



**Town of South Bristol**  
6500 Gannett Hill Road ó West  
Naples, New York 14512-9216  
585.374.6341

---

## **Planning Board Meeting Agenda**

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

7:00 p.m.

### **Call to Order**

### **Pledge of Allegiance**

### **Reading of Vision Statement**

*Preserve and protect our safe, clean, naturally beautiful rural and scenic environment with carefully and fairly planned commercial, residential, agricultural and recreational development.*

### **Minutes**

Approval of August 17, 2016 Planning Board Meeting Minutes

### **Old Business**

Proposed amendment §170-94A (3) to extend site plan review to parcels in R-3 districts adjoining Canandaigua Lake

### **Public Hearing**

Site Plan Review:

Application # 2016-05-P

Tax Map # 184.00-1-56.110

Guy Rogers

Pine View Gravel Mine

6500 Route 64

### **New Business**

Review draft proposal to amend town code pertaining to site plan approval

Proposed amendment adding language to §170-9 lot coverage

Discussion of fall meeting schedule

### **Other**

### **Motion to Adjourn**

## **Town of South Bristol Planning Board Meeting Minutes Wednesday, September 21, 2016**

**Present:** Jim Ely  
Ralph Endres  
Ann Jacobs  
Ann Marie Rotter  
Mike Staub  
Bessie Tyrrell  
Mary Ann Bachman  
Sam Seymour

**Absent:** Rodney Terminello

**Guests:** Bill Grove, Architect  
Guy Rogers, Pine View Gravel Mine  
Steve Cowley  
Dan Marshall  
Judy Voss

### **Call to Order**

The meeting of the Town of South Bristol Planning Board was called to order at 7:01 p.m., followed by the Pledge of Allegiance. All board members were present with the exception of Rodney Terminello.

### **Reading of Vision Statement**

Board member, Mike Staub, then read the Comprehensive Plan Vision Statement.

### **Minutes**

Chairperson Ely called for a motion to approve the August 17, 2016 meeting minutes as written. Mike Staub made said motion which was seconded by Ann Jacobs. The motion was unanimously accepted by all board members present.

### **Public Hearing**

#### Site Plan Review:

Application #2016-05-P  
Tax Map #184.00-1-56.110  
Guy Rogers  
Pine View Gravel Mine  
6500 Route 64  
*(Continued from 8/17/16)*

Chairman Ely: I am going to declare the public hearing open. Diane would you be kind enough to read the notice.

Diane Graham:

LEGAL NOTICE, TOWN OF SOUTH BRISTOL, NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that the Town of South Bristol Planning Board will hold a public hearing on the following application:

Application #2016-05-Z Pine View Gravel Mine owned by Guy Rogers located at 6500 Route 64, Tax Map #184.00-1-56.110 is looking for site plan approval per §170-94 of the town code to expand the existing mine within the confines of his property.

SAID HEARING will take place on the 21st day of September, 2016 beginning at 7:00 p.m. at the Town Hall, 6500 Gannett Hill Road, in the Hamlet of Bristol Springs, NY. All interested parties may appear in person or by representative.

Chairman Ely: Thank you Diane. That will, of course, be place in the record?

Diane Graham: Yes.

Chairman Ely: Do we have an affidavit of publication from Messenger?

Diane Graham: Yes.

Chairman Ely: Fine. Thank you.

Now I would like to give the floor to the applicant or more particularly to Bill Grove and ask him if he would be kind enough to summarize for us the application and then perhaps address some of the specific issues that the County Planning Board had brought up.

Bill Grove: Good evening.

Chairman Ely: Excuse me Bill. Please reintroduce yourself just for the record would you?

Bill Grove: I am Bill Grove, Grove Engineering, representing Guy Rogers on the application before you for the expansion of the Pine View Gravel Mine. So Mr. Rogers currently operates a gravel mine consisting of, I think around, 14 acres total in the life of mine and he has proposed to add 3.4 acres of additional area into the life of mine.

We had to do a lot of engineering studies to satisfy the DEC. Mr. Rogers does, as of now, have his DEC permit for the expansion of the mine. So we satisfied all their requirements including SEQR.

