

Clarence Planning Board Minutes  
Wednesday, June 15, 2005

Work Session (6:30 PM)

- Roll Call
- Minutes
- Sign review
- Update on pending items
- Committee reports
- Zoning reports
- Miscellaneous
- Agenda Items

Agenda Items (7:30 PM)

Patricia Powers, Chairperson, called the meeting to order at 7:30 PM.  
Deputy Supervisor Anne Case led the pledge to the flag.

Planning Board Members Present:

Patrica Powers	Wendy Salvati
George Van Nest	Jeff Grenzebach
Phil Sgamma	Gerald Drinkard
Tim Pazda	

Other Town Officials Present:

James Callahan, Director of Community Development  
James Hartz, Asst. Director of Community Development  
Deputy Supervisor Anne Case  
David Donohue, Town Attorney

Other Interested Parties Present:

Bill Schutt	Steve Bakowski
Jim Blum	Joyce Bakowski

Motion by Jeffrey Grenzebach, seconded by Wendy Salvati, to approve the minutes of the meeting held on June 1, 2005, as written.

Patrica Powers	AYE	Wendy Salvati	AYE
George Van Nest	AYE	Roy McCready	Absent
Jeff Grenzebach	AYE	Phil Sgamma	AYE
Gerald Drinkard	AYE	Tim Pazda	AYE

ALL AYES. MOTION CARRIED.

**Item I** *(not on the agenda)*  
Master Plan 2015

Resolution amending Master Plan 2015  
with particular reference to the Harris  
Hill Traditional Neighborhood district.

Action:

Motion by Phil Sgamma, seconded by Tim Pazda, to recommend to the  
Town Board the adoption of a resolution to Master Plan 2015.

All Ayes. Motion Carried.

**Item II**  
Rocco Del Grosso  
Major Arterial / Res Single Family

Requests development plan approval  
for the construction of a 7160 square  
foot office building at 6215 Transit Rd.

Discussion:

Jim Callahan gave a brief description of the property which is located on the east side of Transit Road, north of Woodbridge Drive. It consists of approximately one acre in the major arterial zone. Master Plan identifies the area in a major arterial classification. The applicant introduced this project to the Town Board on February 23, 2005 and was referred to Planning Board. A variance was granted on May 10, 2005 to allow a reduced front yard setback to place all parking to the rear. A Negative Declaration under SEQRA was issued on May 25, 2005. The applicant received concept approval on June 1, 2005 and is here seeking Development Plan approval. Approval of all plans submitted to Erie County Sewer District 5 was also received.

Chairman Pat Powers asked Rocco Del Grosso what type of outdoor lighting he intended on using in the parking area. Mr. Del Grosso said, "there was a lot of discussion about lighting with regards to the adjoining property and the neighbors. I think it was Wendy Salvati who initially suggested bollard lighting in the parking areas. We decided that that was excellent. Each one of the landscaped areas surrounding the parking lot will have ground lighting. We won't be using area lighting at all. The only other lighting on the building is going to be along the front landscape beds which will accent light the building at night, making it look good and for security reasons. We'll probably put some wall pack on the back of building because of the immediate parking to the east side. The wall pack will simply light straight down into the parking area." Wendy Salvati advised that the lighting be shielded, otherwise the lighting goes out all over the

place. Rocco Del Grosso said that they would be using directional wall pack so that the lighting can be focused where they want it. Mr. Del Grosso thanked everyone again for their effort and help, especially with the parking.

Action:

Motion made by Patricia Powers, seconded by Wendy Salvati, to recommend Development Plan approval for the construction of a 7160 square foot office building at 6215 Transit Road with the following conditions:

1. Subject to the commercial open space fee;
2. Building is to be restricted to professional office;
3. Shared access with business to the north;
4. Planning Board will recommend that four parking spaces be waived;
5. Town Attorney will review the shared access agreement;
6. No dumpsters included because there is a private pick up service;
7. Subject to the conditions of the memo from the Department of Health dated 6/14/05;
8. Subject to conditions stated in the DEC letter dated 6/7/05 and received 6/9/05; and
9. Subject to the Town Engineer's letter dated 6/3/05.

ALL AYES. MOTION CARRIED.

**Item III**

Greenman-Pedersen  
Industrial

Requests preliminary review of  
proposed Roll Industrial Business Park  
development.

