

Town of Union Planning Board Minutes
Tuesday, March 9, 2021

A regular meeting of the Town of Union Planning Board was held Tuesday, March 9, 2021, via Zoom Virtual Meeting Software.

Members present: L. Miller, L. Cicciarelli, S. McLain, T. Crowley, S. Forster, M. Jaros, D. Kudgus, K. Rose (Alternate)

Others present: Marina Lane, Sara Zubalsky-Peer, Kassandre Murdock, Erin Hazen, Sarah Campbell, Bill Walsh, John Lupo, Zachary Schrowang, Paul McMenemy, Brendan Boland, Alex Urda

A. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Miller called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m., and then Ms. Lane called the roll of the Planning Board members. Lisa Miller, Len Cicciarelli, Sue McLain, Scott Tom Crowley, Scott Forster, Dave Kudgus and Kirsten Rose (Alternate) were present.

Ms. Miller then read the Recommended Procedure and Executive Order regarding virtual meetings.

Ms. Lane noted that Mark Jaros signed into the meeting at 7:05 p.m.

B. MEETING MINUTES

1. Acceptance of February 9, 2021 Meeting Minutes

- Page 3, first paragraph, fifth sentence to read as follows, “Mr. Wanchisen explained that the gas piped out through the rear of the building passes through a pressure release valve just in case the regulator fails for any reason.”
- Page 3, second paragraph, second and third sentence, change the spelling of the word “enunciator” to “annunciator.”

Chairman Miller asked for a motion to accept the February 9, 2021, Planning Board Minutes, as revised.

Motion Made: M. Jaros
Motion Seconded: L. Cicciarelli
MOTION: Acceptance of the February 9, 2021, Planning Board Minutes, as revised.
VOTE: **In Favor:** L. Miller, L. Cicciarelli, S. McLain, T. Crowley, S. Forster, M. Jaros, D. Kudgus
Opposed: None
Abstained: None
Motion Carried

C. The K-9 District – Dog Daycare, 4324 Watson Boulevard, K. Murdock

1. Public Hearing: Special Permit for Floodplain Development

Chairman Miller opened the Public Hearing for a Special Permit for Floodplain Development at 4324 Watson Boulevard at 7:06 p.m.

Ms. Murdock gave a short presentation about the dog daycare business. She plans to open a dog daycare business at 4324 Watson Boulevard. She and her two partners will provide a fun and safe daycare experience for dogs. The staff will also provide training and bathing at the site. At this time, the site will not provide boarding for dogs, but Ms. Murdock hopes to add this service later.

Ms. Lane noted that Ms. Murdock had run a very successful dog daycare business in Johnson City; but that property was sold, so she is moving the business to 4324 Watson Boulevard.

As no one had further questions, Chairman Miller closed the Public Hearing for a Special Permit for Floodplain Development at 4324 Watson Boulevard at 7:09 p.m.

2. Vote on Special Permit for Floodplain Development

Ms. Lane read her staff report to the Planning Board. Kassandre Murdock submitted an application for a dog daycare business in an existing 1,938 square-foot commercial office/garage building located at 4324 Watson Boulevard. The building is in the 100-year floodplain, and as such, requires a Special Permit for development in a floodplain. The entire property, according to the BC GIS, flooded most recently in September 2011. Base flood elevation at the site is 836-feet above sea level (836' a.s.l.), and current contour maps show the building at 832-feet a.s.l. Ms. Murdock intends to add additional fencing to the existing fenced-in area to the west of the building for an enclosed 2,000 square-foot outdoor recreation area for the dogs.

Per Chapter 121-10.4, the existing project building is permitted in the flood fringe, or that part of the 100-year floodplain that is outside of the floodway. The Planning Board classified the project a Type II Action under SEQRA on February 9, 2021, because the project is the reuse of a commercial building, and the proposed outdoor enclosure is less than 4,000 square-feet.

