

TOWN OF ELMA PLANNING BOARD
1600 Bowen Road, Elma, New York 14059
Phone: 716-652-3260

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING ~ April 17, 2018

The Regular Meeting of the Town of Elma Planning Board, hereinafter referred to as the EPB, was held on Tuesday, April 17, 2018 at 7:00 PM in the Elma Town Hall at 1600 Bowen Road, Elma, New York.

PRESENT:

*Acting Chairman James Millard
Member David Baker
Member Charles Putzbach
Member Thomas Reid
Member Robert Waver*

TOWN REPRESENTATIVES:

*Raymond Balcerzak, Asst. Building Inspector
Phyllis Todoro, Town Attorney
James Wzykiewicz, Town Engineer*

ABSENT:

*Chairman Michael Cirocco
Member Michael Cleary
Member Gregory Merkle*

I. Approval of Regular Meeting Minutes ~ March 20, 2018

Motion made by Robert Waver and second by Thomas Reid to approve the Minutes of the EPB Regular Meeting held on March 20, 2018. Motion Carried.

II. Site Plan Review for 2 single family homes on 5+ acre lots on south side of Finnegan Dr.

Contact: William Tuyn, Forbes Capretto Homes and Carmina Woods Morris, DPC Architecture, Engineering Firm

Mr. William Tuyn introduced himself and explained the revised plan to build 2 single family homes on 2 -5 + acre lots on the south side of Finnegan Dr. Both lots will have improved road across the entire frontage of the property.

Mr. Putzbach asked for clarification on where the 2 lots are located. Mr. Tuyn showed on the map they are on the eastern side of the Finnegan Dr. property.

Mr. Millard asked for clarification on what type of homes they are. Mr. Tuyn stated they are 2 separate single-family homes on 5 + acre lots.

II. Site Plan Review for 2 single family homes on 5+ acre lots on south side of Finnegan Dr. (Cont.)

Mr. Reid stated that his understanding is that the property owner could come today and build 1 home on 1 lot without having to come to the EPB. Then come back next year and build a home on the second lot. He asked Phyllis Todoro, Town Attorney, if this is correct. She stated yes, if they have the proper frontage for the lot. This is because of the 4-split rule.

Mr. Millard commented that they could also be smaller sized lots. Ms. Todoro said yes, as long as they have the proper frontage.

Mr. Reid said the frontage required is 150 feet.

Ms. Todoro asked Mr. Tuyn if he know anything about a “perc test”.

He said they do not have to do a “perc test” because they are not a subdivision and they are 5 acre lots. He stated that the county allows sand filter systems.

Mr. Millard said we are here reviewing this project under sec 100-2 because the lots are greater than 5 acres. This requires the builder to come before the EPB for a recommendation to the Elma Town Board. The Elma Town Board has final approval or disapproval of the project.

Mr. Millard pointed out that the code requires the septic to be 75 ft. from the lot line. He stated that this limits where the septic can go, because the lots are 198ft. the septic would have to go in the middle of the lot. Mr. Tuyn showed a perspective site in the plans where the septic would go.

Mr. Millard restated for the audience that the property owners could get 1 5-acre lot now and a year from now get a second 5-acre lot. We are asked to approve this project more as a timing issue so they can build more quickly. They could also build on a smaller lot and next year ask for another split.

Mr. Millard explained there were a lot of concerns about drainage at the previous meeting. Any action today would require that a drainage district be formed. They would have to go to the Town Board and if there were any issues they would have to be taken care of before the board can take action.

Mr. Reid asked James Wyzkiewicz, Town Engineer his recommendation as to whether the drainage district should include just these 2 lots or the entire property.

James Wyzkiewicz, Town Engineer stated that legally they could only do just these 2 parcels.

Mr. Tuyn stated that they are only going to buy the 2 lots from the current owner at this time.

Mr. Wyzkiewicz also discussed the need for the septic to be 75 ft. from the lot line and discussed that was shown on the plans.

Mr. Millard asked Mr. Tuyn if they had submitted a stamped survey. Mr. Tuyn stated he would submit that.

Mr. Reid stated that he just wanted to go over the possibilities. If the owner has the property 150 feet frontage they would not need EPB approval and could build 1 house per year on the property. With the current proposal they are limiting how many houses can be built to only these 2 homes unless the road is extended to give the rest of the property more frontage. Actual frontage requirements and the requirements for septic are different for smaller lots.

