

20/20 VISION  
VILLAGE OF WILLIAMSVILLE COMMUNITY PLAN  
COMMUNITY PLAN COMMITTEE

APPROVED MEETING NOTES - OCTOBER 16, 2007

The meeting was called to order at 6:10 PM.

Community Plan Committee Attendees: Charles Akers, David Brody, Paul Iskalo, Walter Pacer (Chair), Vic Paquet, Charles Rizzone, Carolyn Schlifke, Dave Vitka, Kate Waterman-Kulpa, Edward Zabel

Absent: Steve Appler, Mary Carr, Thomas Claxton, Kim Gianelli-Calos, Pastor Madsen, Wesley Stone

Consultant/Town/Village Staff Present: Lawrence Bice, Joelle Guy, Dan Howard, Lynda Juul

Village Board Members: Mayor Lowther, Trustee Jeff Kingsley, Trustee Brian Kulpa, Trustee Basil Piazza

Residents/Other Attendees: Christopher Church (NYS DOT), Thomas Frank, Jr., Thomas Frank, Sr.

**ACCEPTANCE OF MEETING NOTES**

On motion by Kate Waterman-Kulpa, seconded by David Brody, the meeting notes of October 2, 2007 were accepted with modifications.

Unanimously carried.

**REVIEW OF DRAFT PLAN**

***Section 4 - The Main Street Business District***

David Brody questioned the last paragraph on page 66. He asked what the basis is of the draw being local rather than regional; he thought this didn't fit. Lawrence stated he would verify this with David Versel, but thought that he meant it was more of a niche market, and not a regional draw. David Brody said he would like to know more about the logic behind this before he decides if he has any further comment. Dan Howard thought it was in the market analysis report that was given to the committee in the past.

Kate Waterman-Kulpa questioned page 66. She did not like the verbiage of "new retail and housing developments along Main Street..." and thought this could be misconstrued. David Brody stated he liked this wording. Lawrence will change this to "new housing opportunities". Kate and David were both in favor of this change.

Vic Paquet mentioned that from page 65 on, none of the figures were labeled. Lawrence stated that many photographs were not labeled in the plan. Vic was okay with this. He also asked about the Action Items on page 68 – there is no action or timetable for 2.2.

David Brody referenced page 67 under Business District Objectives and Actions. He questioned the 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph where it states: “consistent with the plan and vision for the plan”. Lawrence commented that the overall theme of this business district section is emphasizing the strengths of the area and how it fits in the regional perspective. For him it’s about leveraging what’s unique and special.

Tax Increment Financing (TIF) districts were discussed at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting. Jim Allen of the Amherst IDA discussed PIFs as an alternative to this at that meeting as well. Dan Howard discussed that TIF is limited in New York State because school districts don’t normally participate. Dan asked if there would be any opposition to incorporating an alternative to the TIF into the Plan and wondered if the CPC committee would want to see it before it is put in. David Brody suggested putting it in. Vic Paquet requested that the committee be notified as to where this is added. Lawrence commented that there were a few substantive issues discussed by the Technical Advisory Committee, including the issue of getting safety equipment across the medians, and improving access to the area behind the Village Glen.

Chuck Rizzone asked about the WBA’s openness to a Business Improvement District (BID). Lawrence felt they were open to it. David Brody stated that he chairs the committee of the WBA that is working on this issue. It’s been determined that it’s a worthwhile concept to explore and some of the property owners who are familiar with the BID concept have expressed that they are willing to consider this. He felt page 70 should be changed. Under the responsibilities section, it should be noted that you must get the approval of 51% of the property owners. Two different types of votes are taken – one where each property owner gets one vote, and one where each property owner gets a vote for each property they own. The snow removal program was discussed. This could be done through a BID. Chuck Rizzone wondered if it was making progress; there is a lot of active discussion and interest in the business association. There is a BID on Elmwood, and one down on Main Street that runs Thursday in the Square. They’re generally used in an area that is economically depressed and we are not in such bad shape here.

Vic Paquet commented on page 70 where it states “See Section 5 for a complete discussion of Mill Village”. It was discussed and decided to leave this in. Lawrence will add a sentence to build this up a little more. Kate Waterman-Kulpa suggested changing “Water Mill” to “Mill”.

