

TOWN OF LYSANDER
PLANNING BOARD MEETING
8220 Loop Road
Thursday, December 8, 2022 at 7:00 p.m.

The regular meeting of the Town of Lysander Planning Board was held Thursday, December 8, 2022 at 7:00 p.m. at the Lysander Town Building, 8220 Loop Road, Baldwinsville, New York.

MEMBERS PRESENT: John Corey, Chairman; Hugh Kimball; Steve Darcangelo
Doug Beachel and Matt Hunt

OTHERS PRESENT: Al Yager, Town Engineer; Tim Frateschi, Attorney to the
Planning Board; Jodi Hunt, Tetra Tech; Frank Costanzo,
ZBA; William Massaro, Belgium Cold Springs Fire
Department; Steve Sehnert, Applied Earth Technologies
and Karen Rice, Clerk

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

I. OLD BUSINESS

1. Controlled Site Use
Case No. 2022—003

Baldwinsville PV I, LLC
Wight Property, Sixty Road

John Corey, Chairman, stated that at the last meeting the Board reviewed Part 2 of the Long Form EAF and at the conclusion of that we asked our attorney Tim Frateschi to draft a SEQR resolution. At this time I will ask him to lead us through that.

Mr. Frateschi stated that based on the questions and answers at the last meeting I have prepared a resolution with the recitals identifying the project, identifies the site plan and the site plan package and what it consists of.

Mr. Frateschi summarized the recitals; however they are in complete format below:

RESOLUTION #1 -- Motion by Corey, Second by Darcangelo

WHEREAS, Baldwinsville PV I, LLC (the “Applicant”) is proposing the construction of a ground mounted photovoltaic solar energy generating facility generating 4 megawatts (MW) alternating current, located northwest of the intersection of East Oneida Street and Sixty Road (the “Project”). The Project is situated within an approximately 18-acre portion of an approximately 159-acre parcel (the “Property” or “Project Site”).

WHEREAS, the Applicant, through its engineers Tetra Tech has submitted a site plan package (the “Site Plan Package”) entitled Baldwinsville (Lysander) CSG Solar Project, which consists of the following Sheets: Title Sheet C-001; Notes C-002; Existing Conditions C-101; Tree Clearing Plan CD-201; Site Plan C-201; Grading Plan C-202, Erosion & Sediment Control Plan C-203; Landscaping Plan C-204; Line of Sight C-205; Previous Access Road Details C-401; Fence & Gate Details C-402; Erosion & Sediment Control Details C-403; Erosion & Sediment Control Details C-404; as Project No. 194-1081-0016 , dated May 12, 2022 last revision date November 23, 2022.

WHEREAS, the Planning Board and its engineer have reviewed the Site Plan Package and have considered it in relation to the SEQRA review and findings set forth herein;

WHEREAS, the existing zoning for the Project Site is AR-40 which allows the Project as set forth in the Application;

WHEREAS, land uses in the adjacent surrounding area are primarily single family houses on Sixty Road and the Property is most woodlands;

WHEREAS, because 10 acres of the Property will be disturbed by removal of trees for the Project, it qualifies the Action as a Type I action under Article 8 of the New York State Environment Law and 6 NYCRR (“SEQRA”);

WHEREAS, on June 9, 2022, pursuant to NYCRR Part 617.6(b), the Lysander Planning Board (the “Planning Board”) declared itself the Lead Agency and issued to all involved agencies a Notice of Intent that classified the Project as a Type I action and further stated that it intended to be the Lead Agency for the Action;

WHEREAS, no involved agency responded in objection to the Notice of Intent for Lead Agency;

WHEREAS, by letter dated September 1, 2022, November 7, 2022 and December 5, 2022 the Engineer for the Town has reviewed the Site Plan Package and based on his review has determined that the Site Plan Package meet the engineering and State/Town standards for a solar voltaic system in the Town of Lysander (See Engineer’s Review Letter of December 5, 2022 in review to Tetra Tech’s responses of December 1, 2022 to previous engineering questions);

WHEREAS, Tetra Tech submitted to the Engineer for the Town a Stormwater Pollution and Prevention Plan (“SWPPP”) dated December 2022, which identifies stormwater run-off issues and proposed stormwater facilities that will meet the NYS Department of Environmental Conservation regulations (See Engineer’s Review Letter of December 5, 2022 in review to Tetra Tech’s responses of December 1, 2022 to previous engineering questions);