What we have to do now is because the existing mine predated the town's current zoning and the requirements of the special use permit, he is required to come in and get site plan approval and ultimately a special use permit to be able to expand his mine into these 3.4 acres. The County Planning Board met. They had three concerns.

The first one, we had to submit an agricultural data statement which we did get signed. I signed it and I believe Diane submitted it to the county. I do not know what happens to it after that. I will be honest. I think their concern is that whatever we are proposing does not impact existing farming operations on

adjoining properties. I think we have done a good job of mitigating any kind storm water runoff to that which is another of the county's points. They wanted to know if we designed this to handle any of the big rain storm events. There is an existing storm water detention basin in the existing life of mine in the center of the plan and another larger pond on the eastern edge that is near the Warner's property. The Warners are the neighboring property that is included in the Agricultural Data Statement. They are in the agricultural district. I believe we adequately addressed the need for storm water detention, erosion, mitigation. DEC has agreed that we have done that sufficiently. The fact is that it is a gravel pit and the water when it hits any of the exposed gravel it tends to soak right in. Guy gets very little runoff that makes it to the upper pond especially. I think we have adequately addressed that.

The other concern was that the county wanted you to consider the useful life of mine and the total extent of development. It was suggested that all reclamation plans are to be provided as part of the record to ensure that the special use permit and site plan approval are based on those details. I talked with Guy Rogers and his intention, at this time, is to reclaim any areas that he is not mining in and that reclamation would consist of restoring it to grassland. Top soiling the areas, seeding and restoring it to native grasses. He has a financial obligation I guess to do that. He had to come up with a bond amount to the DEC that would guarantee that he is going to reclaim all of it. If he doesn't, then they take the money out the bond and they have someone else do it. It is certainly in his interest to make sure he gets all the areas reclaimed. I do not know if it is an annual fee whenever the permit renewals come. He has to pay for any of the lands that are not reclaimed. It is his intention to reclaim as much of the mine as possible. He is currently got some of the areas reclaimed and we've proposed more reclamation on the plan and of course the 3.4 acres of additional area and the 2.5 acres is continuing to be mined would not be reclaimed until he is done with the mining operations there. Other than that there are no future plans on developing any of this property at all. It is just going to be restored to green space.

Chairman Ely: Any questions for Bill? On the reclamation point is there a schedule on when Guy intends to reclaim? I know he has posted the bond from what you just said. Is there a schedule of reclamation?

Bill Grove: They ask if there is a schedule for reclamation. No, not really. Within years? Guy says as long as he is permitted to do so he can keep it un-reclaimed.

Chairman Ely: So long as the bond is current with the DEC.

Bill Grove: Correct. There is an existing bond on the existing life of mine and then he had to post additional bondage for the 3.4 acres. It was a pretty considerable number.

Chairman Ely: The agricultural data statement, which is a relatively new requirement. A notice of this was sent to Mr. Warner? Is that correct Diane?

Diane Graham: Yes.

Chairman Ely: Does Mr. Warner have an active farm?

Judy Voss: Not this year. He did not plant anything, right Steve?

Stephen Cowley: Correct. There is nothing there this year.

Judy Voss: It is too dry.

Chairman Ely: Does this mine back up on an agricultural area?

Steve Cowley: There is a huge gully in between.

Chairman Ely: There is a huge gully in between. Okay. So in point of fact it wouldn't seem likely that there would be any water backed on the adjoining property?

Bill Grove: No. None from storm water or even dust and that sort of thing. We are on the complete opposite end of Guy's property from the agricultural operations. I do not think that will be a concern.

Chairman Ely: Thank you. Okay any other questions?

Ralph Endres: Guy, you have been mining this first piece of property for how long?

Guy Rogers: Maybe about 20 years.

Ralph Endres: Would it be safe to say that, if you lived long enough, it would take you 20 years to complete with the 3.4 acres that you are adding?

Guy Rogers: It depends on how much gravel I sell.

Ralph Endres: I mean realistically this is a long range plan.

Guy Rogers: I would say probably gone within ten.

Ralph Endres: What do you do after you have exhausted all the property? Find a new piece of property?