Discussion:

Jim Callahan gave a brief description of the property which is located on the north side of Roll Road, east of Harris Hill Road. The property consists of 100+/- acres zoned Industrial Business Park. Master Plan identifies area in an Industrial Business Park Zone. The applicant introduced this project to the Town Board on May 11, 2005 and was referred to the Planning Board for review and recommendation.

Dominic Piestrak stated that he and his partners are not commercial developers but would like to give this a try. He said they have optioned the front portion of the property and it was bought from Mr. Di Biasi, although they have not closed on it yet. He mentioned that Mr. Di Biasi wants access from his driveway as it is now and does not want access from the new road. Mr. Piestrak

said they have a future option of three years to acquire the rest of the land if they choose. He said, "this is all market driven, and industrial parks may or may not be needed". Wendy Salvati asked how much land is being acquired, and Mr. Piestrak replied that it was roughly 25 acres. Phil Sgamma asked what the access was to the remaining 75 acres. Mr. Piestrak indicated on the site plan where the access would be. He said there has been some talk of making it a thru street, but the idea of lining it up (with Harris Hill) may be a little difficult. Mr. Piestrak added that they tried to purchase the access portion of Di Biasi's property but he was not interested. Mr. Di Biasi wants to maintain the driveway as his access and will not sell that piece.

Pat Powers asked Mr. Piestrak, "without consideration of an extension of Harris Hill Road, if this were to stay exactly as you have it presented this evening, what would be the benefit to the Town of Clarence of that being a public road?" Mr. Piestrak said that if it went straight through, he didn't know how you could make it a private road. He said, "if I owned a commercial building on that road, I would want the road plowed and maintained by the Town. When we did Spaulding, we looked at making it all private. With the tax reductions, it's hard to justify. The Town has fleet vehicles. If it's private, you can restrict use, and I thought there was some talk about taking the pressure off Shimerville and other roads. There is a lot of talk about Condominium Law and the condominium tax exception. If it's a private road with single family homes, and I got three or four of my neighbors together and said let's do a condominium, and apply for the tax exemption, there would be nothing to stop me from doing that. I'm not saying we're going to do that, but it's something to think about on a private road. I have seen a builder do that.

Pat Powers asked Mr. Piestrak if he had given any thought to extending Harris Hill Road. Mr. Piestrak indicated the cluster of trees on the site map was not wetlands. Wendy Salvati asked if he had actually had a delineation done. He said that he had a cursory walk-thru. He indicated that there were some wetlands on the property where Gott Creek goes through, which is a major concern. Wendy Salvati indicated that he had drawn lots on the site plan as if the wetlands didn't exist. Mr. Piestrak said that he has to go back and redo that. He also indicated that he had the opportunity to talk with Steve Doleski of the DEC, on another situation, and he didn't seem to think it would be a major problem.

David Donohue asked if the road could come in from Harris Hill Road, bend eastward around the barn, and then go down the center of the parcel. Mr. Piestrak indicated that Mr. Di Biasi wants to maintain his main entrance way. Jim Callahan said that it creates a concern in terms of this property not having adequate frontage. He said that right now it has a lot of frontage that accommodates the multiple uses, but if it's reduced he won't have sufficient frontage. Mr. Piestrak said he would have sufficient frontage on the proposed

road. Wendy Salvati said, "but, as proposed, it does not conform, until such time as that road is in." George Van Nest added that additional discussion was needed. Phil Sgamma added that the real problem is the traffic issue of offsetting two roads into one. Wendy Salvati said, "especially if that road were to make it all the way up to Clarence Center Road. It would be a road, as Mr. Piestrak said, to take pressure off of Shimerville and Newhouse. Having them offset is not something that we would want to see. The intersection at Harris Hill, right now, is a problematic intersection to begin with." Mr. Piestrak said that the owner wasn't going to take the house down. Wendy Salvati said that we are not asking him to take the house down or that the road run all the way straight back. She said, "we would like to have some kind of road that forms a proper intersection." Mr. Piestrak said that, from a frontage point, the lots on Roll Road are more valuable. He said that it was a point of determining which would be more beneficial for him and his partners or the owner who is willing to sell or not sell. Jim Callahan stated that it has not been determined whether it's realistic to extend a road up there. He said the Town would need to analyze that, and if it is a desired outcome, we would need to look at the impact and get involvement from others. Tim Pazda said that by doing that, you would be encouraging more traffic on Harris Hill Road, which is a protected road as stated in the Master Plan. Jim Callahan said that it really needs to be analyzed as far as desired use is concerned, especially in regards to how it affects the residents. He added that there was talk of a housing project in that area, but because of the moratorium, there's no way to identify a future housing project. Mr. Piestrak said that, from a commercial aspect, the more traffic you can get on that road the better. He said the busier you make a street, the easier it is to market. He said he's not against it going all the way through.

