

PLANNING BOARD

Town of Lewiston 1375 Ridge Road Lewiston New York
Thursday – June 15, 2023

AGENDA: Dillard- Ridge Rd (A), Dipietro- Buffalo St (B)

PB- 06-2023 (A)

Present: Burg, Baker, Conrad, Lilly, Lattanzio, Taczak, Waechter

Presiding: William Burg, Chairman

Burg: I'd like to welcome everybody to the Town of Lewiston Town Planning June 15th meeting.

Roll Call

A motion to approve the minutes of May 18, 2023, was made by Taczak, seconded by Lattanzio and carried.

Burg: We have two items on the agenda today we are going to bring up the Dillard Ridge Road subdivision first. If you can come up. I need you to state your name for the record.

Peter Fontanarosa

Burg: We have a letter here stating that you can speak on Crystal Dillard's behalf.

Fontanarosa: Yes.

Burg: Can you tell us what you got.

Fontanarosa: Ok

Conrad: Hold on one second, I have to turn your microphone on.

Fontanarosa: Anyway, it's a family-owned property that whole parcel the parents are on the left side and the daughter wants to build on the right side. It's 20 acres it's a lot of depth but minimal frontage. So, if you split it in half, you're going to have 105 I understand that you need a 125 so we are looking for a variance to allow this house to go on that side.

Burg: I thought this already went in front of zoning last week and we got the zoning approved the variance approved.

Serianni: That's correct the variance was approved last week's zoning board. So, this is for site plan approval or I am sorry not site plan approval this is for approval to divide the parcel minor subdivision of one parcel.

Burg: I got it.

Lilly: Anything else you want to over or mention about your plans.

PB-06-2023 (A)

Fontanarosa: No, we have a surveyor on board whenever to survey that parcel to make it to whatever we are allowed and on the depth. The gentleman said maybe 200 feet deep well if she sets the house back a little further, I talked to a friend of mine that does septic tanks and he said that sometimes you might need a little more depth than the engineer who is drawing up plans now preliminary said Well you could come up the front. So anyway, I am not sure of the depth of the lot but we got 3400 feet so it's going to be 200 feet deep or maybe 150 feet deep.

Conrad: We would have to know for sure which.

Burg: What's before us is just subdividing we not approving the.

Taczak: Specifics.

Burg: Were not approving the location of the house that would all go through the building department.

Taczak: And this is a just home that she's building to live next to her parents.

Fontanarosa: Yes

Burg: Anything else from the board?

Lilly: So, there's an existing house right now on this large property.

Fontanarosa: Yes, on the left side it's her parents' home.

Lilly: And then so that's obviously staying and it's occupied right now.

Fontanarosa: Yes

Conrad: And the other part of the lot would be irregularly shaped kind of like an L of some sort behind.

Fontanarosa: Right now, it's 200 105 and 105 and as deep.

Conrad: When I first looked at it and Mr. Baker just clarified or pointed out to me it's an enormous lot.

Lilly: So, this is the new lot.

Conrad: Yeah, yeah

Lilly: So, the new lot is going to be larger than the existing property that the house is on.

Fontanarosa: Not necessarily I just was told that by whatever she'd put the house anywhere she thought she would like the house set back a little bit and there is septic there.

Conrad: I think well at least for my perspective is that I would like to know exactly what the dimensions are of the lot that were talking about because we need to know exactly what dimensions are of the lot itself not where the house is going to.

Fontanarosa: Ok

Conrad: Just the lot.

PB-06-2023 (A)

Fontanarosa: Right now, the surveyor and myself discussed previous was 105x200 ok. Now if it changes, I would be misleading you it might be 50 feet more but right now that's what they had in mind.

Conrad: So, we can't

Members talking

Burg: The dimensions are on the site plan and it's asking for a split 105x200.

Conrad: He doesn't know how deep.

Waechter: But then we can't go back you would have to come back and amend it because if it's going to be 105x200 and then they go to 300 if you're not splitting it all the down to the what is it 3428. You know what I mean.

