

MINUTES OF A MEETING AS HELD BY THE
TOWN OF AURORA PLANNING & CONSERVATION BOARD

December 2, 2015

Members Present: Donald Owens, Chairman
Timothy Bailey
Douglas Crow
David Librock
Norm Merriman
William Voss

Alternate Member: Jerry Thompson

Absent/ Excused: Laurie Kutina
Richard Glover

Also Present: Greg Keyser, GHD
William Kramer, Assistant Building Inspector
Chuck Snyder, Town Councilman
Jeff Harris, Town Councilman (arrived at 7:15pm)
50 Members of the Public

Chairman Don Owens presided over the meeting which began at 7:00 p.m. at the Town Hall, 300 Gleed Avenue, East Aurora, New York. William Voss led the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

Don Owens asked Planning Board members to introduce themselves to the public. He noted that the Planning Board members are volunteers that are appointed by the Town Board for a term of 7 years.

Norm Merriman made a motion to accept the minutes of the November 4, 2015. The motion was seconded by David Librock. Motion carried.

At 7:05pm, Don Owens opened the floor to the public meeting regarding Aurora Mills Cluster Subdivision on Mill Rd. He discussed the procedure for addressing the Board. Letters received regarding this proposal will be included in an appendix to the written meeting minutes.

Gerard Green, North Willow St. He indicated that he is a long time real estate broker who has brought the parties together. Professionally, he feels this project is needed in the community. He worked the Polo Grounds for a few years and noted that many people wanted to stay in the

Village of East Aurora/Town of Aurora and don't have the options to do so here, but have to move to Orchard Park and elsewhere. He discussed people who want homes with easier maintenance. He believes this is a benefit to the whole community.

Brian Luca, formerly of Mill Rd. Expressed concerns this development and that it violates the integrity of what Mill Rd is and what the Land Conservancy has been working on. He indicated that more development is not needed there.

Wilson Curry, Sweet Rd. He stated that people who want to live in a development like this should move to Orchard Park, West Seneca, or Amherst. This project doesn't belong in East Aurora because this community is one of the most unique in Western New York. He further mentioned that if this type of development is allowed in East Aurora, it will have an effect and impact on what we've come to be proud of as residents of East Aurora.

Joanne Duerr, Mill Rd. She indicated that she lives at the corner of Mill and Blakeley Roads. The road is crumbling at that corner and Erie County Highway was just out patching it. She discussed a conversation with a Highway employee that Mill Road was not intended for the traffic that is on the road now. There are now tractor-trailers and school busses. There have been so many houses built on Mill Road since she has lived there, and what have those houses done for the road.

Elaine McClory, Mill Rd. She indicated she has lives at the far end of Mill Rd. She stated that people live in East Aurora because of its charming village, beautiful countryside, a top-rated school, and easy access to Buffalo. Allowing mass development will destroy the very nature of our desirable area. She further mentioned concerns including: increase congestion to the west end of Main St; negative impact on traffic from Mill Rd to the circle; increase congestion to the only supermarket; possible overcrowding of schools due to increase in students; costly installation of public water and sewers; nighttime light pollution; and decreasing existing property values as housing supply increases.

Mary Ellen Flynn, Mill Rd. She stated she is not against development. There have been many single family homes built since she has lived there. A major concern is traffic and a traffic study must be conducted on Mill Rd, Mill & Beech Roads, especially at Mill Rd and 20A. This is critical and will be a long term problem if traffic is not addressed with the inclusion of 89 homes on Mill Rd. This almost triples the traffic between Beech Rd and 20A. She further questioned the last time the Town Code was updated or reviewed for this type of development. This needs to be addressed by the Town, Planning, and Zoning Boards for East Aurora to remain East Aurora. There needs to be responsible development to maintain the character of our town.

Peter Pfaff, Fairlawn Dr. He stated that this development is an obvious case that should be turned down. The traffic at Mill Rd and 20A is already bad and it will be a disaster if this development is approved. He asked the Planning Board to turn the project down.

Craig Thrasher, Mill Rd. He stated he is neither for nor against the project. The development adds more taxable property, but needs to be done responsibly. His concerns include: greenspace protection and landscape to include semi-mature trees; potential runoff, to be addressed in SEQR; emergency vehicle access and working space; life safety and potentially install residential sprinklers; truss construction and engineered building materials within these structures; access at Mill Road and 20A, both the angle of access at 20A and the slope of Mill Rd.

Bill Voss asked if the Fire Department will be involved in the review process.