WHEREAS, by resolution dated June 15, 2022 the Onondaga Planning Agency determined that the Project would not have an inter-county wide impact and offered one modification, which modification is agreed to by the Planning Board;

WHEREAS, on November 10, 2022, at its monthly meeting, the Planning Board reviewed, discussed and asked questions to Tetra Tech regarding Part 2 of the Full Environmental Assessment Form (the “EAF”) and answered the 18 questions set forth therein based on the Project;

WHEREAS, for the reasons set forth in the minutes of the November 10, 2022 meeting, the information on Part 1 of the EAF, the notes set forth on Part 2 of the EAF and the personal knowledge of the Planning Board members of the Project site, the Planning Board determined that there would be no environmental impact on Geological Features, Surface Water, Groundwater, Flooding, Air, Plants and Animals, Agricultural Resources, Historical and Archeological Resources, Open Space and Recreation, Critical Environmental Areas, Transportation, Energy, Noise/Oder/Light, Human Health, Consistency with Community Plans, and/or Consistency with Community Character;

WHEREAS, the Planning Board did identify two potential environmental impacts as follows: (i) Impact on Land; (ii) Impacts on Aesthetic Resources;

WHEREAS, of the two potential environmental impacts set forth in the previous paragraph, the Planning Board determined that the standards set forth in the EAF sub-questions indicated “no, or small impact may occur”, except for mitigation measures that would be required related to Impacts on Land and Aesthetic Resources, as set forth in the next paragraph;

WHEREAS, although there are no significant environmental impacts based on the Planning Board’s review of Part 2 of the EAF, the Planning Board has the following concerns from a SEQRA and Site Plan mitigation perspective: (i) the visual impact on the fifteen (15) residential homes on Sixty Road, (ii) impact on wetlands; and (iii) potential impact on land from erosion.

WHEREAS, the State of New York has adopted the 2015 New York State Energy Plan, which sets forth various renewable energy goals for the State;

WHEREAS, on July 18, 2019, the Climate Leadership and Community Protection Act (Climate Act) was signed into law which was among the most ambitious climate laws in the world and requires New York to reduce economy-wide greenhouse gas emissions 40 percent by 2030 and no less than 85 percent by 2050 from 1990 levels. <https://climate.ny.gov/>

WHEREAS, the Planning Board agrees with the goals set forth in these and all the State policies on renewable energy and encourages the production of renewable energy in the Town of Lysander;

WHEREAS, based on the review of the Site Plan Package, Part 1 and Part 2 of the EAF, the Planning Board’s familiarity of the Project Site, the Town’s Comprehensive Plan,

the zoning designation of the Property as AR-40, the comments received by the public, and all of the Recitals stated above, the Planning Board hereby makes the following **FINDINGS and DETERMINATIONS**, which will be added as a supplement to the EAF Part 2 and 3:

1. **FINDING and DETERMINATIONS:** The above recital paragraphs serve as the basis for the FINDINGS and DETERMINATIONS set forth herein and are made part thereof.
2. **FINDING and DETERMINATION:** The Project is consistent with the State policy goals to develop renewable energy opportunities and reduce the use of fossil fuels.
3. **FINDING and DETERMINATION:** The SWPPP presented to the Planning Board and reviewed by the Town Engineer addresses the concerns raised by members of the Planning Board related to erosion, especially during the construction phase of the Project. Before any building permit can be issued, a final SWPPP will be submitted and approved by the Engineer for the Town.

Note: The Town Engineer has looked at the SWPPP that has been provided. It's not unusual at this stage of the project to have a preliminary Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan to give the engineer that the size of the property would be able to accommodate the run-off from the panels and I believe the SWPPP provides him with that information, correct?

Mr. Yager concurred.

Mr. Frateschi stated that during the construction phase they will be able to handle any run-off off of this site.

Mr. Yager concurred.

Hugh Kimball asked if all of the modifications have been received.

Mr. Yager stated that many of the initial deficiencies have been corrected. They're working through some pond sizing as far as meeting a 1 ½ to 1 length width ratio and surface area coverage but they have a plan to address those. They're going to be in good shape.

John Corey, Chairman, reiterated that you're confident that they can resolve any issues you've raised up to this point.

Mr. Yager concurred.

4. **FINDING and DETERMINATION:** The impacts on the land will be minimal because of the nature of constructing a tracking panel structure that would be placed on a tracking system that is pile-driven, thus reducing the impact on the surface area of the land.