Conrad: And it's legal part of it too. You have the deed and everything and all that taken care of.

Fontanarosa: What I believe we can do and I never thought about this I haven't put a septic tank in years. But what the engineer told me he says go in front so in other words if she sets the house back and we don't have enough depth we will just come in the front.

Conrad: Right. You can go on top for all I care. I just want to see the property.

Baker: Just so we are clear. This was one big parcel.

Fontanarosa: Yes

Baker: And now you want to make it into 2 parcels and one parcel where the existing house is at 105.63x200.

Fontanarosa: Yes

Baker: And then you have that L shaped piece which is 3428 deep and at one point it's about 105 wide and then it widens doubles almost doubles.

Members all talking

Conrad: But then you will have this other piece back here which.

Taczak: No, it's all part of the same parcel.

Baker: They are just sectioning off the parcel where the existing house is.

Conrad: Yeah, I know exactly what the parcel is that is being subdivided but when you talk about the parcel that's going to build upon Ok.

Fontanarosa: Right

Conrad: When you talk about the depth being 200 or 250 is that a property line you're going to be creating?

Fontanarosa: I believe that you people or somebody would need a lot right now that's one big parcel.

PB-06-2023 (A)

Conrad: Right

Fontanarosa: So, we are trying to make it 2 parcels. But that second parcel according to the surveyor is going to be 105x200 and that's all we are really looking for. If it ended up being something we don't know about I believe that could come up. But I don't really think it's necessary. All we are looking for and I believe we have to do this for a lot of reasons I think the bank would want a lot identified as specific lot I think maybe you people would want a specific lot.

Members: Yeah

Taczak: That's what he trying to say but the way it has been presented to us right now we have lot number 1 parents' home lot number 2 proposed home along with the rest of the thing behind.

Fontanarosa: We don't want that all we want. We are not looking for that. That piece of paper.

Taczak: This is wrong then. The piece of paper you gave is us wrong.

Fontanarosa: I think it says 105x200.

Lilly: That's the existing house.

Waechter: Where I think it is it's confusing you don't have a back property line.

Conrad: There's no property line.

Fontanarosa: I am confused.

Members discussing talking.

Conrad: That's what I saying when you put that other property line in then you have 3 parcels.

Waechter: So right here what we don't have I don't think I have it one here but these are proposed properties. So, there's no back property line here.

Burg: Ok guys can we have one meeting.

Members all talking

Conrad: Sorry

Burg: One meeting.

Fontanarosa: So, I didn't expect or didn't know that surveyor I guess he didn't want to commit himself until we had conversation, I believe though that's not a problem I can get whatever he identifies that back piece.

Conrad: It won't be a problem we just need it defined.

Waechter: We just need to have that.

Lilly: Actually, somebody does have to commit themselves to something that has some measurements to it. Right at the beginning so as it goes before planning board the bank and all the other entities there

PB-06-2023 (A)

is some clarification and this seems to be some more confusion than it needs to be. And Sarah I mean. This is the entire property ok this is the house right now you've got a shed here also that looks like at this point if you divide this, this shed will be on the new parcel.

Fontanarosa: Ok

Lilly: Correct. That if I am reading boundary's correct so this existing house here is 105 at the front and 200 to the back simple property. Then the rest of this is the rest of the property correct is that what you are looking to do?

Fontanarosa: NO

Lilly: Ok then this drawing is no representing what you want to do.

Fontanarosa: Ok

Lilly: Which means we can't act on it.

Fontanarosa: I am saying no she never mentioned that to me that she'd like to have all this as part of this. So let me ask you this question.

Waechter: Cause that's what it looks like right now.

Members talking

Fontanarosa: The question I got is let's assume we identify this as another lot. So now there's 2 lots and this parcel here who's it belongs too?

Burg: You're going to be land locked.

Members talking

Burg: You can't land lock it so.