Kate Waterman-Kulpa commented on page 72. She is concerned about exterior façade improvements and the Planning Board not being recognized as one of the responsible parties. David Brody thought the plan presupposed that you are going to go through the proper process to get approval. You imply the Planning Board will be actively involved with setting this up. He’s not sure if that’s the case. Lawrence will add that “these improvements will further the vision, but would undergo the normal Village review”. David Brody stated that the IDA has a loan program for facade improvements and wondered if Lawrence would want to include the IDA, or mention them as a responsible agent. David thought the IDA should be added as one of the involved entities in the text. Discussion centered on tax incentives. Dan Howard commented that the IDA is very interested in working with the Village, so some type of statement should be made.

Chuck Rizzone discussed page 73 and requested that the “naughty naughty” verbiage be removed. Lawrence suggested “good natured warnings” as an alternative. Wally talked about a warning ticket he has seen in the past that states you don’t have to pay the ticket if you haven’t gotten one in the last 18 months.

Carolyn Schlifke discussed the fact that there is a Village Parking Enforcement Officer. There is 2-hour parking on Main Street, so employees move into the residential areas. Where are you going to put these people? The employees have to park somewhere. Paul Iskalo responded that it ties in with his cul-de-sac discussion. There is a difference between the individual resident and the good of the community. Master planning is done for the good of the community. The same thing applies to parking on residential streets. The streets are owned by the municipality and people are entitled to park there. The whole idea of living in a village is that you have that urban context. You have walkability and a more urban setting. With that urban setting comes the idea that someone can park their car on your street, in front of your house. Carolyn Schlifke felt the issue is that all these people come to Traffic and Safety and when the Village Board approves limiting parking on their street, you take away the concept. Chuck Rizzone asked why you don’t have the right to park in front of your own house. If the business owners park on Los Robles, will those visiting the businesses also have the right to park in front of his house? David Brody said that this is why it makes sense to increase the densities in the business district and start talking about larger, higher developments that have parking underneath. Right now we’re on the cusp of balancing the needs of the business community and the residents. Neither survives without the other. Instead of getting heated, we should try to do some things with density to help solve the parking issue. Carolyn Schlifke felt a lot of businesses come into the Village and get away with insufficient parking. Carolyn felt there could be stricter restrictions for what the business must supply. Paul Iskalo commented that the problem isn’t having restriction on businesses, but in identifying more areas for people to park so the businesses can exist. There are areas with insufficient parking which will continue to stay empty or having lower tiered tenants. It’s a multi-step approach. They are city streets and there is nothing wrong with having people park on them. In the long-term you try to find other areas to park and plan for this. You have to look at parking requirements as a whole and try to create municipal parking or incentives for public parking. You make it more attractive for people to not park on the residential streets.

Lawrence commented that he lives in a somewhat similar area. If people could not park on the streets, the business district wouldn’t exist. It’s a fact of living in a denser environment with a more traditional scale business district. There are also issues with parking on the opposite side of Main Street and crossing. It is a lot of pieces coming together. Paul Iskalo discussed parking at one of the buildings he owns (the old Bonds). There is always parking on the street in front of Rite Aid, but people coming to the Spotted Giraffe won’t park there and try to cross the street because it’s a treacherous. Dan Howard felt that Paul hit on a recommendation, and that is to do a parking plan for the Village. It sounds like a significant issue that should be better stated as an implementation step to take. Paul felt this would address Carolyn’s concern as well. It would give the Village Board something to point to and show that an area is only one piece in an overall system. Without that kind of a tool it’s difficult to have something to fall back on. Committee members commented that there is no on-street parking on S. Cayuga or Evans. Lawrence will find a place to lay this out a little more, and will make sure it’s strong.

Vic Paquet stated that on page 76, there is no description for Action 6.1 or 6.2.

Kate Waterman-Kulpa suggested changing the verbiage on page 76 from “investigate burying utilities” to simply “bury utilities”.

Vic Paquet asked about 6.1 and 6.2. Paul Iskalo also wondered about this. 6.2 ties right in to the parking issues. It is unclear what is meant by these statements. Paul noted that you have to make a decision if you want a successful business district and what you’re willing to pay for that. It’s a series of trade-offs. He thinks the statement needs to be worked on, but understands the idea that you need to protect the residential neighborhoods. David Brody felt this sounds too arbitrary. Lawrence will change to discuss the issue in general. Kate felt a residential house right next to Main Street is successful. She gave the example of Los Robles; that’s where it’s unsuccessful. It’s more successful near Reist Street. There is a medium box abutting a residential. Paul Iskalo gave a couple of examples – this is a problem at the former Stereo Advantage Lifetime Service Center. The parking was and is inadequate. In order to rectify the situation they had to take down one residential house. This was necessary to provide parking to accommodate visitors and parking. The parcel was rezoned. That’s a busy street. Kate talked about the back end of the property. Paul felt this didn’t apply because it’s all commercial.