Note: the language in the Finding was changed from fixed tilt panels to tracking panel structure. The change was made on Part 1 of the EAF and initialed by Jodi Hunt, Tetra Tech.

5. **FINDING and DETERMINATION:** Based on the Application and Site Plan Package, the amount of land that will be disturbed (approximately 20 acres) is minimal in the context of the large size of the Property (159 acres).
6. **FINDING and DETERMINATIONS:** The tree removal for the project should not have a material impact on the water table for the adjacent residential properties based on the fact that the groundwater table typically follows the grade of the ground surface elevation (the trees being removed are at a lower elevation than the residences).
7. **FINDING and DETERMINATION:** Based on the Viewshed Analysis submitted December 5, 2022, submitted by the Applicant, because the Property is largely wooded and the Site Plan shows a 50 ft. buffer area between the residential property boundaries and the Project that will not be disturbed and remained wooded, the aesthetic or visual impact on the fifteen (15) residential homes on Sixty Road will be minimal.
8. **FINDING and DETERMINATION:** The Army Corp of Engineers has provided the Town with a "Letter of No Effect" regarding the impact on wetlands on the Property thus alleviating any environmental concerns as it relates to impact on surface water.

9. **FINDING and DETERMINATION:** As of the day of this Resolution, the Engineer for the Town has reviewed the U.S. Fish & Wildlife and New York State DEC rules, regulations, and mapping data and per such data has determined that there shall be no tree removal from the Property while the Long Eared and Indiana Bat may be roosting on the Property (April 1 through October 31).

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that having reviewed the EAF and relating it to the criteria set forth in Section 617.8(c) of the SEQRA regulations, having held the public hearing and making the Findings and Determinations contained in this Resolution, the Planning Board hereby issues a Negative Declaration under Article 8 of the Environmental Conservation Law;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Lead Agency is the Planning Board of the Town of Lysander, with a mailing address of 8220 Loop Road, Baldwinsville, Town of Lysander, New York;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Project is a Type I Action under SEQRA;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the proposed Action is located near Sixty Road near the Village of Baldwinsville boundary line in the Town of Lysander;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this Resolution be appended to the EAF Part 2 and Part 3 and made a part thereof;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that Secretary to the Planning Board is hereby directed to file this Negative Declaration with the appropriate entities as set forth under 6 NYCRR Part 617.

5 Ayes -- 0 Noes

Mr. Frateschi stated that he made the changes that were discussed, is calling it FINAL.

Karen Rice, Clerk, asked that it be sent to her for submittal to the Environmental Bulletin.

II. **PUBLIC HEARING** -- 7:05 p.m. (Continuation of Public Hearing 11/10/2022)

1. Controlled Site Use
Case No. 2022—003

Baldwinsville PV I, LLC
Wight Property, Sixty Road

The Public Hearing reopened at 7:15 p.m.

John Corey, Chairman, asked if there was anyone in the audience who wanted to speak to this matter.

There being no one, Mr. Corey stated that he received a letter from Jason Deshaies who asked that his statement be read into the record:

To: Town of Lysander Planning Department

From: Jason Deshaies, Resident at 8235 Sixty Road for 10+ years

Comments on Proposed Solar Farm Project on Sixty Road

My property at 8235 Sixty Road touches a northern section of the parcel where the proposed solar farm is located. I have a background in environmental and transportation planning and analysis. I have several concerns as noted below. For the record, I am not opposed to solar farms, in fact, I support them when sited in an appropriate location.

1) My primary concern is in regard to the high water table in the area (Figure #2). If you are not aware, all of the houses in the surrounding area (in the Town, not the Village) do not have access to public sewer lines (Figure #1) and therefore rely on personal septic systems. I, as well as several of my neighbors, have had issues with our systems backing up due to the high water table. Personally, I have spent a lot of time and money on professional services over the past few years dealing with the problems due to the high water table. My system is not a unique situation, I have had discussions with neighbors that deal with the same issues when there is lots of rain and in the spring melting season. As you can imagine, it is not a good situation when a septic system backs up. Additionally, I was told by a previous owner of my house (as well as a neighbor) that my house was only built with a crawl space basement due to the high water table and that

neighbors with full basements have sump pumps running constantly throughout the year.