Fontanarosa: So, we have to maybe either have this one incorporated with this or Her's incorporated this.

Members: Yes

Fontanarosa: OK

Baker: My understanding with talking with Tim was they were just 2 lots the smaller lot created for the existing house then the rest of the property and the hang up was the lack of frontage in the front which is what the Zoning board of appeals approved for a variance.

Fontanarosa: So, I have to clarify if this parcel is going have all of this with it.

Waechter: Yes

Fontanarosa: Ok. I never thought about it.

Waechter: My assumption is that it belongs to here.

PB-06-2023 (A)

Fontanarosa: Right

Waechter: But the way it's drawn it looks like all of this belong to the new lot.

Fontanarosa: I understand.

Lilly: Is this all-thick brush back here.

Fontanarosa: You know what it's a variety there's brush here then he lets a farmer utilize this here to grow stuff.

Lilly: But you see if this is a lot and this is a lot this gets land locked.

Waechter: I do have a question for you well we are speaking of it. I understand that there is a small ditch to the rear 2/3's of the property that contain the Federal wetlands. Now is that the 2/3's of the 105 or the new parcel or is that the back 2/3's of the 20.3 acres.

Fontanarosa: I don't

Burg: It should be part of the existing.

Waechter: It's number 13 A page 2 of the SEQRA. And I don't believe like I am looking at this I am not seeing that it's delineated on this plan.

Burg: It's not

Waechter: I was just was wondering where that Federal Wetland was if it was on that 20 acres.

Fontanarosa: Somebody identified to myself I believe it was Tim Masters that he knows about whatever. He explained something to me he says it's a little minor ditch is all.

Waechter: Yeah

Fontanarosa: But the identified it on there. That's what I was told by Tim Masters.

Waechter: Ok. Well because it is a Federal Wetland so just it would be nice to kind of know where that's located. Because I am not sure.

Conrad: The ditch probably created it.

Waechter: Yeah so

Conrad: The ditch came first and then the wetland came after.

Waechter: Well could be but it is delineated.

Lilly: So, it's a small ditch what sort of size is that do you have any idea.

Fontanarosa: I have no clue.

Taczak: Well, I guess we I am not going to recommend to approve anything until we get all these questions straighten out.

PB-06-2023 (A)

Fontanarosa: Ok

Taczak: You have a bunch of comments from us.

Burg: We have to make a motion we have to vote on it as a board.

Taczak: I realize that. I realize that but I am saying I going to recommend that we table it until we get the answers.

Burg: I understand.

Baker: Well, it says here the wetlands the ditch and the wetlands is to the rear of the entire property and is 2/3's of the way back so it would be about 2000 feet back.

Conrad: It would be about right here maybe.

Waechter: Well, you are assuming.

Baker: That's what it says in the SEQRA.

Conrad: It's also active farm land also. So that kind of eliminates it.

Burg: They are not transferring that part of the parcel where the wetlands are does that have to be identified? If it's remaining as part of the existing property.

Conrad: But it's active farm land that's what the difference is because for a wetland.

Burg: But if we define what the property line is on the new lot then that doesn't come into play because you can't build there.

Conrad: That would be a building department issue.

Waechter: Yeah, but it would just be nice to know where it's at. I don't think it's very clear in the SEQRA that it's. Because this SEQRA is supposed to go with that 105x200 and if they are identifying it on that piece of property then that's a potential issue because now you've got where are you going to put your house.

Lilly: It could be an issue for the property owner who owns the existing house that his deed going to show some sort of wetlands there.

Waechter: Yes, yes

Lilly: Which could be a money of a mess for them 20 years now.

Fontanarosa: Ok

Waechter: Which it just would be nice to know if it is located on the existing home property if they are keeping it all together or if it's on that little piece of property that they are trying to subdivide. That's all it's just for clarification.

Conrad: Once they start going to engineered drawing then a lot of that stuff will be identified as well.

PB-06-2023 (A)

Taczak: I made a motion that we table it until we get some of these answers.