The Planning Department recommends approval of the Special Permit for a dog daycare facility in the existing 1,938 square-foot building and the outdoor enclosure located within the 100-year floodplain, with the following stipulations:

1. Any chemicals or potentially pollutant or toxic materials shall be stored at least six-feet above ground level, an elevation two feet higher than the base flood elevation, in the event of flooding.
2. Utilities: In the event of any future upgrades to the building and utilities, electrical, heating, ventilation, plumbing and air-conditioning equipment and other service facilities shall be designed and/or located so as to prevent water from entering or accumulating within the components during

flooding. When designed for location below the base flood elevation, a professional engineer or architect's certification is required.

3. No additional fill shall be placed on 4324 Watson Boulevard without applying for a new special permit and a fill permit.

4. No debris/material shall be stockpiled on 4324 Watson Boulevard.

Chairman Miller called for a motion to approve the Special Permit for Floodplain Development at 4324 Watson Boulevard, with stipulations.

Motion Made: S. Forster

Motion Seconded: D. Kudgus

MOTION: Approval of the Special Permit for Floodplain Development at 4324 Watson Boulevard, with stipulations.

VOTE: **In Favor:** L. Miller, L. Cicciarelli, S. McLain, S. Forster, T. Crowley, M. Jaros, D. Kudgus

Opposed: None

Abstained: None

Motion Carried

3. Site Plan Review

Ms. Lane noted that the Planning Board recently approved a vehicle repair business in a Quonset hut located behind the dog daycare building, and both businesses would share the accessible parking space.

Per the staff report, Kassandre Murdock submitted an application for a dog daycare business in an existing, approximately 2,000 square-foot, commercial office/garage building located at 4324 Watson Boulevard. The property is located in a General Commercial zoning district and daycare is a permitted use by right. Ms. Murdock intends to add additional fencing to the existing fenced-in area to the west of the building for an enclosed 2,000 square-foot outdoor recreation area for the dogs. She will provide accessory services with the daycare use, including training, bathing and grooming.

The property is approximately 4.55-acres. The parking requirement for the auto repair business is two per bay, and there are four parking spaces for customers located at the north end of the Quonset hut. The parking requirement for a daycare is one per six enrolled students, and one per employee. K-9 District plans to have a maximum of 24 dogs at any one time, and a maximum of three employees, resulting in a requirement of seven parking spaces. The site plan provides for eight spaces above and beyond those for the vehicle repair business. One accessible space is required for the two businesses together, and there is an existing posted accessible parking space and an access space.

The property has public utilities, water and sewer. Stormwater currently drains northward into the roadside swale system, which eventually drains into the Susquehanna River.

The Planning Board classified the project a Type II Action under SEQRA on February 9, 2021. A stormwater remediation plan was not required because there is no proposed disturbance to the site.

The project is subject to a 239-Review as the property is along County-owned Watson Boulevard, and within 500-feet of State Route 17 / 86. Broome County Planning did not identify any significant countywide impacts, but recommended that the applicant be informed of the risks of placing the project with the Special Flood Hazard Area.

The staff recommendation is to approve the site plan and project with the following stipulations:

1. The kennel and its operation shall not create nuisance conditions for adjoining properties due to noise or odor, in accordance with performance standards contained in the local law of the Town.
2. Other than during walks or outdoor exercise, all animals shall be confined to the property and housed in an enclosed structure in humane conditions (i.e., protected from weather, with clean and sanitary conditions, adequate space, nonporous surfaces, well-vented, etc.)
3. No animals shall be permitted on the premises for care between the hours of 8:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m.
4. No vehicles shall be parked within the 10-foot front setback.
5. The customer parking lot shall be striped according to the plan by June 30, 2021. The required handicapped-accessible parking shall conform to the Building Code of New York State as amended, and shall be maintained with signage displaying the international symbol of accessibility. The access aisle shall be maintained with signage reading, "No Parking Anytime."
6. Dog waste shall be contained in tightly sealed trash bags. No more than six items total may be placed out for trash pick-up for the property.
7. If the applicant wishes to add additional outdoor lighting, the lighting plan shall be submitted to Code Enforcement for their approval prior to installation.
8. If a sign is desired, the applicant shall apply for a sign permit from the Building Official. All temporary signs or portable signs shall be reviewed and approved by the Code Enforcement Office prior to being placed on the property. Signs that blink, rotate, or move are not permitted. Signage shall be at least eight-feet from the front property line.
9. Per NYS law, all commercial buildings must be inspected for fire safety compliance every three years. It is your responsibility to coordinate that inspection by calling the Code Enforcement office at (607) 786-2920 every three years after the issuance of a Certificate of Compliance.
10. If any approved site improvements are not complete prior to the request

for a Certificate of Compliance, the Building Official may issue a Temporary Certificate of Compliance for no more than six months.

11. Site plan approval shall expire after one year unless substantial improvements have been made pursuant to the approved site plan. The applicant may request an extension from the Planning Board.

12. The applicant shall be required to acknowledge all of the above conditions, in writing, prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Compliance. The applicant shall agree to follow the stipulations of approval in strict accordance with the site plan. Changes to the site plan following approval may require a minor site plan review or submittal to the Planning Board, depending on the degree of change per Section 300-63.2. Applicability.

Chairman Miller asked for a motion to approve the Site Plan for the K-9 District Dog Daycare at 4324 Watson Boulevard, with stipulations.

Motion Made: S. Forster

Motion Seconded: S. McLain

MOTION: Approval of the Site Plan for the K-9 District Dog Daycare at 4324 Watson Boulevard, with stipulations.

VOTE: **In Favor:** L. Miller, L. Ciccirelli, S. McLain, T. Crowley, S. Forster, M. Jaros, D. Kudgus

Opposed: None

Abstained: None

Motion Carried

D. Homestead Village Final PUD Development Plan, Bill Walsh, Homestead Village Development Group

1. Site Plan Review

Ms. Sarah Campbell read the first part of the revised staff report.

1. Final Planned Unit Development (PUD) Plan Review:

Homestead Village Development Group, LLC applied for a new Homestead Village Planned Unit Development (PUD) Plan to include an energy storage facility on 14.27-acres of 4311 Watson Boulevard. Oakdale Battery Storage, LLC proposes a 120 MW commercial Battery Energy Storage System, which would connect to the grid at the Oakdale substation across the road on Robinson Hill Road. The purpose of the battery energy storage system is to provide stability to the electrical grid by storing or discharging electricity as needed.

The proposal also corrects a previous oversight that had not included 12 Beech Street in the final 2006 Homestead Village PUD Development Plan.

These changes to the existing Homestead Village PUD Development Plan required the submittal of a new Preliminary PUD Development Plan. All the properties are zoned PUD, and greater than 25% of the land has been dedicated as open space.

Following a public hearing on February 17, 2021, the Town Board issued a Negative Declaration per SEQRA, and approved the Preliminary Homestead Village PUD Development Plan with the following uses: a townhouse residential development, hotel and conference center, a golf course, office use, and the battery storage facility. The final PUD development plan conforms to the preliminary PUD plan.

Ms. Lane read the second and third parts of the staff report.