Mr. Reid asked Mr. Tuyn that as far as he is concerned it is just these 2 lots, and the rest of the property is owned by someone else, and it is wetlands that do not have frontage.

Mr. Tuyn stated they are only under contract to buy these 2 lots.

Mr. Millard opened it up to public comment. He asked that only those that did not speak at the February 27, 2018 EPB meeting or anyone with new information for the board to please speak now.

Mr. Mike Osinski of Hessland Ct. spoke saying that there are repercussions of building and draining more water into existing residential areas. This will affect the value of their homes and bring more water, because the water has to run somewhere. He shared photos with the EPB of the area being discussed and photos of flooding in the area including flooding at the culvert at Bullis Rd and Gaylord Ct. This area has the worst flooding and drainage problems in Elma. He wants to make it public that these people will see more water in their yards.

II. Site Plan Review for 2 single family homes on 5+ acre lots on south side of Finnegan Dr. (Cont.)

Mr. Millard stated that the EBP is aware of the flooding issues. He also stated to keep in mind that more than the 2 planned houses could be built on smaller lots without approval, other than a building permit.

Mr. Osinski stated that he does not believe that because of the wetlands on the property.

Mr. Reid pointed out that they could split into more than just 2 lots with 100feet of frontage before getting to the wetlands.

Mr. Osinski stated that this would only be 1 acre at a time over 4 years and this way they would only be impacting 4 acres and not 20.

Mr. Millard said they are only talking about 10 at this time.

Mr. Osinski said the way he read the rules, it was that they can only build on 1-acre lots without EPB approval.

Mr. Millard said this is not true.

Mr. Mike Pachucinski of Gaylord Ct. spoke. He asked what responsibility the EPB has to protect residents in that neighborhood. He asked what the difference is between a minimal and an insignificant increase in water run-off. He stated that the drainage in that area is below standard.

Mr. Millard stated that drainage is 1 thing the EPB is asked to look at in a site plan, another is the size of the lot and to make sure that it fits all the codes. Drainage is a consideration but they also have to consider what else could be on the property.

Mr. Baker asked if the drainage district would have to be through the owners of the property as it exists today.

Mr. Reid said it would be up to the 2 eventual owners of the property.

Mr. Millard stated that this does provide some protection to others in the area because if something makes things worst they will need to correct it on that lot. But this correction will not solve all the drainage issues in the area.

Mr. Pachucinski asked if this would include any construction because this would make the area worse.

Mr. Millard said not necessarily.

James Wyzkiewicz, Town Engineer, discussed surface drainage and how the drainage would change in the area if the current trees are replaced with lawn or concrete. It is his opinion that putting in a lawn would improve the drainage in the area. A drainage district would have to be formed so that if there were problems in the area they could be corrected. He discussed the problem with areas like Hessland Ct is that a drainage district needs to be formed but it would be very expensive, probably at least 1 million dollars, and would have to be paid for by the homeowners in the district. Homeowners in the area can vote themselves out and not be a part of the drainage district but you need at least 50% of the homeowners in the district to agree. The problem is the relatively small number of homeowners that are the more affected. The needed changes can't happen until the situation changes and they can do improvements based on a town wide drainage district. This has been discussed but he does not see it happening in the near future. It is his opinion that building 2 homes here with lawns would help the issue a little. To solve all the current drainage problem in the Hessland Ct area would be a major undertaking and very expensive. The people affected are the only people that can pay for the improvements.

An unidentified resident of Hessland Ct said she understands there is nothing the town can do about the existing problems but asked if there is anything the board can do to prevent building in the area that in her opinion will make the existing problems worse.

Mr. Wyzkiewicz again explained that if the home owners build lawn it will help the issue. They will not be able to build on the other 10 acres of the property because of the wetlands.

Mr. Millard also stated that they can't build on the other 10 acres because there is no road frontage for that property at this time.

II. Site Plan Review for 2 single family homes on 5+ acre lots on south side of Finnegan Dr. (Cont.)

Mr. Reid mentioned that it is the EPB's job to make sure things apply to the town code. We have reason to say no to added road there because of how it would impact people in the area. The EPB has no authority to say no to adding homes if they are ok to code. We are only here to talk about these 2 lots and the town engineer said it would help the issue and he is the expert.