Conrad: I will second it. We need to identify exactly what he needs to.

Burg: Do you want to define the motion.

Conrad: What the questions are.

Taczak: Number 1 I asked the rest of the members to help out number 1 define- of this subdivision what's happening with the supposed property in the back.

Fontanarosa: Ok

Taczak: If that's part of parcel original parcel where the home is or that's part of the new parcel that they want too.

Fontanarosa: I understand.

Taczak: That's the first one. Number 2 define the back lot line of parcel number 2.

Fontanarosa: Ok

Taczak: In black and white. Anybody else.

Waechter: The wetland location.

Baker: What do you mean by the back lot line?

Taczak: The back lot line of if the back lot line is running in a row from the original house or if the back lot line is going all the way 3000 feet.

Fontanarosa: I understand.

Baker: Well, I think they show it here that it's going back 3000 feet.

Taczak: But they haven't given us any answers. That's what is shows but he's not sure.

Conrad: I think just dimensionally you need to clarify exactly what the lines are specifically.

Taczak: That's what I said we cannot clarify what's everything.

Lilly: I think you are contradicting what's on the drawing here.

Members talking

Burg: Ok we have a motion.

Taczak: Second

Burg: We have a motion that's been seconded to table this until we get a better-defined lot line on this site plan.

Baker: Do you want them to indicate where the wetland is also.

PB-06-2023 (A)

Waechter: I think that it's important if they are going to be building on that depending on where it's located either parcel A or parcel B.

Burg: Do we need it if were not transferring the wetland do we need it, Anthony?

Serianni: It's the site plan approval there is no question on whether or not you're building on this parcel I know that is eventually going to be the plan. That would be something that we submit to the board separately. The only question in front of the board right now is just the minor subdivision the main issue here that I see is that the proposed subdivision that was defined in the application is different than what you are identifying.

Taczak: Right

Fontanarosa: Ok

Serianni: What you are stating the subdivision is. So, I think the board needs a clearer understanding on where these subdivided lot lines are going to be.

Burg: Ok so at the pleasure of the board I am going to redefine that motion if that's ok.

Taczak: That's fine please.

Burg: We are going to redefine Bill's motion to specify where the lot lines are.

Fontanarosa: Ok

Burg: We are going to table that until next meeting and we are going to leave it open. Do we have a second for that motion?

Lilly: I seconded it yes.

Burg: Ok. Does everybody understand the motion?

Members: Yes

Burg: All in favor

Members: AYE

Everyone talking

Serianni: Do you understand the issue?

Fontanarosa: Yeah, I believe I do now yes. When do you guys meet again.

Members: 3rd Thursday of the month July 20th.

PB-06-2023 (B)

Burg: Ok next on our agenda is Dipietro. Just waiting on the town attorney to be ready here. Ok Mr. Dipietro.

Dipietro: Yes sir.

Burg: Is everybody familiar with the project over on Buffalo Street.

Members: Yes

Burg: Alright. So, we don't need to go back over the description. Unless we want to state if for the minutes.

Lilly: Well Mr. Dipietro wants start off with what you have done since we meet last and kind of make your presentation here this evening.

Dipietro: Since we were tabled, we did a drawing and I think everyone has a copy of the new stuff. Recently within the last couple of day is that correct.

Members: Yes

Dipietro: I sent it to Mr. Masters I think her forwarded it everyone. It starts out with traffic flow in and out did everyone get this or not.

Members: Yes

Dipietro: So, I revised everything with traffic flow and what type of fencing I was going to use. Restructured the parking and vendor areas moved parking from the front of vendor areas got rid of 1 vendor area. Structured the parking so it was in line with the 150 per vendor area for every required square footage per vendor area for each parking space. What was needed and took into consideration the building across the street and traffic flow in and out. The porta potty the distance back set back I didn't know what set back is needed or if there is a desired one, I couldn't find anything. I don't know on the back property line so if there is one, we are planning so we can talk about anything. I am open to talk about stuff I would like to move with information and discussion. What we have is what we have.