2. Site Plan Review

- The energy storage system will provide clean energy capacity and ancillary services to the regional electric grid, reducing the need for non-renewable, fossil-fueled energy support during peak demand. This will contribute to New York's goals for clean energy, and enhance the efficiency of the electric grid.
- The facility, as part of the final PUD, will be located in a wooded area with one single-family residence, significantly buffered by trees, approximately 500-feet to the south, a mulch business to the north, the Oakdale substation and woods to the east, and all woods to the west. The Buckeye Pipeline along the west perimeter serves as a 25-foot buffer to the remaining 130+ acres of wooded area on 4311 Watson Boulevard alone, not including the Glen or woods on 4101 Watson Boulevard. The facility will not have a significant impact on the adjacent properties.
- Public utilities are permitted in all zoning districts. The proposed new development exceeds all minimum bulk restrictions required in any zoning district, with the closest front setback being greater than 70-feet (Industrial zoning requires a minimum of 20-feet), and a minimum side setback of 30-feet or greater (Industrial zoning requires 10-feet adjacent to a non-residential use, and 25-feet adjacent to a residential use). There is 310+ feet of wooded area between the facility's south property line and the closest residential line.

Ms. Lane noted that the parcel was going to be 9.66-acres. However, New York State has required that they move the boundaries further away from the battery storage facility as a measure of safety. So nothing else will change except the distance between property lines is going to shift and we will get that as part of the final PUD Plan.

- The facility will not affect water or sanitary sewer utilities; and once constructed, will generate only 3-5 vehicle trips per week.
- The NYS Office of Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation determined the project would not impact any historical or archeological resources. No rare or endangered species of animal or plant have been

identified in this location, per the NYS DEC.

3. Planning Department Recommendation:

The Planning Department recommends approval of the final Homestead Village Planned Unit Development Plan with the following conditions:

1. 12 Beech Street, a dental office, shall be included in the Final Homestead Village PUD Development Plan.
2. Future development in the PUD should use bulk restrictions conforming to zoning districts that permit the proposed use.
3. A minimum of three full-size (24"x36") copies and the PDF version of the final Homestead Village Planned Unit Development Plan shall be submitted to the Planning Department for the Planning Board Chairperson's signature. One signed copy shall be filed in the Town of Union Clerk's Office prior to the issuance of a building permit. One signed copy shall be for the developer.
4. Future amendments to the final development plan can be made by the applicant by submitting a new site plan to the Planning Department. The process for final development plan amendments shall be followed as detailed in § 300-65.9. Revision to PUD Districts.
5. Should the development not proceed in accordance with the approved Final Homestead Village PUD Development Plan within five years of approval, such approval shall be revoked the per § 300-65.11 of the Town Code.
6. The applicant shall be required to acknowledge all of the above conditions, in writing, prior to the signature of the Planning Board Chairperson on the site plan for the final Homestead Village Planned Unit Development Plan.

Mr. Cicciarelli asked Ms. Hazen if there was a chance that the project would be expanded in the future. Ms. Hazen explained that the battery storage facility is designed around the specific interconnection size in megawatts, which are dictated by two or three year studies between GlidePath and the utility. There is no possibility of expanding the battery storage project without starting from square one.

Chairman Miller asked for a motion to approve the Final PUD Development Plan for the Homestead Village PUD, with stipulations.

Motion Made: L. Cicciarelli
Motion Seconded: D. Kudgus
MOTION: Approval of the Final PUD Development Plan for the Homestead Village PUD, with stipulations.
VOTE: **In Favor:** L. Miller, L. Cicciarelli, S. McLain, T. Crowley, S. Forster, M. Jaros, D. Kudgus

Opposed: None
Abstained: None
Motion Carried

E. Lupo’s Outdoor Pavilion, 2710 E. Main Street, J. Lupo

1. Advisory Opinion: Area Variances

Mr. John Lupo gave a short presentation about the project. He had constructed the pavilion fourteen years ago, but it collapsed this winter during the storm in December. The company hired to replace the pavilion advised Mr. Lupo that he should submit the project to Code before they start construction. When Mr. Lupo called Code, he realized that he had never applied for a permit to put up the original pavilion because he was not aware that he needed one. The Code Enforcement Department advised Mr. Lupo that he would need to apply for area variances to construct the new pavilion.

