

April 18, 2011

A Special Work meeting of the PLANNING BOARD of the TOWN of CAMBRIA was called to order at 7:00 P.M. by William Amacher, Chairman, for the purpose of discussing and input into the proposed CAMBRIA SHOVEL READY PROJECT. The meeting opened with the PLEDGE to the FLAG.

Members present: William Amacher, Chairman  
Jeffrey Hurtgam, Douglas Mawhiney, John Phillips, Roger Schreader Sr.  
Gerald Kroening, alternate

Also present: Clifford Burch, Building Inspector  
Donald Lane, Deputy Building Inspector  
Gary Billingsley, Attorney  
Randy Roeseler, Wendel Duchscherer, Eng.  
Andrew Reilly, P.E., Wendel Duchscherer, Eng.  
David Britton, P.E., Conestoga-Rovers & Associates, who will be representing the  
Town of Cambria on the Cambria Shovel Ready Project

Mr. Reilly gave to board members a copy of tonight's Agenda and Draft Scoping Document dated April 18, 2011 on the DRAFT GENERIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT for the proposed Niagara County/Cambria Shovel Ready Project.

Concerns of board members:

1. Uses of buildings; this Planned Development area is unique.
2. Parking
3. Ideas of things wanted in the municipality
4. Address driveways
5. No residential uses in this project

Mr. Reilly said nice to have different types of uses within a project. He suggested commercial businesses out front by the road where more noticeable to the public and the back area for industrial facilities. Green space available. Plan for the future.

Mr. Billingsley asked about setback requirements?

Mr. Reilly said it would be up to the town to decide on setback requirements, general guide line rules. Town Board is Lead Agent on this project.

How involved does the Planning Board want to be in the SEQR process?

Next meeting, **May 11<sup>th</sup>**, will be the Scoping meeting and Wendel will make small presentation and accept comments. Wendel will finalize Scoping document and submit to the Town Board prior to next meeting. Planning Board to send representatives, William Amacher and John Phillips, to this meeting.

Counsel said under P.D., Planning Board makes recommendations to the Town Board.

**May 16<sup>th</sup>**, Planning Board meeting to further discuss DGEIS.

**Week of May 23<sup>rd</sup>**, Town Board to issue final Scoping document – Formal DGEIS submittal. Complete document reflecting Planning Board input received to date.

**Week of June 27<sup>th</sup>** – Hold Public Hearing for DGEIS and can combine with Rezoning PH

Applications have been submitted for Rezoning by Mr. Ohol, Mr. Walck and Mr. Wasik.

Planning Board to make conceptual Site Plan.

Per Mr. Reilly, Scoping Document is to make sure everything important within SEQR is covered regarding environmental impacts.

Mr. Reilly said in front area, do not rezone the right-of-way. Need access roads. Need permission from utility companies, two locations.

Front of the site is in the wetlands. Biggest problem with the access roads is the wetland. There are three options for access roads.

Mr. Schreader inquired about access roads in the back of the property.

Counsel said there are no specific setback requirements in the PD Zone and that final approval should include setback

Mr. Reilly stated there could be required parking distance from the road, suggested 50 feet. Buildings should be set back from the road. Specific things to be included. There are certain things allowed in different places. Might need to alter where something is permitted. Would not be permitted unless use a certain amount of space. Could be minimum size. Do not waste the land on small businesses.

Mr. Schreader asked how many buildings are being proposed in this project?

Should maximize what you can get on this size of property, maximize size of building. Perhaps, two buildings in the front. In the back, two very large buildings with large parking lots, two or three users. Small agriculture could be a part of this PUD.

Mr. Phillips asked – what amount of land coverage?

Front side, example, 50 per cent of lot covered – try to maximize site first. Back part, height of the building? Perhaps, up to 60 feet wide and high?

Mr. Mawhiney asked what if a user wants to erect a cell tower?

Mr. Schreader asked about security system?

Front area for berm?

Alternative power? (telecom, solar and wind)

Mr. Reilly said these may be restricted in this location

Referred to DRAFT SCOPING DOCUMENT 4-18-2011

**Impacts on Land** – top soil, land coverage, long-term on multi-phased impacts that can last longer farm land and agriculture

**Impacts on Water** – storm water is a big issue, extension of water line and capacity of sewer systems

**Impacts on Air** - traffic, air quality impacts user, no smoke stacks permitted, industries that could cause dust  
Agriculture – separate category (in accordance with Town’s Comprehensive Plan)

**Socioeconomic Impacts** - positive – impacts of the property, why we are doing this?

**Impacts on Community Facilities** - services such as fire and emergency, police, health care, educational

**Impacts on Historic and Cultural Resources** – SHPO

**Impacts on Aesthetic Resources** – line of sight, building setback from the road. Entire sight line of the area, wooded wetland, rural part of the town.

Lighted entrances, some entrances will be gated. Private road, not for public use

Height of buildings, look at topography of the area.

Ingress and egress, emergencies, volume of traffic, look at intersections

One small piece of property borders on an abandoned right-of-way.

Traffic impact – no sidewalks along Lockport Road, railroad, bike path into Town of Pendleton, snowmobile trail (plans by County), no walking in this area from place to place.

Airport at Niagara Falls

**Impacts on Energy Resources** – National Grid and New York State Gas and Electric provide for gas.  
Improvements in power

**Noise and Odor Impacts** – mostly noise receptors

Residential homes will be restricted.

Emergency generators, decibels permitted

**Impacts on Public Health and Safety** – no contaminants like fertilizer and chemicals; PCB’s in railroad area?

**Impacts on Growth and Character of Community** – character of the community – like use of the site, measured on growth and character. Residential houses in the back. Plans do not call for residential use; agriculture related uses. Town is pretty much strip development. Agriculture related in the back. Alternatives preferred.

Impacts (3 buildings on property or 2 large buildings)

There could be expansions to some of the businesses in the future. Possibility of getting more land for development. Could expand to Campbell Boulevard, sewer extension in the future for back part of subject property, but the back part has a lot of restrictions on.

David Britton will represent the town at the public meeting on May 16<sup>th</sup>.

A motion was made by Mr. Phillips and seconded by Mr. Schreader to adjourn at 8:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Marjorie E. Meahl, Rec. Secy.

Minutes approved: \_\_\_\_\_