Wendy Salvati asked if there was a way to get access to Newhouse Road. Mr. Piestrak indicated on the site plan an area where there could be access. Jim Callahan also mentioned access from Bill Marfurt's property, but didn't know if it would be difficult with a stream crossing. He said there were some issues with the Waterford project with stream crossings. There were problems with the type of bridge, the wildlife to go under it, and design standards. Mr. Piestrak said that, because of the trees, he was originally interested in the property as a high-end residential subdivision. He said he asked the Town to look at it, and the feeling was that they wanted to keep it industrial. He said he would like to see the road go all the way through to Clarence Center Road, but he doesn't know what kind of problems there would be with the residents. Wendy Salvati asked Mr. Piestrak if he was envisioning something similar to the Essjay Road configuration (either Centerpointe or Crosspointe). Mr. Piestrak said he didn't know if that was feasible. He said that if you introduce the road and a lot of traffic, it doesn't make sense for higher priced, single-family homes. He reiterated that his decision would be market-driven.

Pat Powers asked Mr. Piestrak, keeping in mind that this was preliminary, if he would consider a bike trail through the property. She said that the Town was looking for a north/south bike trail, and right now, it is scheduled to come in near Vincroft. Mr. Piestrak said it would not be a problem. Mr. Sgamma asked if condominiums or townhouses were possible. Jim Callahan responded that, at this point, it would not be feasible because of the zoning. He added that it was something that the Town should look at if it makes sense, in terms of buffering off an industrial or residential area. He said the Planning Board needs to take a hard look at this, and whether a public road would be a benefit or too much of an issue. Wendy Salvati added that it needs to be considered, so that the area is planned property. She said that they are not against development, but it needs to be thought through and planned properly. Mr. Piestrak added that he did not disagree with that. Jim Callahan added that residential development didn't make sense near the gypsum buildings, but the area near the trees might make sense. Mr. Piestrak said that he had a talk with Mr. Doleski about segmentation, and Mr. Doleski felt that an industrial use in Buffalo, New York may be a margin call. He said that he knew certain decisions would have to be made about the road. He added that he has always been against building homes on busy roads, and if that road eventually went through, he would assume that the whole piece would be industrial. He said he doesn't want to get involved in a questionable market, especially when everyone is leaving Western New York in droves.

Pat Powers asked who would make the decision if the road would go through – would that be a Town Board decision? Jim Callahan said ultimately yes, and probably recommended from this board. He said it's almost like you are doing long-range strategic planning. He said there were a lot of opportunities – the connection to Marfurt's property or a connection near the Vincroft property, as examples. He added that all the neighbors would have to be involved before coming up with an ultimate plan. He said you need to do it from the bottom up, with support. Tim Pazda asked, "if you are extending the road, primarily for industrial, aren't you going to have all kinds of flack from certain neighbors?" He added that, if it were being extended for residential development, you might have a chance. Mr. Piestrak said, "it's going to be a tough one to sell." Phil Sgamma said, "isn't Harris Hill a county road." Jim Callahan said yes, it is a county road. Pat Powers said, "suppose that it was decided that this should be a public road and that it should be extended to Clarence Center Road, it would require involvement from the county – if it's an extension of Harris Hill Road." Mr. Piestrak said he would like to meet with the MRC and then meet back with the Planning Board to look at different options. Pat Powers said, "before we get the neighbors involved, and they will be involved, we would like to see you address some of the issues that have been brought out this evening. We will have you come back once we have notified the neighbors and have them come in. To be honest, we had no intention of referring this project out this evening. It is here for preliminary review, and it's the first time the project has been presented to

the Planning Board.” Wendy Salvati said she would like to see a plan that takes Gott Creek into consideration, exploring other options. Tim Pazda said the other issue for consideration is the property owner and the driveway situation.