Mr. Thrasher indicated that the Department is included in the ODA review as far as the Building Department involves them.

Bill Voss questioned the capability and process for snow removal in this development. In the event of a major snow event and concern for emergency vehicle access, he asked if a plan could be required to be stated in the HOA bylaws.

Mr. Thrasher stated that the development must have a long standing snow farming plan.

Bill Kramer indicated that the Planning Board could request this plan be a part of the approval process. Enforcing it when there is a 7' snow is another situation.

Bill Voss stated that people who move in there would know they have to take care of that and that is a potential expense.

Mr. Thrasher asked if the Planning Board could request a meeting between the Fire Department and the developer to address these concerns, before they start work on the actual dimensions.

Dave Librock asked if the Fire Department reviewed the Polo Grounds project.

Mr. Thrasher stated they had a review process on Reed Hill and Polo Grounds but they found nothing significant.

Cheryl Pfaff, Fairlawn Dr. She expressed concern about traffic at Mill Rd and 20A. This will not help the situation. She is concerned about the capacity of the sewer system.

Matt Bindig, Center St. He recounted a story told in his college economics class about a small town in upstate NY that fought to keep Walmart from coming in. He felt a sense of pride when his professor talked about his hometown and what it meant to be from East Aurora and to resist that sprawl that defines so much of the other suburbs in Western NY. He further stated that a house farm like this is a representation of that sprawl and it is a slippery slope down that path. The character of this community has always been one that is decidedly different.

Matt Smyczynski, 90 Girdle Rd. He stated he grew up in the village and recently moved back and bought a home in the town because of the rural character. He further stated this development would be completely irresponsible and would tear the fabric of what the town stands for. East Aurora is a unique place in Western NY and people want to move here for it. And we have to maintain the quaint village atmosphere and rural character of the town.

Valerie Davis, Mill Rd. She lives across the street from the proposed development. She agreed with the traffic concerns. She also mentioned concerns including: light and noise pollution and construction disturbances for the next five years; wildlife disruption such as deer, rats, raccoons, coyote will be pushed someplace else in the town and possibly the village; pollution of Cazenovia Creek due to lawn chemicals; traffic study doesn't accurately depict actual conditions on Mill Rd; condominium status, which means that they will pay less taxes, and that single family homeowners will be picking up the slack for covering the costs of services they will use (fire, police, public roads). She further stated that she is not opposed to development, but this 89 unit cluster subdivision is wrong for the Town of Aurora.

Rosemary King, Mill Rd. She stated she will look at 40 houses from her backyard. She mentioned the Condos and apartment complexes on Mill Road and questioned why all the multiple dwellings are on this side of town. It is absurd to put 89 homes on this property and traffic at Mill and 20A is already difficult and atrocious.

Paul Kloc, Mill Rd. He stated he is not against development. It is a necessary part of life, a town's growth and it helps the tax base. But it needs to be done smartly and in keeping with the character of the town and village. He reiterated concerns regarding safety, traffic, light pollution, runoff into Cazenovia Creek, greenspace, and encroachment on Cazenovia Creek. He questioned if this development is something the town truly wants and is it in keeping with the character of the town. He expressed further concerns regarding Mill Road. He stated that Mill Road is not engineered properly and he often finds cars overturned in the ditch in front of his house. He discussed the statements that this development will be for retirement age people looking to downsize and that there won't be any kids or busses and that there will be fewer cars. He stated that most households have two cars and that seniors these days are incredibly active and there will be a lot of traffic. He expressed concern about the possibility of snowbirds and the opportunity for vandalism and theft in the development and the necessity for increasing police presence there.

Chuck Snyder, Snyder Rd and Town Board member. He read the Mill Road accident report from the East Aurora Police Department. From March 2003 to October 2015 there were 31 deer related, 8 weather related, 91 other. Averaging about 10.4/year. He stated that several of the other were probably weather related, just not documented in a way that could be ascertained from complaint cards. He further indicated that some accidents may have occurred outside the Blakely Rd-20A area of Mill Road, but that documentation of an accident doesn't always include an address. He agreed that an independent traffic study be conducted.

Marilyn Scattoreggio, Prospect Ave. She stated she retired here two years ago because this area reminds her of the town she grew up in on Long Island. She further mentioned that her hometown no longer looks like East Aurora because of this kind of development. Over the past 50 years, Long Island has experienced unfettered, high density development to the point where there is no country between towns anymore. This type of high density and sprawl is seen in other communities here like Cheektowaga and Amherst. She would like to see an environmental impact study. She also stated concerns about high density development, traffic, sewer capacity, tax impact, and change that is not beneficial to the town as a whole.