Guy Rogers: Retire.

Ralph Endres: Okay. Thank you.

Chairman Ely: Any other questions? Okay. Thank you Bill for the moment at least. At this point I should read into the record any reports received from federal, state and county agencies. We have, of course, the report from County Planning Board. I am not going to read it because you have all had copies circulated. As you can see county, in fact, has approved this subject to the reservations that Bill has been addressing in his report to us a few moments ago. Diane we can just put this into the record?

Diane Graham: Yes.

Referrals 138-2016 and 138.1-2016 be retained as Class 2s and returned to the local board with the recommendation of approval with comments:

SEQR per Mr. Griffiths ó DEC Region 8

- Total volume of excavation is approximately 160,000 cubic yards of unconsolidated materials. Is estimated to be mined for 3 years.
- According to the SWPPP runoff from active mining area will be directed to a storm water retention pond located in the southeast corner of the property.

- Mined Land Reclamation Plan has been developed to address re-grading of mining faces, re-installation of stockpile topsoil, seeding and mulching of all areas of soil disturbance.
- If truck traffic will be accessing and exiting parcel via County Road 12, the applicant should reach out to Ontario County Department of Public Works.

Steep Slopes:

- Per D. Graham from the Town of South Bristol ó According to DEC Pine View Gravel Mine has an erosion control plan in place already and does not appear one is required.

According to ONCOR:

- No State or Federal wetlands are present on the property.
- The parcel is not located within the FEMA floodplain.
- The property is located within Agricultural District #9. An Agricultural Data Statement should be submitted by the applicant and reviewed prior to action by the referring board.
- Soil Characteristics
  - Type: Palmyra gravelly loam
  - Slope: 15 to 25 percent
  - Soil permeability: High
  - Erodibility: Medium
- Soil Characteristics
  - Type: Palmyra gravelly loam
  - Slope: 3 to 8 percent
  - Soil permeability: High
  - Erodibility: Medium

Additional comments:

- The referring board is encouraged to look at the proposed storm water infrastructure and its ability to handle larger rain events. Storm water infrastructure should be sized so that no sediment laden water is discharged offsite.
- The referring board is encouraged to understand the useful life of the mine and its total extent of development. It is suggested that all reclamation plans are provided as part of the record to ensure that the Special Use Permit and Site Plan approval are based on those details. The Town is encouraged to work with NYSDEC to understand what level of reclamation has been done to date and to utilize their ability to place conditions on the applicant during the Special Use Permitting Process to ensure updates and/or inspections are provided to the Town.

Chairman Ely: Reading it is pointless when we can just put it into the record, right? So we will dispense with that. I am to read into the record any communications received on the proposal. That will be very easy because we have received no communications on the proposal. Now I will give the floor to any persons in attendance who wish to comment or ask questions of either Bill Grove or Guy Rogers.

Bill Grove: The correspondence you may want to add is the DEC permit dated 9/6/16.

Chairman Ely: Thank you. I think that is pretty lengthy. I think we will note that rather than put it fully in the record. The DEC permit. Thank you. That is a good suggestion.

Okay is there anyone in attendance who wishes to speak to the issue? Alright then I can declare the public hearing closed. Are there any further comments from the planning board? No. Okay. Are we ready to take some action?

First question, Bill you eluded to this. The DEC made a SEQR determination, correct?

Bill Grove: Yes.

Chairman Ely: So that has been resolved, right? They took lead agency status.

Bill Grove: They did. Yes.

Chairman Ely: I know when they contacted me I could not send my consent form fast enough. I think that is resolved. So I do not have to sign any SEQR paperwork because that is already done, correct?

Bill Grove: Correct.

Chairman Ely: The question is are we prepared to grant preliminary and final site plan approval. It is strongly suggested that we may wish to make some findings. In fact, I have some proposed findings handy here if I can just put my hand on it. Let me suggest some of these proposed findings and we can take them one by one or we can vote on them in bulk.

Findings:

1. The proposed project is consistent with the comprehensive plan.
2. The proposed project is consistent with the zoning district in which the project is located.
3. The proposed project will not have an adverse impact on the physical or environmental conditions of the district.
4. The proposed project will not adversely affect the character of the neighborhood.