Ms. Lane read her staff report. John Lupo submitted an application to replace an outdoor pavilion that collapsed due to heavy snow at 2710 E. Main Street. The property is located in a General Commercial zoning district and the pavilion is a permitted accessory building to the take-out restaurant. An accessory building requires a minimum side yard setback of 10-feet, and the proposed side setback is 4-feet. In addition, a minimum separation between a principal and accessory building is 8-feet, and the proposed distance is 4-feet. The accessory building should be behind the principal building and the proposed location for pavilion is to the side of the principal building.

Planning Department staff recommends that the Planning Board recommend to the ZBA approval of:

1. a variance of six-feet for a four-foot side setback to the east property sideline,
2. a variance of four feet for a four-foot separation distance between the principal and accessory building, and
3. a variance to permit the accessory building to be to the side of the principal building rather than behind the principal building.

Mr. Lupo proposes to place the pavilion in the same footprint as the previous structure, and there were no negative impacts with the previous structure. In addition, the existing parking takes up the remainder of the lot.

Mr. Cicciarelli asked Mr. Lupo how the pavilion would be constructed. Mr. Lupo answered that the replacement pavilion would be like a carport and there would be no wood in the structure.

Chairman Miller asked for a motion to recommend approval of the following variances:

1. a variance of six-feet for a four-foot side setback to the east property sideline,

2. a variance of four feet for a four-foot separation distance between the principal and accessory building, and
3. a variance to permit the principal building to be to the side of the principal building rather than behind the principal building.

Motion Made: L. Cicciarelli

Motion Seconded: D. Kudgus

MOTION: Approval of the area variances required for the reconstruction of the accessory building at 2710 E. Main Street by the ZBA.

VOTE: **In Favor:** L. Miller, L. Cicciarelli, S. McLain, T. Crowley, S. Forster, M. Jaros, D. Kudgus

Opposed: None

Abstained: None

Motion Carried

F. Solar Generation Projects LLC, 720 Riverside Drive

1. Presentation

Mr. Zachary Schrowang of Solar Generation Projects LLC gave a short presentation about the project to the Planning Board. Mr. Paul McMenemy from Solar Generation also attended the meeting. Mr. Schrowang explained that this is a preliminary meeting to get the Planning Board's input about the project.

Solar Generation's partner is demolishing the Westover Power Plant and remediating the site. After the remediation, the property will be turned over to Solar Generation as a clean site for the installation of a 7.5 megawatts DC / 5.0 megawatts AC community solar project. They are currently working to get the property surveyed. Mr. Schrowang is aware that there is a floodplain issue, and that they will have to adjust the setbacks on the project.

Ms. Lane asked Mr. Schrowang to explain the relevance of the two different figures for AC and DC. Mr. Schrowang answered that DC is the rating of the sum of the solar panel modules. DC electricity has to be converted to AC electricity in order to flow into the grid. The AC rating is the output of the inverters.

Mr. Cicciarelli asked how many houses the electricity would support. Mr. McMenemy answered it would power somewhere around 1500 homes, depending on the size of the households. If the households are mansions in the suburbs the number will be less, but if the households are row houses in the city, the number will be higher. Mr. Forster asked if the power generation was dependent on the sun being out. Mr. McMenemy answered that the arrays only work during the day when it is sunny, on average 4½ hours per day across the entire year. Solar power generation it is not a 24/7 proposition. Mr. Cicciarelli asked if the energy generated would go directly to the grid, or if there would be storage facilities. Mr. McMenemy answered that the energy

will go directly to the grid and that no storage facility is contemplated at this time.

Mr. Cicciarelli asked what the size of the field of panels is. Mr. Schrowang said that the arrays would take up approximately 8-acres. Mr. Cicciarelli then asked Ms. Lane for the size of the existing footprint of the AES Westover Power Plant. Ms. Lane used the GIS System to calculate the area shown on the site plan and she got 21 acres. Mr. Schrowang explained if you put all of the modules together, they would take up 6½ acres, but the entire area proposed for the arrays is closer to 20 acres. Ms. Lane added that the solar arrays shown on the current plan take up most of the footprint of the Westover Plant, but the site plan will change because the arrays have to be set further back from the adjacent residential uses. Essentially, they will lose the arrays along Riverside Drive and the homes in the upper northeast corner.