Chuck Akers stated that we’re living with problems that were created before us. David Brody discussed the fact that needs change over time. Is the committee saying that if you have to remove one or two of the homes in the Village to resolve the parking problem that the committee is against this? The plan should look forward so that as needs change over time there is flexibility. He is concerned about hard and fast rules. Lawrence interjected and stated that there are perspectives on both sides. A lot of this has to do with the way that current development is done now. It’s a complicated issue and discussed that the seam between residential and commercial needs to be sensitively approached. Vic Paquet felt that the people who live here don’t want to see residential neighborhoods compromised. Paul felt that at the same time they are the first to say they want to see a vibrant Main Street with cafes and businesses. Chuck Rizzone felt that the key that is missing here is the buffer. That is what’s missing in this whole discussion. Maybe something should be put in pertaining to this. Lawrence stated that he thinks this comes down to zoning. He will think about this and come back with something that can build consensus among everyone.

Paul Iskalo feels you can do a lot with good landscape design and lighting. Taking up more space exacerbates the problem. Separation is good in suburban Amherst, but doesn’t apply here. Kate agreed 100%, but cited the Hampton. You can put in all the landscaping you want, but you still have a huge parking lot. It is out of scale in that area.

David Brody feels there is a tension that is always going to exist, and that there should be recognition of this in the Plan to put it in perspective.

Vic Paquet asked if the committees have been added to the Draft Plan. Lawrence is waiting on all the comments prior to making changes. Lawrence felt there could be an upfront discussion on all the committees in the Village instead of trying to plug all the various committees into the plan. David Brody’s preference would be to leave it up to the Village Board, since not all committees are decision making bodies. Kate clarified that HPC is decision making. Lawrence would prefer not to include every committee throughout. Dan suggested stating “involved agencies”. Vic suggested “committees as appropriate”. Vic is concerned that if a committee isn’t tasked, the Board will ignore the committee. Lawrence will put something up front.

Chris Church stated you can put the DOT as having the responsibility, but it won't mean responsibility to them. Paul Iskalo suggested that listing someone as a tool would be helpful. It's helpful to have a suggestion as to who is responsible.

Lawrence will say "involved parties" and add text up front listing all the committees in the Village, as well as a statement to the effect that "the Village Board will allocate to the appropriate committees."

### ***Section 3 - Transportation***

Chris Church commented that overall he doesn't see any major problems with the plan. The most negative comment is to not get too specific with recommendations and paint yourself into a corner. David Brody commented that when the development is proposed, it could be looked at in more detail.

Paul asked if Chris supports prohibiting cul-de-sacs; Chris responded he very much supports prohibiting them.

The rest of Chris' comments were very detailed (lane width, etc.). He stated that Main Street is very constrained. Chuck Rizzone asked about the corner of Union and Main Street – figure 19 after page 54 – he would like a definition of bump-out. Chris commented that bump-outs have the effect of slowing down traffic. Dan Howard commented that it constrains Main Street so that drivers aren't as comfortable driving through. Chris Church stated that bump-outs will also provide a shorter distance for pedestrians to cross. Chuck wondered if he would be protected in that bump-out area. Dan stated yes, it's curbed in. Carolyn Schlifke suggested going out to Batavia to see a bump-out. Chuck Akers commented that there is one at Dick Road and Genesee. It slows down traffic. Dan Howard stated that it also gives pedestrians better visibility of the road.

David Brody's biggest criticism is that there aren't more bump-outs. Chris Church pointed out an issue that while bump-outs are wonderful for pedestrians, they are hard for DOT plows which are one-man plows. Their policy is that they do not plow parking lanes where there are bump-outs, so the Village would have to clear those parking spaces. The snow from the rest of the road will end up in that parking lane. Lawrence asked if there were 1,000 feet between the bump-outs, will the DOT not plow the lane. Chris replied that the Village is so small. You can put them in strategic spots or everywhere, but it will have consequences.