The unidentified resident of Hessland expressed her frustration with being asked to be ok with someone building on swamp land when in her opinion it will affect her property. She does not believe the opinion that this will not affect her property.

Mr. Wzykiewicz gave the example of how putting lawn at the sports field at the school helped the drainage in the area.

Mr. Millard stated that the EPB is not saying that the building won't affect her property but that they are taking into account all the information they have and what the town engineer is saying. They are also considering what the property owners could do if they were not coming before them with this project.

Mr. Osinski questioned the wetlands on lot 2 and whether they can build on these 2 lots if there are wetlands.

Mr. Millard stated that there is plenty of buildable area that is not wetlands.

Mr. Tuyn talked about the process that is required for building on property with wetlands. He also explained there are different type of wetlands on the property. There are differences in how these wetlands are regulated either by the state or by the federal government.

Mr. Millard asked about the location of the house.

Mr. Tuyn showed the location of the houses and stated that most of the land is being left alone.

Mr. Baker asked what distance has to be kept from the wetlands.

Mr. Tuyn said that for the septic system it is 100 feet.

Mr. Baker asked Mr. Wzykiewicz if there was any protection of the water during construction and does the drainage district apply during construction.

Mr. Wzykiewicz said if they are disturbing more than 1 acre they need to get a SWPP. If it is less than 1 acre the code allows for the building inspector to come in and ask for any water running off to be taken care of but it is not a part of the drainage district. This property is MS4 zoned.

Mr. Baker clarified his understanding that there is protection both during construction and after.

Mr. Millard asked if there was either of the perspective home owners in the audience. He asked if they we planning to plant grass.

The new home owners said they want to be a part of the community, they respect the process and yes, they are planning to plant grass.

Mr. Reid asked Phyllis Todoro, Town Attorney and James Wzykiewicz, Town Engineer if there was anything else the EPB can do to provide additional protection to the people "downstream".

Ms. Todoro said they have to form a drainage district.

Mr. Reid asked if there was anything else the EPB can do tonight about this site plan approval to provide additional protection and securities., is there anything that was missed.

Ms. Todoro said no. The homeowners have to correct the existing problem that is there and form a drainage district. The drainage district will be very expensive and will not have many members.

Mr. Reid stated that forming a drainage district with the 2 new lots will provide a level of protection that does not exist now. He asked if there is anything in addition we can do to these 2 lots.

Ms. Todoro said this is correct and no there is nothing additional.

II. Site Plan Review for 2 single family homes on 5+ acre lots on south side of Finnegan Dr. (Cont.)

Mr. Baker asked what the timing was to form the drainage district.

Mr. Millard explained that the EPB is only making a recommendation to the Elma Town Board and that they could make one of the requirements of the recommendation be that a drainage district be formed.

Mr. Osinski asked if it was possible for the town to purchase this property and make it green space.

Mr. Millard stated he would have to go to the town board and ask that.

Mr. Reid explained that the EPB is only a recommending board for this project.

Mr. Millard explained that since the EPB is only making a recommendation that it would be up to the Elma Town Board to complete the SEQR.

Mr. Baker asked for clarification on what the property owners could do on this land.

Mr. Millard said they could ask for a buildable lot of less than 5 acres and get a building permit without having to come to the EPB. Then next year than could ask for a second one.

Mr. Reid commented that there could then be more and smaller lots.

Chairman James Millard entertained a motion to give a recommendation to the Elma Town Board for the approval of this project with the requirement that they provide a stamped survey and that a drainage district be formed for these 2 lots. Motion made by Thomas Reid and seconded by Charles Putzbach. Yes – 3 No – 2. (Mr. Baker & Mr. Waver). Motion Carried.

III. Final site plan review for addition to MOOG Federal Credit Union, 7181 Seneca Street

Don Aubrecht, Ivan Garcia, and Patrick Stewart from -Fontanese, Folts, Aubrecht, Ernst Architects, P. C. and Tim Shevlin – builder

Mr. Garcia went over the plans that includes 2 additions to the current building. One part will be additional office space and the 2nd will be to add 2 new teller lanes and an ATM lane. These additions will add more space and allow the Credit Union to go from 13 employees to 15.

Since the blue color was questioned at the previous EPB meeting Mr. Garcia showed some examples of the building materials that will be used and the color blue that will be used.

Mr. Putzbach asked if this business is a part of MOOG. Mr. Garcia said no that it is a separate business.