Gerald Drinkard mentioned not straightening out the intersection of Harris Hill and allowing the property owner to keep his easement/right-of-way, by changing the configuration of the proposed lots. He felt it would, otherwise, introduce a lot of traffic problems. Mr. Piestrak added that the people on Clarence Center Road would probably rather have the problem on Harris Hill. He felt that the easiest solution might be to cut across the bridge. Mr. Piestrak requested that he get back on the agenda quickly. He also mentioned that the DEC advised him that there is a pile of gypsum that is leaching into Gott Creek, so his involvement could be kind of hands-off. George Van Nest asked him if the DEC was looking at it in terms of enforcement because it is a concern for their planning purposes. Mr. Piestrak said Steve Doleski just wanted him to be aware of it, plus one of the neighbors had called. Pat Powers asked him if he was comfortable presenting this project, even with the mines underneath the property. Mr. Piestrak responded that the industry has proven that the mines aren’t a problem. He said there were many concerns about Loch Lea and it’s been ten years with no problems. In Amherst, where the mines are even more questionable, there hasn’t been a problem.

There was additional discussion on residential use of the property and a possible buffer zoning (in the treed area). Jim Callahan said that it could be considered, but would require an amendment to the Master Plan. He said there are some compelling arguments to consider it. Pat Powers asked Mr. Piestrak if he would preserve as many trees as possible. He responded that with a residential use, he would preserve them; but it would only be if the commercial use wasn’t going to work. Pat Powers said that if the plan was presented with that in mind, it would eliminate the segmentation issue. Mr. Piestrak mentioned that the Town still wants to see industrial on the site.

Action:

Motion made by Jeff Grenzebach, seconded by Gerald Drinkard, to table this item for further study.

ALL AYES. MOTION PASSED.

**Item IV**

John Braddell  
Industrial

Requests preliminary review of  
proposed Lakeside Industrial Business  
Park development.

Discussion:

Jim Callahan gave a brief description of the property located on the south side of County Road, west of Goodrich Road. The property consists of 45+/- acres, zoned Industrial Business Park. Master Plan identifies the area in an Industrial Business Park classification. The applicant did introduce the project to the Town Board on May 25, 2005 and was referred to the Planning Board for review and recommendation.

Bill Schutt, of William Schutt & Associates, introduced himself and the property owners/project sponsors, John and Ed Braddell. He mentioned that, prior to the March 2005 zoning ordinance, the property was zoned Industrial. He said it was their intention to construct a public road, approximately 1,300 feet long, and then sell off lots in accordance with the current ordinance. He mentioned that the project already has a tenant for one of the sites. The tenant also has submitted plans to the Town and is moving directly behind us in the review process. He said it was his hope that they move both projects along in a timely fashion.

Pat Powers said that she hopes the prospective tenants understand they are a long way from 'shovel to dirt'. She said that the project has to go through the process and reach development plan approval before their request would be entertained. Mr. Schutt said they were aware of that. He added that it was a project which is zoned correctly, with no environmental or neighborhood issues. Wendy Salvati mentioned the many small triangular parcels on the site plan. Mr. Schutt said that the site is bisected by a National Fuel Gas right-of-way, which is a parcel on its own; and that's why it has created some of the triangle-shaped parcels. Ms. Salvati asked if Mr. Schutt had authorization to cross the right-of-way, and he responded that the authorization was in process.

A discussion ensued regarding certain parcels and their relationship to each other. Ms. Salvati felt the site plan was very confusing to look at. Pat Powers asked about the proposed road and the extension shown on the site map. Mr. Schutt said the extension shown was a potential future extension. Ms. Salvati asked what the proposed use would be. Mr. Schutt said they were just considering a potential loop in the road if market conditions would allow expansion in the future. Dave Donohue asked why the east side lots were not extended all the way back. Mr. Schutt said it was done to keep the piece contiguous with the Braddell's other property. He added that they are offering lots that are minimum in size, based on the current zoning ordinance. Mr.



Donohue asked about the proposed use of the large center lot. Mr. Schutt said there was nothing proposed on that lot at this time. There was more discussion about the configuration of the lots and the unused portions. Mr. Schutt said that the National Fuel Gas right-of-way will probably impede the development of one lot, so that is why it is shown as a large parcel. Wendy Salvati said she would be more comfortable if Mr. Schutt would set before them a subdivision plat. From the SEQR perspective, he needs to tell them what he will do with the rest of the land. Mr. Schutt said he could do that. Ms. Salvati reiterated that she was uncomfortable with some of the lots **not** going back to the property line, unless the subject piece was going to be annexed to the adjoining property. Mr. Donohue said that it was already annexed, and asked why it was part of the plan. Ms. Salvati said, "it's a separate tax lot."