Mr. Crowley asked about the life expectancy of the project. Mr. Schrowang answered that it is at least 30 to 35 years. Most panels have a guaranteed output of 80 percent anywhere from 25 to 30 years. Mr. Crowley asked if panel disposal is an issue. He learned at a solar class that most of the panels come from China and end up in a landfill, and some landfills will not take the panels. Mr. McMenemy responded that the panels are made of metal and glass and there is nothing toxic in those materials. The company enters into a decommissioning plan that requires they will return the site to pre-existing conditions at the end of the project. It is the company's responsibility, not the Town's, to recycle or decommission the panels. Mr. Forster asked if a single panel that stops working be bypassed or replaced. Mr. Schrowang answered that they have monitoring on site and they would repair the module or replace it.

Ms. Lane asked if they have started to explore how high the panels will have to be to be above base flood elevation. Mr. McMenemy answered that they have just started to explore how high the modules will be, but generally, the arrays are two to three feet off the ground in front and twelve feet off the ground at the top. However, given the issue of the floodplain and whether they have to build a berm or not, the company is in the discovery process on the height of the arrays. They can raise the arrays, but that is lot more steel and more costly, so the company will have to look into all their options. Mr. Forster asked who would be constructing the arrays. Mr. McMenemy replied that they do, as a one-stop shop out of Kingston, New York, that has been in business since 2003. They have built several smaller arrays and now they are moving up to the larger ones. Mr. Forster asked if they will hire any local people, and Mr. McMenemy answered that they will be hiring a few local folks.

Ms. McLain asked how visible the project would be from people's residences or from the street. Mr. Schrowang said they have not done a visual assessment yet. Mr. McMenemy said that typically the company provides screening. They are working on a project in Oneida, NY, and will be planting spruce trees to block the panels from certain angles. He added that there

would be a security fence as well. The company is open to doing some plantings.

Mr. Cicciarelli noted that a new array had just been installed by the Maine Memorial School in Maine, NY, and that would give the Planning Board members an idea of what the project would look like. Ms. Lane asked if they use an anti-glare coating on the panels. Mr. McMenemy answered “Yes.” Mr. Kudgus asked if the arrays make any noise. Mr. Schrowang answered “No.”

Ms. Rose asked several questions. If the panels have a life expectancy of 30 years, give or take five years, how many panels do they anticipate having to replace because of damage or if they stop working? Second, when the power goes directly to the grid, is it sent to wherever it is needed, meaning the power does not necessarily stay in the region? Mr. Schrowang said that since the power will be sent to the NYSEG station, it will stay relatively regional. Residents could benefit directly from the project because community members can subscribe to the community solar project and they would receive a 10 percent discount against their electricity bill. He does not anticipate having to replace any of the panels. They will be monitoring the site, and the likelihood of needing to replace panels is less than one percent during the lifetime of the system. In twenty-five years, the arrays may still be functioning, and the Town can decide if they want to renegotiate the terms or choose another option at that time.

Mr. Cicciarelli asked what provisions they have for maintenance of the site. Mr. Schrowang answered that they would take care of the mowing and snowplowing on the site. The company never uses pesticides on their sites. The company will also provide local monitoring of the site, and they will come out several times a year to inspect the electrical equipment and to make sure that there are no other issues. Ms. Lane asked whether they would have grass or gravel under the arrays. Mr. Schrowang answered that he would prefer grass and the use of goats to trim the grass.

Mr. Forster asked if there would be someone on site throughout the year. Mr. McMenemy answered that they will have a full-time custodian of the facility, someone to do the mowing, and a local inspector to check on any other maintenance issues. There would probably be three local jobs.