It might also be noted that there was no one either by written or verbal communication appeared in opposition to the proposal.

Alright, can we agree on those findings?

Board Members: Yes.

All in favor. Aye: 7; Opposed: 0

We have agreed to each finding. Now we come to the \$64,000 question. Are we prepared to grant preliminary and final site plan approval on the application before us involving the Pine View Gravel Mine subject to the zoning board of appeals granting the special use permit which will be next week as I understand it, right? We can grant preliminary and final site plan approval subject to the ZBA granting the required special use permit. I would add only as a caveat that we would urge them to consider as we have done the comments of the County Planning Board.

Mike Staub: Made a motion to approve preliminary and final site plan approval subject to the findings of the zoning board and granting of the special use permit.

Ralph Endres: Seconded the motion.

All in favor. Aye: 7, Opposed: 0

Ely, Endres, Jacobs, Rotter, Staub, Tyrrell, Bachman

### **Old Business**

Proposal to amend section 170-94 A(3) to extend site plan review to parcels in R-3 districts adjoining Canandaigua Lake

Chairman Ely: I understand that the town board acted favorably on that. Dan could you speak to that briefly?

Dan Marshall: We addressed it. It has been sent to Jeff Graff, Esq. for his review. He requested that we let him look at it first prior to organizing a public hearing. I expect certainly to have that information by the October meeting at which time we will schedule a public hearing.

Chairman Ely: Great. Thank you so much Dan. That has to go to county planning, I think, for review. In any event thank you. That is a good update.

### **New Business**

Review draft proposal to amend town code pertaining to site plan approval

Chairman Ely: Okay. Now we come to two other items. We can review the draft proposal to amend the town code. This is a project as you know that I have worked on with Jeff Graff and Kevin Olvany for quite some time. It had been my hope that Kevin could come tonight and share his thoughts and work through this with us. I thought that would be the most efficient way to go about this and I think he could add a lot to our deliberations. He unfortunately could not come tonight. I am quite happy to have some conversations about this if you would like or we can delay it until such time as Kevin can be with us. Those are what amount to the two choices. I know it is a lot to digest and that is why I felt that there are some places with alternative wording that Kevin might be a way to expedite conversation on this subject, but I would defer to your opinions. Ann what do you think?

Ann Marie Rotter: I would like to wait and have Kevin speak with us.

Mike Staub: I agree with Ann.

Bessie Tyrrell: If he thought it was a good idea to begin with...

Chairman Ely: He volunteered. Of course he volunteered until I actually had to pin him down on a date. Are we all agreed to that?

Board Members: Yes.

Ralph Endres: It is always enlightening to listen to him speak anyway.

Chairman Ely: Okay. Very good. I will put that off and then we come to discussion. Yes. Dan?

Dan Marshall: Could I have a draft copy for myself?

Chairman Ely: Of course.

Dan Marshall: I have not seen it yet.

Chairman Ely: Of course. Diane will get that done tomorrow, right?



Diane Graham: Yes.

Proposed amendment adding language to §170-9 lot coverage

Chairman Ely: I have circulated some language for you to consider. Let me give you a little bit of background. This has really been driven by our own code enforcement officer, Phil Sommer. He had been concerned that we have a number of lots on Seneca Point Road which are bisected by public and private roads. While we do have a 20% coverage limitation on lots there is a tendency for people put all of the development on the lake side and then say I am within my coverage requirements because the rest of the lot is empty. I know this has been an acute problem in Gorham and some of the other towns. Phil has suggested that we should address this issue. I have talked to Kevin Olvany about this, in fact, some of the wording that I have before you virtually comes from Kevin. I know because Kevin showed me other towns that have had to address this problem in a similar manner. You can see first the proposed amendment that I prepared based on what Kevin had suggested to me. I was proposing 50% lot coverage on lake side still not to exceed the 20% overall. Phil today suggested slightly different wording. He thought they should have a maximum 40% on lake side and still not exceeding 50% overall.

Bess Tyrrell: You mean 20%.