Jim Callahan asked if it would require a separate cut on County Road. Mr. Schutt said, "the one parcel would have a separate driveway cut." Pat Powers asked how far it would be to the closest intersection of County and Goodrich, and it was said to be around 1,000 feet. She also asked if the access to this parcel lines up with a street across County Road. Mr. Schutt said that there was Cimato's landscaping and topsoil business across the street.

Mr. Sgamma asked if he was proposing a private road, and Mr. Schutt responded that they were proposing a public road, which, they felt, was the intent of the ordinance. He said they feel that the health, welfare and safety of the residents of the Town would be better served with a public road and a public water line. Mr. Sgamma asked if the public road could eventually be extended into the property to the east, and then out to Goodrich. Mr. Schutt said, "that's correct."

Dave Donohue asked Mr. Schutt if he had considered designing the road so that there would be a minimum number of curb cuts, as you develop eastward toward Goodrich. He said it seems like we're running into something similar to Transit Road. County Road is a 55 wpm stretch of road. Mr. Schutt said that he only has one curb cut onto County Road. Dave Donohue said that it sometimes starts a pattern and that is the concern. Mr. Schutt said that some tenants may take multiple lots.

Wendy Salvati said she can't see what the advantage of a one acre lot would be to a business, and she would think they would want a bigger lot. Mr. Schutt said the project sponsor is prepared to sell the lots based on the tenants' needs. Mr. Sgamma said, "this plan only appears to have two curb cuts (on County Road), the major road and the one parcel." Mr. Donohue said that his concern was the future development eastward and the resulting curb cuts. Wendy Salvati asked that the plan be revised to make more sense, using a better layout. Mr. Schutt said that he would provide that. She said, "I'm not impressed

with this layout and would rather see these lots come all the way back to the edge of this parcel." Mr. Braddell asked her why she wanted them to come all the way back, because they are one acre lots and if they were extended, then the fronts would have to be narrowed. Ms. Salvati answered that there was a portion not accounted for.

Tim Pazda asked, "how does the Board feel about access roads, if this is going to be a public road?" Mr. Schutt asked, "what do you mean by an access road?" Mr. Pazda said, "one driveway that would be shared between all of the tenants. That's what we're striving and begging for on Transit Road. Mr. Schutt said, "this is a lot different than Transit Road, and this is not a retail development." Wendy Salvati said, "you could have commercial development here, and I don't think you can tell me now what's going to happen on all this land." Mr. Schutt said, "no, we can't, but there are certain other restrictions with respect to development. You're not going to get the kind of development that you would under commercially-zoned land." Mr. Schutt asked why the private/public road question was brought up by the Board. Mr. Sgamma said he brought it up for clarification because it's the first they've seen the drawing. The other issue, he said, is traffic control. "We need to do as much thinking now, so that we don't run into problems later." Mr. Schutt said, "that's exactly what we're doing by constructing a road off of County rather than just splitting up frontage, which has happened historically along County Road." Mr. Sgamma said, "the more you can eliminate curb cuts on County Road, obviously it's safer for the tenants and more prosperous for your industrial park." Mr. Schutt said, "and for the Town, as well."

Joyce Bakowski introduced herself and her husband, Steve, as the purchasers of the 7 acre lot on the parcel. She said she understands that her project is contingent upon the approval of this road or some type of access to their property. She said they have been searching for four years for the perfect site in Clarence to start their new business. She said they could have gone many other places, but are very excited to stay in the Clarence area. They already own another business in Clarence, and would love to see the development go through. She said, "We were quite excited that it would be off a side road off of County so that we don't have the issue of making traffic issues on County Road. I'm not aware of what all the parcels are going to be used for, but I speak to four of them, for a total of 10 acres. We would like to ask that you work as expeditiously as you can so we can get in there to start our business. I would hate to see it stalled because we don't know what the other lots are going to be used for. We have a very detailed plan that will be presented at the next Planning Board Meeting, July 6<sup>th</sup>. Please take into consideration that there are many interested parties for the area. My husband has already spoken to National Fuel Gas and we have some information on what they have told us about that."