Burg: Does anyone else want to speak for or against this project? Can you step up.

David Warnick: I live 2835 Elm Street which is the property to the west of his property line. My only concern is the where the vendor areas are they permeant structures what are they? Cause it's just a blue blab there right now to me it looks like a building that's my question cause the off set for that would be 50 feet if it's a permeant structure.

Burg: Is that your only question?

Warnick: Yeah, I know what he is trying to do here. Just that property line and then you got the sidewalk on the south side where the short portion of the L is that's right on the property line as well right next to the sidewalk. Again, are they permeant structures it's not really defined.

Lilly: Your property owner behind you have the large privet hedge there. Is that your property?

PB-06-2023 (B)

Warnick: Yeah, I am on the west side.

Lilly: On the other side of that ok.

Burg: Alright. Thank you!

Baker: This lot is the address Buffalo Street or Elm Street?

Warnick: the parking lot itself is Buffalo Street.

Burg: Any discussion by the board?

Lilly: I think when we left off last month.

Dipietro: I was going to address his answer.

Lilly: I am sorry go ahead.

Dipietro: There is no permeant structures at all this would all be like a craft vendor comes with a pop-up tent or a truck there is no permeant structures at all on any weekend or anything. It is strictly bring and leave that day.

Burg: Thank you!

Lilly: Ok since we last met there were some questions, we kind of were in favor of the concept just wanted some more details. As far as traffic flow and things of that nature which you might have identified that but it still seems like there's still some information as far as more specific that are still lacking. The town attorney I think if you can read some of the items that we asked for at the conclusion of last month's meeting.

Serianni: So, I had a set number of notes that identified specific key points that need to be addressed on this site plan. This is what I have and feel free to add to this. First and for most we need a delineated parking spaces, specified traffic flow traffic in and traffic out, signage to help facilitate traffic flow, measured dimensions drawings, identify fencing to limit flow and access to the parking lot siting and location of a rented porta potty and a site plan with over lay for plan A vs. plan B. So those are the things I had and some of these were addressed. So those are the ones I have written down.

Lilly: So, it looks like traffic flow might have been identified but it's still lacking some of the other items.

Dipietro: The fencing has been addressed so it would only be only one entrance and one exit. The one on Elm Street is 30 feet because the dots are fence post which I shown. The fence would be pressure treated posts set in concrete 33 feet to the center line 4 feet apart from the landscaped area that the town provided north to south right on Buffalo Street so cars would not get in and out through there. People could walk through it but no car can. So that would be the thought you can't get through that 6-inch round in concrete in a line.

Conrad: No horizontal just the verticals you're saying right.

PB-06-2023 (B)

Dipietro: Yeah, just posts they do it in boat docks and stuff like that. Just so people can't drive through it. I didn't want to put a fence up because of the snowplows and stuff like that possibly snow packing and damaging it especially when my lot get plowed, they push snow up against it or whatever. Don't have a lot of maintenance there I didn't want to do a landscaped area not really crazy about that but it is a fence of sort. It's in concrete still it's going to cost money it's an expense about \$1200 expense to do that.

Conrad: Right, you know you're a business person you know that any venture is going to be an investment.

Dipietro: That's how I kind of wanted to approach that. You can't get a car though there it's a permeate thing it's not temporary it's going to be there it's not going to look bad because I have seen them, they look decent. They are in a row professionally dug post holes 42 inches deep in concrete. That would be my fix for the fence. That would be all the way through there. Right up there. It would be the same opening and same distance where the curb breaks on Elm Street. So, it would be the same distance over by the one entrance so that would be the in and the out and they both would be clearly marker with signs in and out. That would be the traffic.

Lilly: How about the signage where will you have signage what sort of verbiage would be on it?