Ellen Neumaier, Mill Rd. She discussed the charm of East Aurora and its greenspace. She expressed concerns about traffic and especially the slope of Mill towards 20A. It is no longer safe to walk up and down Mill Rd.

Greg George, Mill Rd. He owns the house at the 20A and Mill Rd intersection. Mill Road traffic is already at a saturation point. He asked if East Aurora is so impoverished to spend dollars to get quarters in taxes. The math doesn't work and nobody wins in this situation.

Brian Luca, formerly of Mill Rd. Asked the board if there are any responses to what the residents said.

Don Owens stated that the Planning Board will have a discussion with the applicant and about the public comments and will make a recommendation at a later meeting.

Don Owens closed the public information meeting at 7:54pm and indicated that the meeting would resume after a short break. He reconvened the meeting at 8pm.

Aurora Mills Cluster Subdivision. Gary Eckis, Pat Bittar, and Amy Drake of SRF Associates Traffic Consultants appeared as agents for the applicant.

Gary Eckis introduced Amy Drake from SRF Associates Traffic Consultants who has worked on the preliminary traffic study. He also reintroduced Pat Bittar and discussed how the design has changed since the last time the project appeared before the Planning Board. The Town Board had requested all private roads, preserving the greenspace and view as much as possible and they have tried to accommodate all the requests.

Don Owens mentioned that when the project first came to the Planning Board it didn't look like the current layout and he noted major modifications have occurred.

Ms. Bittar stated that much of what was said tonight has been heard in the past. One of the biggest concerns is traffic and Ms. Drake modified the letter assessment to only include patio homes. She then asked Ms. Drake to discuss the results.

Ms. Drake discussed the study. She stated that there are State and County DOT guidelines that determine how and when a traffic study is conducted. Generally a traffic study is required when a development is going to generate more than 100 trips during the peak hour, which is usually in the morning or evening commute time period. She prepared this traffic study which indicates the development will generate significantly less than that. Trip generation uses a national resource that is produced by the Institute of Transportation Engineers. It is used by nearly every traffic consultant in the country, State and County DOTs. They compile a database of trip generation information by going to sites and counting the traffic and determine how much traffic a site generates. They can then determine how much traffic a new development will have based on this information. There isn't a patio home category yet, as this is a fairly new style of development. She stated that her company has counted the traffic and determined their own trip generation numbers for other patio home developments in Hamburg, Villas at Brierwood and Stonebridge patio homes. Using this information and 89 patio homes, the morning peak hour will result in 8 vehicles entering and 21 vehicles exiting.

Jerry Thompson asked about logic behind these numbers.

Ms. Drake stated that because these are older, retired residents, they don't travel during the peak hours. They can avoid it by working from home, going in later to the office or other activities. She indicated they have seen this pattern in similar developments.

Bill Voss stated that the Hamburg development is not completely occupied.

Ms. Drake stated that they based their calculations on the units that are occupied.

Jerry Thompson asked what kind of traffic study would be conducted requested for Mill Road.

Ms. Drake stated that a traffic impact study for a development like this would not be required, since it doesn't generate that much traffic. But if one was to be done, actual counts during peak hours would be conducted during am and pm. A two hour period is counted (7-9am and 4-6pm) and the one hour peak is determined. Then they would look at multiple points including: the driveway intersection; retail centers; population centers; employment centers; how traffic exits the development.

Mr. Eckis asked how the County and DOT determines threshold for traffic studies.

Ms. Drake stated that in the SEQR regulations a study is triggered at 100 trips. She outlined an example of a Walmart development where there are 500 trips/hr generated both entering and exiting. This development would trigger a traffic study and every intersection that 100 trips/hr are added to or if the intersection has a signal they should also be studied. Or if there is a concern from the Town, it should be studied, for a development of that magnitude. With this

development, she stated she understands the concerns at Mill Road and 20A. She discussed the recent mill and regrade done by the DOT when the circle was reconstructed.

Jerry Thompson stated that the DOT also widened the intersection and added a left turning lane.

Bill Voss stated that as someone who uses that intersection was that it wasn't done well. He further asked about the study that was done in 2010. First many houses have been built since then. And second, it was conducted on .9 miles north of Sweet Road, which is considerably before the apartments on Mill Road. This doesn't take into consideration any traffic heading north from the apartments. He stated he understands you aren't required to have complete traffic study because there won't be 100 trips/hr. However it is well known that there is an existing problem.