Chairman Ely: Excuse me. 20% overall. Thank you Bessie. Still not exceed the 20% overall. I have no strong feeling about this. Phil is the one who has to deal with it and enforce it. I am inclined to go with his judgment rather than mine. The 50% frankly came from something Kevin Olvany had shared with me. I am open to your suggestion. We would have to recommend this to the town board, of course, for their consideration, but I am open to discussion.

Mike Staub: I guess the only concern I have is the actual size of the lot. If the 40% would actually accommodate a building, if the lot was small. I guess we could put in some kind of special permit.

Chairman Ely: I suppose they could all go the zoning board of appeals for a variance.

Mike Staub: Because some of those lots are kind of small the way they are broken up.

Ralph Endres: Some of those lots should not have houses on them that already have houses on them. There is nothing we could do about them, but there are a lot of lots down there. There are a lot of properties that could be subdivided. It is incumbent on us to make sure that you can still see the lake from the road because there are a couple of buildings down there in the last year or two that have completely obstructed the view from the road. There is nothing that you can see other than house. I am inclined to go with 40% versus the 50% that Kevin put forth. I think it's restrictive but I think it needs to be restrictive because if you say 50% they will build at 50%. The people that are going to pay for those lots will build as big a house as they possibly can build. If you go up and down the lakeside you can find on any given day in the summer 90% of them are closed up tight. There is nobody living there. There is nobody even using it.

Bessie Tyrrell: I think the 40% is a good idea.

Ralph Endres: That is my feeling.

Mike Staub: I was just concerned over the lot size and as you mention they can go to zoning board.

Chairman Ely: Or if they have a hardship situation.

Ralph Endres: They can always go to the zoning board of appeals for a variance. Am I right?

Chairman Ely: Dan do you want to speak?

Dan Marshall: The thought comes to mind is even 40% which I would agree with that number but I would think that maybe there is a possibility that there are some lots that even if you have 40% occupied by the building there is no room for the septic system.

Chairman Ely: Which means they couldn't get a permit.

Dan Marshall: There are probably lots down there along the lake that should not be subject to building. I do not know how the town could say that to somebody who owns land on top. I am sure that would be actionable. There are pieces of land down there that probably should not be built on.

Dan Marshall: I do not know whether or not if you are going to have an either or situation if you say 40% but then they cannot build on the lot or they cannot put a septic system in. If I am not mistaken, they do not have the option any more of holding tanks along the lake. I believe that is true with the exception of Woodville, I think. I just did not know whether you would find yourselves in a conundrum because of opposing requirements let's say.

Ralph Endres: I think one of the things when you take into consideration of 40% or 50% it is not just the house, it is also the driveway, the tennis courts, the patios. That all becomes a function of that 40%.

Dan Marshall: If it is written that way.

Ralph Endres: I think it is.

Chairman Ely: It is. Yes.

Ralph Endres: If you go down Seneca Point Road, there is one house that there is pavement that has just been built in the last two years between tennis courts, driveways and parking areas they do not need to spend a lot of money to have people come and mow lawns.

Chairman Ely: I know exactly what you are speaking of. This was part of the reason that we pushed to redefine coverage. This is basically an extension of that. This is a problem that Phil has highlighted and Kevin came up with proposed wording. The 40% is fine with me. That is what Phil would prefer. I think that there are some real issues down there. Some of those houses not only blocked views substantially of the lake but they have virtually covered the entire lot between the tennis court, the driveway and the house there is hardly any grass.

Ralph Endres: Then the patio in the front.

Chairman Ely: Then the patio in the front. Let's not forget. So the fact of the matter is that seems to me is not the way the town ought to be going down there.

Ann Marie Rotter: Some own on both sides of the road so it needs to be clearly defined.

Chairman Ely: It needs to be clearly defined exactly.

Sam Seymour: To address your point on the septic systems all these people are going across or under the road too. Septic system on the opposite side of the road. What about Granger, Long Point, and Hicks Point. Those places where there are driveways, common driveways that run through to multiple houses with their divided property so will this apply to just the town roads or will this apply to

Chairman Ely: No. Public or private roads.