Mr. Schrowang thanked the Planning Board for allowing them to give their presentation. He said that they would call the project Cold Solar. Ms. Lane thanked Mr. Schrowang and Mr. McMenemy for being so responsive to the Planning Board’s comments and questions.

G. Other Such Matters as may properly come before the Board

Ms. Lane informed Mr. Alex Urda that the Planning Board had approved the PUD and she will need a new site plan with the revised parcel size before the next Planning Board meeting in April. At the next meeting in April, we will have site plan review for GlidePath with the adjusted 14.27-acre parcel.

Bob Kashou sent in field lighting plans for 1500 Co. Airport Road that Ms. Lane forwarded to the Planning Board members. Ms. Lane stated that the Code does not allow lighting where the foot-candles extend beyond the property line. Mr. Kashou's proposed lighting plan showed that the foot-candles extended beyond his property line and crossed the road onto properties across the street. Ms. Golazeski had asked Mr. Kashou to provide a full light study. Ms. Lane noted that the Planning Board is aware that the Dome collapsed and that it has been a tough year for Mr. Kashou because of COVID. However, Ms. Lane feels that the Planning Board cannot move forward with the lighting plan that Mr. Kashou submitted.

The Planning Board had several comments about the proposal. Mr. Cicciarelli said that he was in agreement with Ms. Lane and he is empathetic with Mr. Kashou because the building collapsed, but the Planning Board has an obligation to the rest of the community. He doesn't think it would be fair to Mr. Kashou's neighbors because the lighting would be too invasive.

Ms. Rose, a former soccer mom, has been to Mr. Kashou's field many times; however, she also agreed that the project is invasive and she hopes that Mr. Kashou will find some responsible way of adding lighting to the property. She said that adding lighting to the field would increase the use of the field and bring more opportunity for travel teams to play tournaments. She added that the property should be used responsibly, and she hopes Mr. Kashou can come back with another plan.

Mr. Forster suggested that Mr. Kashou proposed this lighting system because it is more cost effective, but he also agreed with everyone else that the current plan would be detrimental to Mr. Kashou's neighbors. Mr. Cicciarelli noted that the sports field is a real asset to the community, and he hopes that Mr. Kashou can submit another plan that is responsible to the entire community.

Mr. Forster asked if Mr. Kashou had moved forward for his plan to have chickens.

Ms. Lane answered that Mr. Kashou had chickens already, but he was unaware that a special permit was required to house his chickens at his Dimmock Hill Road property. She explained that it is the Planning Department's practice that when Code cites someone who is unaware that a permit is required for a particular use, the Planning Department gives the person a chance to remedy the situation. Ms. Lane noted that Mr. Kashou applied for the Special Permit immediately after being cited, and paid \$100 for a Special Permit to keep his ten chickens.

Ms. Lane noted that staff is working on some new code that will extend the zoning districts that will allow chickens. Ms. Lane personally has nothing against roosters, but some people do. She gave an example of what the new code regarding chickens may say "that any property larger than half an acre could have a certain number of poultry, that roosters are only allowed in Rural Residential zoning districts and the number of chickens that you have is dependent on your acreage." Ms. Lane noted that there is a growing number of

people in the Town of Union who would like to have chickens. Currently chickens are permitted only in Rural Residential zoning districts.

Ms. Golazeski is also working on a piece of code allowing electric charging stations for vehicles.

H. Adjournment

Chairman Miller asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:12 p.m.

Motion Made:	D. Kudgus
Motion Seconded:	L. Cicciarelli
MOTION:	Adjourning the meeting.
VOTE:	In Favor: L. Miller, L. Cicciarelli, S. McLain, T. Crowley, S. Forster, M. Jaros, D. Kudgus Opposed: None Abstained: None Motion Carried

Next Meeting Date

The next meeting of the Planning Board is tentatively scheduled for Tuesday, April 13, 2021, at 7:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,
Carol Krawczyk