Ms. Drake stated that she spoke with the DOT earlier and that the Mill Road and 20A intersection is not on their radar as a problem intersection.

Doug Crow mentioned that because of the speed limit in that location, there are accidents but they aren't high speed accidents. The DOT is really concerned with high speed accidents.

Ms. Drake stated that the DOT is also looking for types of accidents that they can correct. So if there isn't the same type of accidents occurring, there isn't something the DOT can focus on and fix. A light would probably help, but there are rules for when a light can be installed. Jerry Thompson discussed an email from a contact at the DOT regarding the impact of an increase in traffic at Mill Road and 20A. The email further stated that the developer may need to complete a traffic study and confirmed that there are no DOT plans for the intersection.

Ms. Bittar stated that they have not done SEQR yet, so they haven't solicited outside agency approvals yet. She further mentioned that they are not avoiding this, but haven't come to this step yet.

Jerry Thompson stated his disagreement with the traffic study conducted so far and wants to see a more in depth study in the appropriate location, as well as the affected intersections.

Ms. Drake stated that the point of her study was to show how much traffic this development would add. And for 89 patio homes, during the morning peak hour, there are 8 entering and 21 exiting trips and at evening peak hour 19 entering and 19 exiting trips. She further indicated that if this was a development of single family homes, the number of trips would be three times this number.

Jerry Thompson asked why a single family home generates more traffic.

Ms. Drake stated that with single family homes, there would be kids and teenagers, school bus traffic and parents leaving for work. It is a different traffic pattern.

Ms. Drake discussed the 2010 traffic count and mentioned that when they conduct a traffic study, they do not use numbers that are over three years old. If they do not have appropriate numbers, they would go count traffic. In 2010, there were about 2200 vehicles/day on Mill Road. It is a county road and a collector road that connects points, and yes there are homes that directly front the road. A collector road should be carrying up to 3000 vehicles/day.

Bill Voss stated he disputes this number, because the study was conducted south of the apartments. This number would be significantly higher near the apartments.

Ms. Drake agreed and said that Mill Road is not a residential road with a few houses and 300 vehicles a day. It is a county road connecting to West Falls. It collects traffic from the south, from Colden, not just residences. She further mentioned that Erie County could be asked to look at the road, since it is a county highway. There are things that can be done to encourage drivers to slow down.

Mr. Eckis stated that during the agency review, these concerns would be addressed.

Don Owens stated that the Planning Board would like to make a recommendation at the January meeting. There could be an additional meeting in December, if the Board would like more time to discuss the project.

Jerry Thompson discussed the project and mentioned that conceptually it meets code. There are areas of concern such as traffic and environmental impacts, etc that will be addressed in SEQR, but this phase is conceptual and it seems fine from a zoning standpoint.

Bill Voss stated that the character of the Town that should be considered. He expressed concern that the process is steamrolling ahead pushing off decisions on character or traffic impact to down the road.

Jerry Thompson stated that this is a concept plan. He further discussed that if the Planning Board suggested to the Town Board that conceptually this plan is seems to meet all the requirements, then the process moves on to the other steps involved. The Planning Board will review this project two more times and that is when these concerns are addressed (width of road and safety, lighting, snow removal, etc).

Bill Voss stated that the number of units is a major factor in the traffic. He asked if the Planning Board could tell the developer that there are too many units because of the traffic.

Doug Crow stated that the Planning Board could make a recommendation that there are too many units.

Mr. Eckis discussed the density and that the number of units would remain the same if it were a traditional subdivision. If the number of units was cut in half, the project would end. Both on the development side and from the resident's side, as they wouldn't be able to afford the fees associated with the private roadways, sewers and pumps, lawn maintenance, and common area maintenance.

Doug Crow stated that there was a lot of talk about traffic and asked if there were other issues the developer wanted to talk about.

Ms. Bittar stated that this is the sketch plan phase and they haven't gone into the detail of many of the concerns, which they will be required to do. These requirements include: storm water management, waste water evaluation and calculations, noise and light pollution will be evaluated, snow removal, safety concerns discussed with the Fire Department, among others.