Mr. Garcia provided a few items that were requested at the previous review.

The EPB reviewed the checklist for Site Plan Review.

Documentation- an amended business use plan was provided.

SEQR- was provided

A stamped survey was provided.

Lighting- Mr. Millard asked if there would be any new lighting. Mr. Garcia explained the only new lighting will be on the teller lanes under the canopy. It will be down lighting. They are also relocating a couple of light poles in the parking lot and adding 1 more.

III. Final site plan review for addition to MOOG Federal Credit Union, 7181 Seneca Street (Cont.)

Mr. Millard asked if what they are adding will be the same as the existing lighting. Mr. Garcia said yes it will be similar to what is there now, that was added about 3 years ago.

Mr. Baker asked what wattage is under the drive thru lanes, if they are currently on 24 hours a day and if they will be now. Mr. Garcia said they will be the equivalent of 100-watt LED. They are not currently on 24 hours but they will be. A photometric plan provided.

Mr. Baker asked if the lights are recessed in the drive thru. Mr. Garcia confirmed that they are.

Mr. Putzbach asked if there will be any effect on the neighbors to the south. Mr. Garcia said they are putting up a stockade fence.

Parking- The minimum number of spaces required is 33. There will be 52 spots. The length of the spots was increased to 20ft so they lost 1 spot. There are also 10 reserved spaces for the new tellers.

Traffic patterns- the slight change in traffic patterns was shown on the plans. There will not be any new curb cuts. Mr. Baker asked about the width of the ingress & egress and if there will be any markings. It was shown on the plans and will have markings.

Sidewalks- will be 8-9 feet wide

Drainage- Mr. Millard asked that a drainage district be formed for the property. Raymond Balcerzak, Asst. Building Inspector commented that there are some drainage concerns with the neighbor to the south, Kathryn Burger. He asked if they would be digging out the swale. Mr. Garcia explained that by removing the existing teller lane on that side of the property and planting grass. They will be improving the drainage. They will be regrading and directing water to the new retention pond. There will also be a stockade fence between the properties. Mr. Putzbach asked about the changes. Mr. Garcia explained to Ms. Burger how they are improving the drainage.

Signage- there will not be any new signage

Landscaping- A landscaping plan with a value of \$20,000 was provided. Mr. Garcia mentioned they are putting up a stockade fence. Mr. Millard stated that they need a guarantee on the landscaping, that if something dies it will be replaced.

Dumpster- Mr. Baker asked about fencing. Mr. Garcia showed on the plans where the dumpster is located. There will be a fence around the dumpster enclosure. There will also be a fence along the south side property line.

Mr. Waver asked about what other properties are next to this one. There is a business to the north and the MOOG campus borders the east side.

Mr. Baker asked if any changes in the traffic patterns will be closer to the property lines. The traffic on the northside of the property will remain the same.

Fire Hydrants were identified as being 175 to the north and 305 to the south

A letter from the Erie County Health Department about the septic system was provided.

A letter from Springbrook Fire Department was provided.

The EPB reviewed the SEQR. The EPB checked box #2 on the SEQR. James Millard made a motion to approve the SEQR and seconded by Thomas Reid. Yes- 5 No- 0. Motion Carried.

James Millard made a motion to give Final Site Plan approval contingent on the formation of a drainage district, motion seconded by David Baker. Yes – 5 No – 0. Motion Carried.

IV. Preliminary site plan review for construction of a 5,436-sq. ft. chip storage building for MOOG Inc. at 170 Jamison Rd

Contact: Richard Crance- MOOG Inc. & Fontanese, Folts, Aubrecht, Ernst Architects, P. C.

Richard Crance, facilities manager at Moog introduced himself. With him was Patrick Stewart and Dave. Mr. Crance gave some background information on the current project. They have 3 large machine shops and a few smaller ones on the MOOG campus. They generate a lot of chips which are collected and recycled. Their recycler is now requiring that the chips be dry before they can be delivered to them. The new chip storage building will allow the chips to dry for 1-3 days before they are delivered to the recycler.

The building will be just over 5,000 sq. ft. and will be on the NW part of the Jamison Rd campus near the sand volley ball courts. There are 2 fire hydrants nearby, one is 45 ft. away and the other is 121 ft.

Mr. Millard asked how far from the road it will be. It will be 150ft. from Seneca St and 932 ft. from Jamison Rd. You will really have to search to find it if you are just driving by.