Sam Seymour: Public or private roads?

Chairman Ely: Public or private roads.

Sam Seymour: Private driveí as well.

Chairman Ely: Good point Sam. It is public or private roads.

Ralph Endres: The two that are going up on the one lot that we just approved within the last month or month and a half. They got 3.3 acres to 3.4 acres. It is not a problem with that particular but it can be a problem if you are only dealing with 40,000 square feet lot.

Sam Seymour: Yes, or if they decide to put a tennis court in.

Ralph Endres: That puts them probably over. If you put a tennis court in all you are doing is pushing more water into the lake really. The more paved portion you got the more it is going into the lake.

Chairman Ely: What we are trying to do is cut back on that.

Ralph Endres: Absolutely. Absolutely.

Chairman Ely: Apropos of not the immediate issue, but I do want to echo something that Ralph said. I walk down there pretty regularly and I am amazed even in high season how many of those houses are empty. I see boats there that I bet have not been off their hoists once all summer. It is really extraordinary. Anyway I did not mean to get on my soapbox. People can do what they want with their own property.

Ralph Endres: You are right. Just getting off the subject a little bit. We had a guy come in here that did a survey of boats on the lake and said a lake this size should not have more than 10,000 boats using slips that are on the lake. I listened to his whole presentation and then I told him other than 4<sup>th</sup> of July, Memorial Day, and Labor Day I can go out from Bristol Harbour and sit in the middle of the lake if it is a sunny day I can tell how many boats pretty much on the whole lake because I can see from one end to the other you can see the reflection off the windshields of the boats. Most days Monday through Thursdays you can count on both hands the number of boats you see. I was out today and I counted eleven boats and I went all the way to the north end and almost all the way to the south end. The fact is these houses that they built there was a time in 2008 when the economy fell apart that those houses were being used more. I suspect they were vacations closer to home, but now it is back to where it was when I first came here. They have the biggest houses and nobody there. Then you will go some places where there is a one piece of property that comes down off the side of the hill and you will have three or four tents and you will have fifty people there having a great time. They are there Friday, Saturday, and Sunday with no investment.

Chairman Ely: Well okay.

Bill Grove: Kevin Olvany suggested 50%. Do you know any about any other townships that are in the watershed?

Chairman Ely: That is a very good question. He suggested 50%. I did not ask him to review what other townships were doing. So I do not know that. He gave me some different word formulas and 50% is what we had come up. So that is a good question. I cannot give you a direct answer. I do not know. I know that Phil thought that 40% made more sense.

Bill Grove: Okay.

Chairman Ely: Okay. Are we ready to vote on this?

Board Members: Yes. As amended to 40%?

Chairman: As amended to 40%, yes. Okay, do I have a motion to recommend this to the town board?

Sam Seymour: Question for you. So which language are we voting on?

Chairman Ely: We are voting on the South Bristol Planning Board September 13, 2016. We striking 50% and putting in 40%.

Ralph Endres: And leaving 20%.

Chairman Ely: And leaving 20. 20 is the basic rule. Unless we are going to open up a whole can of worms. Do we have a motion? Mike you made a motion I think.

Amend the town code §170-9 Lot Coverage to add "No lakefront lot or parcel bisected by a public or private road shall exceed 40% lot coverage on the lakeside portion of the lot or parcel, and shall not exceed the 20% allowable lot coverage for the entire lot or parcel."

Mike Staub: Yes.

Chairman Ely: Do I have a second?

Bessie Tyrrell: I will second it.

Chairman Ely: All in favor. Aye 7. Alright. Thank you. I will forward this officially to Dan.

Dan Marshall: May I suggest that the board send what you've just done to Jeff Graff, Esq. Perhaps Jeff can look at 170-94 A(3) which is already in his hands and that.

Chairman Ely: Sure. Good idea. We will get that off. I can tell him that it is your suggestion right so I won't be jumping out of the que here. I would be happy to do that. We will do that tomorrow or the next day Diane.