Dipietro: It would say in with an arrow and out with arrow on Elm and Buffalo Street. You can't force people you can suggest it but they can come in or out what are you going to do. You can put it there I see it at Smoken Joes all the time. People go in the wrong way there's arrows and there are signs but.

Conrad: It's also a different county. They can kind of do things a little differently than Sanborn.

Dipietro: On Buffalo Street you would say in but if people are you can't force them and you can't stand there and say.

Lilly: But the signage certainly help if there is no signage or direction then you can't blame someone doing something you don't want them to do if you didn't direct them.

Dipietro: Right say in with an arrow I would put that at the end of Buffalo Street side and then on elm Street I would put out with an arrow.

Conrad: I would think that you as the business owner property owner would really want to encourage that heavily that traffic flows the way you want it.

Dipietro: Correct

Conrad: So that there isn't a problem.

Dipietro: Correct I understand it's a strong concern of the board that's how you want it.

Conrad: It should be a strong concern of yours were just putting it out there.

Dipietro: That's just it you're telling me how you want thing to work and it's my job to rely that to hey this is how it's got to work it's just like vendor area it's got to be this, propane tanks have to be if there's

PB-06-2023 (B)

food truck or whatever they need to be 25 or 40 feet apart. I have to make sure that it is that so that's kind of how things work you know that's part of this process you know. That's how I look at it. You're saying these have to be marked they got to be marked good and that's how we want it. You say I want a sign 2 feet by 1 foot with an arrow and in then it's 2 feet by 1 foot out we got it and it's done. That's how I look at things.

Burg: Did you receive a copy of the site plan requirements for the Town of Lewiston.

Dipietro: Site plan ordinance?

Burg: Site plan requirements for the Town of Lewiston.

Conrad: As far as the submission. What you need to submit to formally when you submit a site plan requirements.

Burg: We have a little leeway as a planning board. But we need a good starting point. And I think in my opinion it seems like there's a lot of questions out there. I don't know if we're even the right outfit to guide you on how to draw your own site plan. Let me just for the record now this is just from the building department some of the concerns they have. The traffic pattern public would be directly in the path of a potential line at the porta potty so currently your traffic pattern is going right in front of the porta potty. In regards to the center parking area you have no distance between the northwest corner of the parking space to the southeast corner of the garage no distance between the parking spaces in vendor area. There are no details submitted regarding the fence it's just posts, posts with rails similar to a county style fence picket fence. Vendors to be determined Saturday and Sunday we need this to be ironed out it could be both days.

Dipietro: I don't know how do I get vendors I don't even have permission I am not going to solicit people. I don't have anything it's a commercial property I am not going to solicit people to say come to my property it's a commercial property I don't have permission to do anything.

Waechter: We just need to know the plan. Like is your plan to have it open on Saturday is it your plan to have it open just on Sunday is it a combination of both days. We just need a little bit more information in regards to that. And also, as far with the site plan as I was looking at it, I don't see a legend as far as your scale of your drawing. Like 1-inch equals 1 foot so I don't know if I have missed it but it doesn't appear that this drawing is to scale because I do see that you have listed 10 parking spaces 9 parking spaces but there's no delineation of do you actually have the space to do that amount of parking spots.

Burg: What is a parking spot usually 8/9 foot.

Dipietro: 9 foot

Conrad: 9x19

Dipietro: 9x19 is a normal spot.

Waechter: So, I mean those are the things that would be helpful to us as we make our decision and then also too as far as the signage that need to be included on the site plan like where are you going to

PB-06-2023 (B)

put your in and out signs how big you plan on making those. All of that should be included on this drawing.

Burg: That would be the benefit of having an engineered site plan. They will identify your setbacks they will identify your parking spots, they will identify a safe traffic flow that we can rely on and be enforceable and then the planning board we also need something defensible when it gets clumsy I am not saying that it would but I am saying if it does. When members of the town come to the planning board, they go to the town board because we are an advisory board. They go to the town board and say why did you plan this. And that's what I mean by we need something defensible and this.