It is a pre-engineered building with overhead doors on the East side. Mr. Crance showed where it is located on a map. He also showed the closest building which is an oil storage building. They are avoiding the nearby wetlands. Mr. Millard asked if the building is the same materials as the existing storage building. It is not, this will be a pre-engineered building. The other storage building is a pole building.

They will be tying into the existing sewer treatment plan as well as existing electrical and water lines.

Mr. Baker asked if the chips are from any MOOG building and how do they get them to the storage building. They will be transported from the loading docks of the various buildings, and transported using the roads on the MOOG campus. Each material is keep with like materials. They pick up daily from each building and will be held in the storage building for 1-3 days.

Mr. Crance described the process of the facility to dry the chips for recycling and what the layout of the building will be. It will have 4 overhead doors, a small office and bathroom.

Mr. Baker asked if they have to have inspectors. Mr. Crance said yes if it is government materials but that doesn't happen very often.

Mr. Baker asked which side you would see from Seneca St. It was explained that you won't really see it from the street because there are so many trees around.

Mr. Reid asked about the color of the building. It was stated that they really had not picked a color. Mr. Reid asked that they try to make it the least visible as possible. Mr. Crance agreed to a dark grey color.

Mr. Millard again asked about the screening and how it is not visible from the street.

Mr. Millard asked about any lighting on the building. It will have lighting above the overhead doors and by the "man" door.

Mr. Reid asked if they will be wall packs. Yes, they will be.

Mr. Millard asked for clarification on the buildings location on a map. It was shown that there will be about 600-700 ft. of trees between the building and the street.

Mr. Reid asked what wattage the lights would be. They will be 100-200-watt LED. There will not be any spotlights strobes or neon signs. There will not be any new lighting in the parking lot. They will not be any new employees.

Mr. Millard asked about a stamped survey. Mr. Crance said they would get him one.

Mr. Reid asked about how they are containing any oils. Mr. Crance explained the process saying it is not a lot.

Mr. Millard asked about a letter from the health department. Mr. Crance explained that the permit for waste management covers the whole property. There will be plenty of capacity in the existing facility.

Mr. Millard asked James Wyzykiewicz, Town Engineer if he had any concerns about drainage. He said he did not.

IV. Preliminary site plan review for construction of a 5,436-sq. ft. chip storage building for MOOG Inc. at 170 Jamison Rd. (Cont.)

There will not be any new signage, fences or dumpsters. Landscaping will be the existing trees.

Mr. Baker asked if the material is flammable and if they have to alert the local fire department. Mr. Crance explained that the material is combustible but the quantities are small. They do pay close attention to them however.

The EPB reviewed the SEQR. The EPB checked box #2 on the SEQR. James Millard made a motion to approve the SEQR and seconded by Robert Waver. Yes- 5 No- 0. Motion Carried.

Mr. Reid made a motion to give final site plan approval contingent on the applicant providing a stamped survey and a note that the lights are not to exceed 100 watts. Motion seconded by Charles Putzbach. Yes – 5 No – 0. Motion Carried.

V. Site Plan approval for MS Properties, 6411 Seneca St for 1 50' x 60' building (see March 20th P. B. meeting minutes)

Mr. Mark Subjeck and Mr. Todd Huber were present to re-present this project to the EPB.

Mr. Millard referred to the minutes from the March 20, 2018 EPB meeting for information on the proposed project and what they were asked to return with. This included a change on the plans showing 20 ft. driveway, an increase in the number of parking spaces to 17 and a letter from the local fire company.

A letter from Springbrook Fire Company was provided.

Mr. Huber submitted a stamped survey. He showed the 17 required parking spots and other changes made to the parking lot. He also discussed a change in the lighting plan. Lighting will be 18w LED light fixtures that are down lite and on the Seneca Street side of the building.

Mr. Huber explained some changes made in the swales for drainage and water control. The property owners have filed for an easement on the back of the neighbor's property. Drainage from the parking lot will be directed to 2 swales that run along the back of the 2 properties.

Mr. Millard asked what the easement is for.

Mr. Huber explained that they have 2 different easements. This one is for the right of way for the swale on Zilliox property.

Mr. Millard asked if the swale exist now. Mr. Huber stated that yes it does and the easement allows for the town to come and remove any blockages.