Based on the plans of the proposed project, the almost 20 acres of land will be clear cut. Each tree holds a certain amount of water as well as provides surface area for evapotranspiration. So, with each tree that is cut, there will likely be additional groundwater resulting in a rise in the local water table. Based on the Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) provided by the project team, the depth to water table at the site is an average of 4 feet (also shown on Figure #2) and depth to bedrock is 2 to >6 feet. This confirms that any impacts to the land that will raise the water table could negatively impact local septic systems that sit at similar levels below ground. I really feel that ANY rise in the water table could create additional issues with the area's septic systems.

Based on my research, there are currently public sewer lines on Sixty Road to the south of the project area (Village) and to the north of the project area ending in the area of the Ainsley Warehouse on Brundage Road (about 0.2 - 0.3 miles north of the site). I am not sure why the sewer was never extended south to the Gypsum office and to the residential houses in the area since we are in a designated Sewer District.

If this solar farm project was to be approved, the Town or the project applicant should seriously consider extension of the current sewer line to serve the gap between the village and Brundage Road, which again is within the current defined Sewer District. That way residents/businesses in the area will not have to deal with septic issues in the future.

2) My second concern is in regard to general land use planning. In my opinion, this is really not the best location for a solar farm. The property is immediately outside the Village with residential land uses to the north and south (Figure #3). If anything, this property seems better suited for additional residential housing, which would also help the argument to extend sewer services to the area. Also worth noting is the proposed 140 residential unit development immediately adjacent to the south in the Village.

As you probably know, the Micron development in Clay has already spurred interest in additional housing in the County so the Town should really consider where it would want future housing built. It makes more planning sense to keep the housing development dense and close to the village as opposed to sprawl. Which is consistent with the Syracuse Onondaga County Planning Agency's (SOCPA) Plan Onondaga efforts (<https://plan.ongov.net/>). If you haven't heard, SOCPA is looking to hire 4 additional land use planners to assist the northern suburbs with planning for the significant growth the county will see over the next 20 years. I encourage the Town to use SOCPA as a resource for reviewing such proposals.

It is much cheaper to locate new housing/mixed use in areas with existing infrastructure. As noted in the EAF, a solar site doesn't require water or sewer infrastructure so why locate it in an area with these services? There is plenty of already cleared land in the Town and County that are more suitable for a solar farm. From my understanding, solar farms are mostly being located in already cleared rural areas, so why locate one in an area that is more suitable for residential use? In my opinion, that is not a good planning decision. In light of the Micron development, I encourage the Town Planning Board to reconsider where it wants to see residential growth and where development such as a solar farm should be located.

3) Finally, unless there are other documents available that I have not seen, I feel that the potential environmental impacts have not been fully explored. The EAF seems a bit lacking in regard to several things such as impacts to wildlife and the surrounding ecosystem, seeing that it is a nice mature forested area. For

example, was there a full wetland delineation completed and was an Indiana bat habitat assessment completed? There are many more species of animals, than listed in the ESF, that live in the area. I understand this would be a concern no matter what use was proposed for the site.

I appreciate the Board's time in reviewing my comments. I am hoping to make it to the meeting on December 8th to voice my concerns in person.

Mr. Deshaies provided exhibits that are part of the public record and can be obtained from the Clerk to the Planning Board.

Mr. Corey stated that from the review we just went through with the SEQR Resolution and our comments, most of his issues have been addressed at least from my perspective.

Steve Darcangelo questioned if a wetland delineation was done on the property.

Jodi Hunt, Tetra Tech, stated that one was completed.

Mr. Yager stated that we did receive a letter from the Army Corp of Engineers stating that there is one area they want protected, the rest of it they were fine with.

Steve Darcangelo reiterated that the intermittent streams are identified just as Army Corp Wetlands.

Hugh Kimball posed a question to the Town Engineer, asking if there was anything in this letter that we have not dealt with...you're content with the way we're going.

Mr. Yager concurred.

Mr. Corey stated that we're cutting almost 20 acres out of 159, a little over 10% is not a big impact.

Mr. Kimball questioned if the houses are generally on a higher plain.

Mr. Corey...and the land does slope. Jason's issue was the water table, not erosion, not ground water running in it because it can't. I'm not a hydrologist but I know water doesn't flow up hill.

There being no further comments the Public Hearing closed at 7:22 p.m.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Review and approval of the minutes of the November 10, 2022 Planning Board meeting minutes will be tabled.

