kelly mentioned that for this question the mitigation is normally using low energy usage appliances and HVAC units. Due to the fact that there isn't a sub-station that they have to put in this question is mostly related to load.

Sal mentioned that on d the threshold is 100,000 sq. ft. and this project is almost 4 times the size, so it will be a moderate to large impact.

Paul said yes, but will it be a significant adverse environmental impact?

Sal said yes.

Gerry, yes.

Scott, no.

Charly, no.

Carl, no.

Franco, no.

Larry, no.

Lambros, it's a large impact, but not an adverse one.

Bill agrees that it's not a significant adverse impact.

Paul said the next section was impact on noise, odor and light. The board had flagged letter a as a moderate to large impact.

Kelly mentioned that most of the impact from noise in this type of project is from the HVAC units and systems. They are using low noise HVAC units and generators. As for the lighting part she mentioned that they are using night compliance lighting. She also mentioned that the lighting plan complies with the town code that there is no light outside of the project site.

Andy asked Kelly the 55-65dB what's the distance on that? Its usually 10 ft. or so, right?

Kelly said she thinks its less than 10 ft., she said she thinks it's within standing proximity of the unit.

Franco asked if Dave could tell everyone what the noise ordinance was in the town?

Dave said its 95 dB normally, construction requirements nothing on Sunday and the board can add more requirements to that, during site plan.

Sal agrees with Dave that the construction should be handled during site plan.

Scott said he believes that most of the issues for this section were for construction. He said that there is no impact.

Paul asked if any other board members think this is a significant adverse environmental impact or not.

Gerry asked if anyone took into consideration fire and ambulance?

Kelly said with respect to the ambulance they have indicated before that they are providing their own ambulance service. She said with any development there would be an increase in police and fire calls.

Paul asked if the main concern was about the noise from sirens, in and out of site?

Sal said yes, it's a concern with the neighborhood right there.

Gerry said it is a factor as with the other nursing homes in the area people hear sirens all the time going to and from the sites.

Sal said on the other hand it is allowed in their zoning.

Paul asked would this be a significant adverse environmental impact? That would require an EIS to be done.

Scott said no, as you will have this issue in any neighborhood.

Franco agrees with Scott.

Carl said its not an adverse impact.

Charly no its not an adverse impact.

Larry said no.

Sal said no.

Gerry small impact.

Lambros asked if the ambulance service the applicant is proposing will they be running with lights and sirens or just a shuttle service?

Kelly replied that it would be a normal ambulance service, and the sirens would be used as necessary.

Lambros said small impact.

Bill said no significant adverse impacts.

Paul said the final section was consistency with community character. The board had flagged 2 issues: one is the action may create a demand for community services, the other is that the construction of the ALF is out of scale with the SFD that are about 200 feet away.

Kelly mentioned that they drove up and down route 9W and took pictures of what is existing now.

Don showed the pictures that they had taken.

Gerry asked what are the dimensions of your building compared to the ones you showed, minus the Hannaford mall?

Don mentioned that the length of the ALF is approximately 300 linear feet and it spans from Tractor Supply to the north edge of McDonalds. It's a little less than half of the Bridgeview Plaza.

Gerry asked if it would be that far off the road?

Don said its not that far off the road.

Gerry said that is the issue, its such a large building, so close to the road, where the mall is farther back and less significant.

Don said yes, the building will be closer to the road then the mall, but no higher than the mall.

Gerry said is it the same height as the mall and the problem is that you are also on a hill, where the mall is not.

Franco mentioned that it fits the zone.

Kelly said she just brought it up as there were questions about the consistency of the building and the architecture of the building with the surrounding community.

Franco asked Kelly about them running their own ambulance service out of there?

Kelly said yes.

Franco then asked if it would be possible to let Lloyd also have that ambulance service? As of right now the town is in contract to negotiate a new contract and there is an increase in taxpayer's money by over \$100,000 over the last one. If the town could use it would be beneficial to the town, if they could do it at no cost.

John replied that the client is willing to help out by either providing the service or contribute to it to make up for the difference.

Paul said the question for the board is in respect with consistency with community character are there any significant adverse environmental impacts?

Sal said yes as there is a huge building right next to SFD, to him it would be an adverse impact.

Gerry agrees with Sal.

Franco asked do we know the distance from the southern edge to the SFD? It meets the setbacks, right?

Sal said its about 200 ft.

John said yes, and in between the project and the homes on Mayer there will be a significant green vegetation buffer that will be maintained.

Franco said no impact.

Scott agrees with no impact.

Carl said no adverse impact.

Charly said no adverse impact.

Larry said no adverse impact.

Lambos said no to small impact.

Bill said no adverse impact.