Conrad: It's not a road side market it's because it's in the middle of downtown Sanborn. It's in the middle of a neighborhood and it needs to be clearly defined and more formal for us to move forward well to make a decision on it either way and I think it's just the presentation from my opinion too casual. As far as what's been submitted.

Dipietro: So, you're saying I need a professional drawing and were going to be pretty close to being ok. Or if the dimensions are good, are we close or not.

Waechter: Well, I think you work with Tim on that right you get your professional drawing done you get your plan done on paper again your signage the place for the porta johns your parking spaces all figured out and then call Tim and say hey Tim this is what I got can you look at it and see what you think. Work with him and then bring it back to us.

Conrad: That's why your engineer architect should be advising you on what, whether it's do able or not

Burg: As far as the concept of your business that's not before us and I don't think anybody had a problem with it quite frankly it's a great idea. But as the custodian of the town laws, we have to make sure that it's safe and it's proper. And I am not saying that it is or it isn't I am saying that from this chair I don't have enough information.

Dipietro: That's plan B what about plan A the road side farm stand? Can you approve that?

Waechter: Well, you still have issues having a to scale drawing. Because we still need that information as far as where are you going to put that farmstand how big it is and

Dipietro: the requirements I did that, the requirements can be so far from the road.

Taczak: What the attorney mentioned when he read off the list, we don't have a plan A delineated we don't have a plan B overlay delineated. Am I right Mr. Seaman

Serianni: Serianni I am not Seaman

Taczak: My bad

Serianni: But yes, so that's another piece of this that's unconventional puzzle see if the applicant submitted to site plans for the board to approve the board can approve just plan A if the board is satisfied with the drawings that were provided for plan A. Now that being said I am sifting through my file I have a lot on plan B I don't have plan A.

PB-06-2023 (B)

Burg: Is plan A just the black 10x16 structure?

Dipietro: That was a 10x16 structure roadside stand. That was it

Baker: It's a temporary structure also?

Dipietro: Yes

Baker: Will it be gone at the end of the day?

Dipietro: Not at the end of the day

Conrad: At the end of the season

Baker: The gentleman behind you was concerned about something like that

Dipietro: I think he was concerned about the blue area

Burg: We need to keep the questions presented to the board please. We don't have plan A in front of us we have a plan. We required some additional information before we could move forward and I don't see where we got all the information we are looking for.

Dipietro: Plan A was just the market stand the actual farm stand then it got moved into the plan B really took things over. I was just trying to put a roadside farm stand on my property. Then it was like well here we can do other stuff there too and it turned it into plan B.

Burg: This drawing here

Dipietro: Business in both simple farmstand right by the road. Set back from the road. That was the original

Members all talking

Waechter: Also, what it is too we do require to scale drawings from other groups also so it is just something that we have been requiring per our code from this board.

Dipietro: To put a farmstand?

Waechter: You're coming before us to commercially develop the property so any of that type of stuff requires a site plan to it. And it's just part of our code.

Dipietro: A roadside stand requires that?

Waechter: Any of it requires that.

Conrad: A site plan approval it's the same thing as the gentleman was before you subdividing a piece of property, he's got nothing built on it. And he still needed an engineered drawing with defined dimensions and something formal.

Dipietro: There is no foundation. It requires a drawing for that

PB-06-2023 (B)

Conrad: There are requirements that town has on a site plan approval. You are here for a site plan approval and you need to meet that criteria that's written in the code.

Dipietro: I will be back next month. Thank you!

Burg: ummm

Conrad: Make a motion to Table

Burg: We can make a motion for that. We need a motion.

Taczak: Bill made a motion to table it I will second it

Burg: All in favor

Members: AYE

Burg: Ok. Any other new business in front of the board? Do you need something to address with board?

Waechter: Motion to adjourn

Taczak: I'll second it

Burg: All in favor

Members: AYE

Burg: Thanks folks

Respectively submitted,



Lisa Wisnieski
Building Dept Clerk



William Burg
Planning Chairman