#### Discussion of Fall Meeting Schedule

Chairman Ely: Discussion of the fall meeting schedule - I am reminded of the old joke in academics life that the principal thing a committee does is discuss when it is going to meet next. I circulated a memo to all of you about meeting complications and I tried to make a number of suggestions bearing in mind a

couple of things. I will be away, in fact I will be out of the country actually, on the day of our October scheduled meeting. We could meet and I made some suggestions for other times in October or you can meet without me. I am not essential. I can see if I could draft some kindly person to take the chair of the October meeting as scheduled. So I put these various options on the table for you. We can have some discussion.

Ralph Endres: Do we have anything that we think is coming up like a public hearing or anything for the October meeting? Public hearing is something that would be in the hopper right now. I know of nothing.

Chairman Ely: At this point I know of nothing.

Ralph Endres: I also thought that part of your thing is if we changed the October meeting to the first of November or first week in November then we could do the December early also.

Chairman Ely: We could yes. That is one of my proposals wasn't it?

Ralph Endres: That works decently for me.

Chairman Ely: Okay. I would like you to be here as much as possible. We have traditionally sort of combined November and December. That tends to be such a confusing time and usually the board's business is not that pressing. Even the meeting with Kevin is hopefully designed for next year's building season. It is not pressing right now. Shall we consider that then going to December?

Ralph Endres: If you want to do one in October put it in October later in October and then early December. That will take care of the November meeting.

Chairman Ely: We could do that. Do you have my proposal handy there?

Bessie Tyrrell: I do.

Chairman Ely: Thank you Bessie. I got it here but I have so many papers I am shuffling. Okay. I will be here the 21<sup>st</sup> of December and that, of course, is fairly close to Christmas and you are going to be gone anyway. We could meet November 7 or 9.

Bessie Tyrrell: On November 9 Ann and I would be at one of our meetings on comprehensive plan.

Chairman Ely: I do not want to interfere with that. We could meet November 7 and we wouldn't have to meet necessarily then in October at all.

Ralph Endres: That works and then do one in early December?

Chairman Ely: Then we could see what my schedule is in December. We could cancel October and plan to meet November 7. We wouldn't need to meet near Thanksgiving?

Bessie Tyrrell: How about November 2<sup>nd</sup> which is a Wednesday?

Ann Marie Rotter: November 2 does that work?

Chairman Ely: I am going to be out of the town.

Bessie Tyrrell: Okay.

Chairman Ely: On the 2<sup>nd</sup>. I am sorry. Again this does not have to dictate what we do.

Bessie Tyrrell: We like you.

Ralph Endres: November 7 works for me.

Chairman Ely: Does the 7<sup>th</sup> work? I could see then if I give Kevin enough advance notice we could lock him up.

Bessie Tyrrell: That is Monday.

Chairman Ely: That would be a Monday. Yes. Wednesday is out because it is the 9<sup>th</sup>. Shall we go with that?

MaryAnn Bachman: So it would be December?

Chairman Ely: We haven't gotten to December. I will have to get back to you on December.

Ann Jacobs: Is it necessary that we meet in December?

Chairman Ely: Not necessary.

Ann Jacobs: Could we hold the November meeting and forego December because of the holidays?

Chairman Ely: We can forego the December meeting and just meet November 7.

Ann Jacobs: Right.

Chairman Ely: I know of no other business pressing.

Ralph Endres: If something should come up then we will do it.

Chairman Ely: If something comes up, we will deal with it, right? We have nothing pressing.

Ann Marie Rotter: So we will not have an October meeting or December meeting?

Chairman Ely: We will not have an October meeting or December meeting. We will meet November 7. That is the Monday. Monday okay. Is that agreeable? Does that work?

All in favor. Aye 7; Opposed 0

**Other**

Mike Staub: I have one thing for reference or education the young gentleman, Liam Holtz came down by my place. He is trying as an Eagle Project to do a memorial. I do not know if everybody has heard about it or not. Dan wrote a letter about it. Okay. If everybody is aware of it then that is good enough for me.

**Motion to Adjourn**

Being no further business, Mike Staub made a motion to adjourn the meeting and it was seconded by Ann Jacobs. The motion was unanimously accepted and meeting was adjourned at 7:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane Scholtz Graham  
Board Secretary