Steve Bakowski said he has done some research on the pipeline and has found that you can drive over it. He said you just can't build a permanent fixture on the gas line. "You can pave over it, or stone over it. They just need access to it 24/7." He said he was thanked by National Fuel for notifying them, as most people just purchase land and assume they can put something on the pipe line. He said he plans on working hand-in-hand with them on what can be done legally and safely. He added that he did not feel that the Braddell's intent was to add curb cuts up County Road toward Goodrich. He asked the Board to consider wash-out curbs instead of curb cuts, as he felt they were much safer. Wendy Salvati said that when they refer to curb cuts, they are just referring to driveway access. Ms. Salvati said, "I heard you mention that you had purchased the land." Ms. Bakowski replied that they have an intent to purchase.

Pat Powers asked Mr. Schutt and the Braddells for a boundary survey and a more detailed plan, particularly regarding the property to the east of the parcel and fronting on Goodrich Road. She said, "if you want to send the boundary survey to Planning & Zoning, we can look at this again and have you on an upcoming agenda, and we will invite the neighbors." Mr. Van Nest also asked for clarification from National Fuel on the right-of-way issue. Mr. Sgamma added that he felt the project was very promising even though the Board is searching for clarification. Pat Powers said to the applicants, "we don't want you to go away from here thinking that we are opposed to this project. We would welcome this project in this particular place, but we have some details that have to be ironed out before we can move forward."

Action:

Motion made by Wendy Salvati, seconded by Tim Pazda, to table this item for further study.

ALL AYES. MOTION PASSED.

## Item V

## Subdivision Law review.

### Discussion:

Jim Callahan reported that draft #4 has been put together based on public hearing and comments received; based upon our page-by-page review at the Planning Board level; and based upon attorney comments and individual comments from interested citizens, as well as individual Planning and Town Board members.

### Highlights:

- Parks/rec/open space sections are constricted. There were two sections and we've made it one. It's better coordinated with the Master Plan and the zoning law.
- Wording changed related to the public road dedication, as input from the Town Board.
- Setbacks from existing public roads to protect public viewscape. (some wording has been incorporated in)
- Town Board as final approval body for all approvals under the Law.
- General streamlining.
- General definition upgrades, coordinated with the Master Plan and zoning law, and with the proposed Adequate Facilities Law.
- All spelling and grammar issues as previously identified. (We did get comments from Steve Bengart that have been included.)

He added that these are changes from draft #3. It should reflect a lot of the discussion that we've had. Jim Hartz added that a lot of what is included in the Adequate Public Facilities ordinance has to be at least referenced in the Subdivision Law. It could be encapsulated in the Subdivision Law. He said there's an opportunity to get them both done at the same time.

Pat Powers asked how the Planning Board should proceed. Jim Callahan asked the Board to review it and make sure everything is OK, based on their notes. At the next meeting, if there are any major issues, we can talk about them; if not, we can move the project along to the Town Board. They could do

public hearings, as well. We could do another public hearing at this level, depending on what the Board thinks about the draft.

Jim Callahan said that the consultants are recommending that, prior to adopting an Adequate Public Facilities law, you should have some identification in the long range planning that would allow you to pursue it. They have gone through the Master Plan and identified those sections that could potentially be upgraded with the recommended changes. That would put in the overall guiding legislation the ability to move forward with the adoption of an Adequate Facilities Law.

Pat Powers asked if they should be considering the amendments prior to recommending the ordinance. Jim Callahan said that they are recommendations to amend the Master Plan. We are in that process now, and need to look at them to make sure they make sense. It will allow us to move forward with an Adequate Public Facilities Law. It incorporates some of the language into the Master Plan that would allow us to move forward.

Pat Powers said, "then by the time we come back to our next meeting on July 6<sup>th</sup>, we should have reviewed the Facilities Ordinance, as well as the recommended Master Plan amendments. Could we possibly, at that meeting, recommend the Master Plan amendments? Should we make this an agenda item for July 6<sup>th</sup>?" Jim Callahan said yes. Ms. Powers said, "let's be prepared to discuss the Facilities ordinance and the subdivision of land. I'm not saying we'll recommend approval on subdivision that night." Jim Callahan said the focus should be on comparing it to the previous draft, making sure that we have everything in there.

Motion by Phil Sgamma, seconded by Wendy Salvati, to adjourn the meeting at 9:40 p.m.

Patricia Powers, Chairman