Doug Crow mentioned that he is pro-development and that there is a character difference between the town and the village. This development clearly doesn't fit with the character of the town but it can't be said that the village would never expand. If the village were to gradually expand, it would generally be acceptable. However, he stated he could not support the project as with the character it has turned into. He further mentioned that the changes made at the request of the Town Board have made it worse. Private roads and lack of sidewalks are a travesty. Part of the character of our village is that there is a mix of people; young families, older families, families without kids. This development has turned into a mono-culture community to satisfy complaints and the desires of the Town to be frugal. If this project was more like the character of the village, he would be in favor of it. The project started out closer to that, but got farther away. At this point he can't support it from a sketch perspective. He further mentioned that he thinks all the issues can be resolved (sewer, light, traffic, storm water, fire access) through the process. But the basic structure and design of a bunch of patio homes, relatively close together with private roads and no sidewalks does not fit with the character of East Aurora. He can't support it.

Jerry Thompson stated that he supports the project because it does meet the cluster code requirements. He further discussed there already is cluster development in the village, specifically Stonegate and on the other end of town off of Brooklea. We can't stop growth. This is a large parcel of land that was clearly identified as becoming residential in nature, right at the edge of the village. The sewer that the County put in a long time ago is adequate to handle this type of development, as the County said at that time, ends right at Beech Road. There is still a lot of work to do on a project like this and it will take a long time before it is finished. This is a concept and he stated he thinks the developer has done everything the Town has asked so far. He prefers a cluster design, keeping the area open.

Don Owens mentioned that this property is right next to the village. What limits development in the town is the lack of sanitary sewers. This proposal is right at the end of the sewer line and is suitable from that standpoint.

Don Owens thanked the agents for the applicant for appearing. He further asked Mr. Eckis if it would be possible to extend the deadline by 5 days, so that the Planning Board could make a recommendation at the January 6 meeting. Mr. Eckis agreed.

Knox Road ODA referral from the Zoning Board of Appeals. Peter Sorgi of Hopkins, Sorgi and Romanowski, appeared as agent.

Perry O'Connell, Knox Rd. He discussed his concerns regarding the ODA particularly traffic safety and drainage. If the driveway entrance is opened up, it may give the appearance that the Knox Road continues straight. If the driveway entrance is moved toward his property, the sign that indicates the turn will have to be moved. Also, there is no ditch at the road and water travels from the Seminary, across his property, over the ODA property and into the creek. He would like to know if there is a drainage plan so that the driveway won't block this water flow.

Don Owens mentioned that for the private road of the ODA, it would be required to have appropriately sized culverts. After reviewing the plan, he noted that it does show culverts and reviewed the plan with Mr. O'Connell.

Jerry Thompson clarified that the Zoning Board of Appeals is only asking for the Planning Board to review the request for a variance from the 50' frontage.

Mr. Sorgi confirmed the purpose for the meeting. He further mentioned that after the variance determination, engineering will be completed to address these other issues.

Jerry Thompson stated he visited the site three times. He was not able to locate the corner stakes and understand the property lines due to the corner of the road.

Mr. Sorgi stated that the survey shows a frontage of 33'. On the survey, there is a paper street called Big Tree Road.

John Glenn, Knox Road. He discussed the fact that Knox Road at one time didn't have a bend. The road was then known as Big Tree Road and it continued straight down to the creek and continued on into Orchard Park. It allowed for horse and buggy access to Orchard Park because there wasn't a need for a bridge. He confirmed that it was a public road.

Mr. Sorgi stated that if this road was a public road, a variance may not be needed. When the survey was prepared, the surveyor looked at the deeds and noted that the deeds were measured to the center of the former Big Tree Road, which is common. The ODA lot deed does not measure

to the center of the former road. It measures to the edge of the right of way, leaving a gore or no-man's land in between of 33'. Research will need to be conducted to confirm this Big Tree Road was a public road that was abandoned. And if it is, then NYS Real Property Law takes over and that states that if a public road is abandoned, the road is essentially split down the middle and the property owners on each side take half. But since they have 33' now and if the right of way is 33' then the frontage would be 66' and a variance wouldn't be required. He further stated that they are still pursuing a variance at this time because this information was just recently identified. He further discussed the Town Board's request for his client to ask to purchase additional land from the adjoining property, but was cost prohibitive for his client.

Bill Voss asked if the driveway will still be 20' hard pack surface.

Mr. Sorgi confirmed and stated that the driveway will be 20' wide from the property line all the way back.

Jerry Thompson asked about the ownership discrepancy on the deed.

Mr. Sorgi stated that if a survey was done of the ODA and neighboring properties to the north would be separated by a 33' gore or no-man's land. The surveyors only use what is recorded. He further stated that he would record an instrument that says this road was abandoned and therefore his client owns it. This is not adverse possession or squatter's rights, it is State Law and all he has to show is that the road was abandoned and it will be added to the legal description.