Mr. Millard asked if it is a drainage district. Mr. Huber said it will be part of the drainage district. Phyllis Todoro, Town Attorney, said that it will part of the drainage district.

Raymond Balcerzak, Phyllis Todoro, James Wzykiewicz discussed with Mr. Huber the paperwork that was submitted regarding the easement and drainage district. Mr. Huber will get the needed paperwork and legal descriptions to Ms. Todoro for the drainage district approval.

Mr. Millard asked Phyllis Todoro, town attorney if there was anything that concerned her about the easement for the drainage and driveway. She said no.

Mr. Millard stated that anything the EPB did would require that a drainage district be formed and it sounds like they have that in motion.

Mr. Millard asked if the driveway is 2 feet from the property line or the end of the easement. Mr. Huber said that it is 2 feet from the end of the easement. The top line on the plans is the line of the easement not the property line.

V. Site Plan approval for MS Properties, 6411 Seneca St for 1 50' x 60' building (see March 20th P. B. meeting minutes) (Cont.)

Raymond Balcerzak, Asst. Building Inspector asked for some clarification on where the property line is and what is the easement. Mr. Huber went over the stamped survey showing that 92.5 feet is the property and 10.5 feet is the easement for the total of 103 feet. Mr. Millard made a note on the survey for clarification and initialed the plans. The driveway is 20 ft. wide including the easement and is 2 ft. from the easement line and stops just short of the building.

Raymond Balcerzak, Asst. Building Inspector, had a question regarding the location of the septic system. He stated that on previous submittals of the plan the parking lot would be over the existing septic system. Mr. Huber stated that they had a new stamped survey done, and any previous surveys were incorrect. The new plans only show a blank space for the septic system. Mr. Huber gave his assurance that the parking lot will not be over the septic system.

Raymond Balcerzak, Asst. Building Inspector asked Mr. Huber what the plan is for the telephone pole that is out by the street that will be in the middle of the driveway. Mr. Subject stated that if they cannot move the pole over that they will funnel the new driveway into the existing on.

Mr. Millard asked for clarification on the existing driveway and how it will be blended together. Mr. Huber explained how they will blend the 2 driveways and the new driveway will use the existing curb cut and be 20 ft. wide at all points.

Mr. Balcerzak asked if they will keep it level and taper to the lawn. Mr. Huber stated that they will shed the water to the face. The neighbors already have a problem so they need to get the water away from the house.

Mr. Millard clarified that the driveway will blend in with the existing one and be made wider on one side.

Mr. Millard stated that they have a letter stating the waste system is adequate but they still letter a letter from the Erie County Health Department the Erie County Health.

Mr. Baker asked if the easement would make the neighbor property non- conformant. Mr. Huber said it would not.

Mr. Baker asked about their building use permit. They submitted a business use permit. Mr. Millard explained that since they complied with the required number of parking spaces they do not have to amend their business use permit.

Mr. Baker asked if the driveway will be paved. Mr. Subject said yes it would all be paved.

The EPB reviewed the SEQR and approved it with noted changes made. The EPB checked box #2 on the SEQR. James Millard made a motion to approve the SEQR and seconded by Robert Waver. Yes- 5 No- 0. Motion Carried.

Mr. Baker asked about question 5 and whether the proposed action is consistent with the adopted comprehensive plan. Mr. Reid stated that the is no adopted comprehensive plan.

Mr. Millard made a motion that the EPB give final site plan approval contingent on the formation of a drainage district and receipt of a letter from the Erie County Health Department regarding the septic system. motion seconded by Charles Putzbach. Yes – 4 No –1. Motion Carried.

Mr. Baker voted no and stated that he was opposed to this project because he did not feel that it fits the characteristic of the neighborhood.

Mr. Huber asked to speak to the EPB regarding another of his projects. He wanted to let the EPB know that the Springbrook Hotel apartments had been put out to rent. The code says the garages need to be built before a certificate of occupancy could be issued. He wanted to let the board know that he had met with Town Supervisor and does intent to build the garages in the fall but he would like to come back before the board to discuss moving the location of the garages to the east side of the property. He will follow up with an amended site plan.

VI. Adjourn

Motion to adjourn at 9:26 pm by Mr. Waver, 2nd by Mr. Millard. unanimous consent.

Respectfully Submitted,

*Barbara Blair
Elma Planning Board Secretary*