IV. OLD BUSINESS (Continued)

1. Controlled Site Use
Case No. 2022—003

Baldwinsville PV I, LLC
Wight Property, Sixty Road

John Corey, Chairman, stated that the question at this point is the Board prepared to move forward and take action tonight; are you comfortable where they're at or are we looking for anything else for consideration.

Al Yager, Town Engineer, stated that the Stormwater Management System will be revised from the set of plans that you have in front of you, other than that I do not anticipate any additional changes to the Site Plans.

Mr. Corey stated that if we pass a resolution tonight approving this project we can condition it that no maps will be signed or building permit issued until approved by the Town Engineer.

Mr. Yager concurred.

Steve Darcangelo stated that he asked the question about grades a while back; I think the answer at the time was that there are no slopes greater than 5%; but it shows now that there are, which I anticipated, and you put level spreaders in to account for that.

Jodi Hunt, Tetra Tech, stated that she believes the newest plans show that. Al and our Stormwater Engineer have been working on that. I have not seen that; the stormwater stuff is way over my head.

Hugh Kimball stated that he has a few dot the i's cross the t's questions, I'm not concerned that anything's going to happen as a result, but this is for Karen more than anybody...the Village and Fire Department in this District have received information of this with no response from either.

Karen concurred....twice now with no response.

Mr. Kimball....interesting and you actually sent plans to the Fire Department. It's disappointing, but we can't deal with anything we don't have in front of us, that's for sure.

Mr. Yager stated three times because I sent them a package too.

Mr. Darcangelo posed a question to Bill Massaro, Belgium Cold Springs Fire Department, as a mutual aid company does Belgium Cold Springs see anything there that would raise a flag.

Mr. Massaro stated that as long as they provide a turn-around like the one provided on the River Road Solar Farm. There's not a whole lot that we're going to need with this type of structure.

Ms. Hunt stated that there will be no battery storage on the site.

Mr. Massaro stated that if we had to go in for some reason, can we get back out.

Mr. Darcangelo stated that the concern would be ground fire, grass, etc...

Mr. Massaro concurred stating as long as there's access; that is what we were concerned with, with the River Road facility but I don't want to speak for Northwest.

Mr. Kimball stated that there are wetlands out there but no in the area where you will be putting the panels. I'm assuming therefore that there's no reason to take down shade trees that would protect the areas where the wetland areas are, right?

Ms. Hunt stated that they're not going to impact any State wetlands; and the Army Corp was not concerned that we were going to affect theirs; that's correct.

Mr. Kimball stated that the only other thing I would bring up is one of the maps that you were talking about plantings, flowers, species, etc... I would hope that those seeds would be the type that would encourage bees to go there. It's a National problem, we're losing bees, we're losing butterflies and if you plant the right stuff we can help a little bit instead of hurting more.

Ms. Hunt concurred that it is a problem so we have to be careful about planting that's something that's native to the area too because the local farmers don't want weeds taken in to their fields either, so we work with Cornel and use local native mixes.

Mr. Darcangelo stated that there are specific pollinator mixes.

Ms. Hunt concurred stating that they will blend with something that is native that will grow.

Mr. Darcangelo questioned the necessity of a decommissioning plan; as I've not seen it or read it, but...

Mr. Yager stated that by our Code they're not required to do a decommissioning plan until the issuance of a building permit. It's part of the building permit process, not necessarily a Planning Board function.

Mr. Darcangelo questioned if the decommissioning requirements require that the property be brought back to its preexisting condition.

Mr. Yager stated that obviously once the trees are gone, the trees are gone, but yes it would be. All of the equipment and structures would be removed.

Mr. Darcangelo questioned if they would remove the roads...my questions are, are you stockpiling soil that's stripped for

‘recommissioning’...do you tear out the roads and put back the topsoil?

Ms. Hunt stated that if the landowner doesn’t want the road it will be removed and replaced. That’s really the only soil that would be stockpiled. The areas where the panels are located that gets left as is, that doesn’t get stripped off.

Mr. Darcangelo stated that you don’t show a soil stockpile; so your decommissioning plan would be to bring in new soil at the end of the life of the array.

Ms. Hunt...as needed, usually very little is needed. It’s very similar to putting in a fence post. The racking system is punched down into the ground.

Mr. Darcangelo...just for the road, do you box out for the road?

Ms. Hunt stated that for the road yes, the topsoil that is needed will be brought in.

Mr. Yager stated that after 25 years there will be enough sediment in that gravel road that will have plenty of grass on it when this is over.