Doug Crow discussed the joint meeting between the Boards.

Bill Voss stated that the variance is for one very small point at the property right of way. Since the property opens up, there is no problem with snow removal. He stated he doesn't think this is setting precedence, as long as it is made clear that it is for the one point.

Doug Crow confirmed that Bill is recommending the ZBA approve the request but only for the pinch point.

Tim Bailey clarified that the ODA lot width of 50' is for utility access, driveway and snow removal.

Mr. Sorgi stated there is a utility plan that shows utility access. The driveway will be 20' wide from the property line.

Bill Voss agreed and just wanted it to be documented for the ZBA so that it doesn't set precedence.

Doug Crow clarified that this decision is not about ODA approval, just for the ZBA variance request at the right of way.

Bill Voss moved to recommend to the ZBA that they approve the variance for the choke point only at the road. The driveway will still have the required 20' hard pack. Jerry Thompson seconded. Don Owens asked for comments.

Jerry Thompson stated that he does not want to do the ZBA's job. He doesn't think it is proper for the ZBA to put it in their findings that the Planning Board recommended a decision.

Mr. Sorgi stated that State Law says the ZBA has the power to ask the Planning Board for a recommendation. It was his understanding from the ZBA hearing that the Planning Board wanted to see this.

Doug Crow clarified that the Planning Board had requested the ZBA ask for recommendations.

Tim Bailey asked if there has been any input from the Fire Department yet.

Mr. Sorgi said no but a letter has been submitted to Roger LeBlanc.

Dave Librock stated that Craig Thrasher would probably be the representative who would look at the site and write the letter.

Mr. Sorgi indicated he would reach out to Mr. Thrasher prior to the next meeting.

William Voss moved to recommend to the Zoning Board of Appeals that they approve the ingress/egress variance request of the Knox Road ODA (SBL: 164.00-2-6.2), Town of Aurora, NY. This variance is for the choke point only at the road. The driveway will still have the required 20' hard pack. Seconded by Jerrold Thompson.

Upon a vote being taken: ayes – six noes – one (Thompson) Motion Carried.

Code Review request from the Town Board. Chuck Snyder, Town Councilman appeared.

Chuck Snyder discussed the Code Review Committee that has worked for a several years on this project.

Doug Crow asked about the intent of the changes.

Tim Bailey stated that it is to incorporate the Table of District Regulations into the code.

Chuck Snyder also mentioned the intent is to clean it up too.

Jerry Thompson stated he doesn't think we should be using the Table of District Regulations anymore.

Bill Kramer indicated it will be gone.

Chuck Snyder stated that the district uses and regulations will still be there, you just won't have the separate sheet.

Bill Kramer stated that it is all incorporated into Chapter 116.

Jerry Thompson asked if the Planning Board is being asked to look at the code and clean it up.

Chuck Snyder said no, the changes have been made. The Planning Board is being asked to look at this code and make any recommendations or suggestions.

Bill Kramer stated that they have taken the table of district regulations and put it into book form. And changes have been made along the way, such as setbacks and heights for accessory buildings in different districts and different uses. And now the Town Board is looking for Planning Board input.

Bill Voss mentioned that Rural Residential is new. He further asked that in the all areas that are currently zoned agricultural the first 300' of these areas will be under these new restrictions.

Chuck Snyder and Bill Kramer agreed.

Bill Voss asked about the domestic animal restrictions.

Bill Kramer stated that if there is a residence there. He further mentioned that if you owned a 1000' of Ag district on Davis Road, you wouldn't have to worry about the number of chickens. But if you have a residence on a piece of property within 300' then there are restrictions on animals. Beyond that 300', however many horses the acreage allows.

Jerry Thompson stated that the B1, B2, I were confusing.

Bill Kramer clarified that they aren't changing the zoning map, just the regulations allowed in those districts.

Greg Keyser stated that Rural Residential is new.

Bill Kramer stated it is an overlay, not a zone. He also mentioned that a lot of things the

committee looked at were ZBA variances, such as an accessory building in an Ag district could only be one story.

Don Owens stated that he would like to schedule a special meeting for the Code Review on December 16th at 7pm.

Chuck Snyder asked for the recommendation to be back to the Town Board by late January or early February.

A motion was made by Jerry Thompson and seconded by Doug Crow to adjourn at 9:15PM.

THE NEXT REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING WILL BE WEDNESDAY January 6, 2016 AT 7:00 P.M. AT THE TOWN HALL, 300 GLEED AVENUE, EAST AURORA, NEW YORK