Board members concurred.

Mr. Corey stated that at this point in time I don’t really see what prevents the Board moving forward with a Conditional Approval; but I don’t have a resolution.

Mr. Frateschi stated that simply what the Board would be doing would be to approve the site plan package that has been presented by Tetra Tech and we can put that together:

RESOLUTION #2 -- Motion by Corey, Second by Kimball

RESOLVED, that Planning Board approve the Site Plan package that has been presented by Tetra tech that’s entitled Baldwinsville (Lysander) CSG Solar Project, Sixty Road, Lysander, New York, which consists of the following Sheets dated May 12, 2022, last revision November 23, 2022, Project No. 194-1081-016: Title Sheet C-001; Notes C-002; Existing Conditions C-101; Tree Clearing Plan CD-201; Site Plan C-201; Grading Plan C-202, Erosion & Sediment Control Plan C-203; Landscaping Plan C-204; Line of Sight C-205; Pervious Access Road Details C-401; Fence & Gate Details C-402; Erosion & Sediment Control Details C-403; Erosion & Sediment Control Details C-404; with the following conditions:

- 1) Final Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) reviewed and approved by the Engineer for the Town; and
- 2) No Building Permit will be issued until all fees associated with this application have been paid.

5 Ayes -- 0 Noes

Ms. Hunt thanked the Board for their time.

V. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Major Subdivision—Final Plat River Grove, Phase IIB
9 Lots: Hickory Knoll Lane

Stephen Sehnert, Licensed Land Surveyor, represented the applicant stating that this is the third phase of this subdivision over a number of years. Dan Barnaba, Eldan Homes, the current developer, is asking for Final Plat approval for nine (9) lots on Hickory Knoll Lane. This site has been selected for the 2023 Parade of Homes. Everything that needs to be shown on the map is shown. If you have any specific questions, please ask.

John Corey, Chairman, asked if there were roads that have to be dedicated to the Town.

Al Yager, Town Engineer, stated that there was an option to dedicate this road to the Town but at this point the Homeowner’s Association for the initial development has not agreed to the necessary testing, core sampling that needs to happen on the access road off of Drakes Landing, so at this point in time the Developer is not dedicating the road to the Town. He is only asking the Town for dedication of the Storm and Sanitary Sewers.

Mr. Sehnert stated that the road is in and National Grid installations are taking place.

Hugh Kimball asked if this is consistent with what we've seen in the past.

Mr. Yager stated that there has been no change to the lot lay-out at all from what was initially proposed and approved by this Board.

Mr. Sehnert stated that there may be very minor technical changes.

There is a letter on file dated December 8, 2022, prepared by Al Yager, Town Engineer, that will be made part of the public record, in part:

I have completed my review of the final subdivision for the River Grove Phase IIB subdivision prepared by Applied Earth Technologies, P.C., dated March 31, 2022. The final subdivision plat as presented has no apparent variations from the preliminary plat for the project previously approved by the Planning Board. I would not be opposed to the Planning Board approving the final subdivision plat as presented and authorizing the Chairman to sign the map contingent on the Town Board accepting dedication of the storm and sanitary sewers associated with the project.

RESOLUTION #3 -- Motion by Corey, Second by Hunt

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board authorizes the Chairperson to review the Final Plat, for the River Grove, Phase IIB, subdivision application of Eldan Homes, for property located at Lots 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40 & 41, Hickory Knoll Lane, Baldwinsville, New York, Part of Military Lot No. 61 and Part of Tax Map No. 081.2-01-01.1 and finding that all modifications and conditions have been met; the Board authorizes the Chairperson to waive the Final Plat public hearing and sign the Final Plat with the following condition:

- 1) The Town Board accept dedication of the Storm and Sanitary Sewers associated with this project.

5 Ayes -- 0 Noes

2. Review and approval of the 2023 Planning Board Meeting Calendar.

RESOLUTION #4 -- Motion by Corey, Second by Hunt

RESOLVED, that the 2023 Town of Lysander Planning Board meeting schedule be approved as submitted.

5 Ayes -- 0 Noes

VI. **ADJOURN**

RESOLUTION #5 -- Motion by Darcangelo, Second by Kimball

RESOLVED, that the Town of Lysander regular December 8, 2022 Planning Board meeting adjourn at 7:42 p.m.

5 Ayes -- Noes

Respectfully submitted,

Karen Rice, Clerk
Planning Board