David Brody suggested that a recommendation should be to find out how much it would be to remove that snow. Another issue is not having a sidewalk in the winter time. Paul Iskalo felt this is a key issue that needs to be dealt with. Lawrence felt it's a concept that's embraced, and that we need to move forward. Paul Iskalo felt that you shouldn't give an easy out by putting a study in - it gives an excuse not to act. The committee seemed to be in agreement. Chris stated that when the time comes to build these, the Village will have to work with the DOT. Dan felt the concept the committee wants to pursue is what should be in here. The plan is more concerned with what is a good idea for the Village, and not the details of working these things out. The committee discussed having bump-outs on one side only. David Brody feels we're limiting ourselves with the picture in the plan. David Vitka wondered if we are taking bus stops into consideration. The detail of the bump-outs and crosswalks was discussed. There was some rationale for where they were put in the depiction, but more detailed study will need to be performed before construction. David Brody felt there should be language that many of the depictions are conceptual in nature. Chris church pointed out that right on the bottom of the depiction it is stated "concept".

Lawrence stated that you won't build from the concept. It's better than showing a typical section, but not the detailed plan. David Brody thinks this was hinted at on page 5 under How to Use the Plan. Maybe this could be stated more definitively. Lawrence will put more language in front of this section to set it up.

Chuck Rizzone asked if we could ask for a statement from the DOT for a plan like this. Typically would it take 10 years of planning before it was completed? Chris Church stated that he doesn't think that anything like this has been dealt with to be built. If you had a project on the books with the DOT, you are talking a minimum of 3 to 5 years. Practically, you are planning to figure out what you want to do for a project. This would be more than 5 years. David Brody discussed the reconfiguration of Broadway. It took at least 7 years to complete the process. The planning was 2 years, a couple of years for design and another one or two years to build. Chuck Akers asked about the time frame to re-top Main Street. This is probably 10 to 12 years away. Chris church commented that there are a lot of smaller things you can do more quickly, such as count-down timers at crosswalks. Smaller projects can be done, especially if the village is willing to fund them. Medians can be installed relatively easily. You should figure out what your objectives are and what you want to have done. You should put together a plan like this, and then figure out how to implement it. Paul Iskalo asked if the installation of signals is based on traffic warrants, and not on pedestrian warrants.

Dan Howard stated that the job here is to establish a vision, and a preferred alternative for Main Street. This should save time in the future. He asked if there is enough here to give the DOT guidance from the Village as to where they want to go. Chris felt there was enough here. He does not want to discourage the committee from putting in here what they want to see.

Dan Howard asked if there is a way to prioritize the transportation recommendations.. Chris replied that there are smaller contracts that can be done relatively quickly, but the Village would have to request this and the resources would have to be available. Dan asked about, for example, the Mill Village concept, starting in the core and working out – is this approach reasonable? Chris thought it was a valid approach. David Brody mentioned the Business Improvement District (BID). Batavia improved much of their area with matching grants through the BID. It is feasible to raise the funds in other ways than the DOT. David felt the BID could have bonding authority as well. Lawrence will clarify building from the center and moving out geographically. Dan Howard referred to page 40 – it would be reasonable to start in the C-5 area. Lawrence felt it would make sense to start in the priority areas. You just want to make sure there is a consistent look. Vic Paquet felt that the Village is headed in that direction. Dave Vitka added that the area from Union to Los Robles has nowhere to cross. Chris Church added that while signals at intersections are most convenient for the DOT, it is not the only possibility. Villages do have crossings mid-block. You may have to signalize a mid-block cross-walk due to the traffic issues in the core area. Paul Iskalo suggested choosing one mid-block cross-walk that is the most critical and will have the most impact. Lawrence will consult with Steve Ferranti from SRF. Paul felt it must be justifiable as an area where a lot of people cross or park on one side of the street, and want to cross to the other side (i.e. the area between Town Hall and the Mill). Lawrence will look with Steve and come up with some ideas. Ed Zabel asked about the power lines. The process of burying the lines was discussed. Dan Howard stated that you have to go to the utility and ask them to do that. Paul asked why they would do it; there's not much incentive. It's incredibly expensive. Lawrence stated it will sometimes be done when there is a large construction project being undertaken.

Ed Zabel thought burying the utilities would be first step before you move on with others. Dan Howard felt this isn't something the Village should wait for. The utility could be approached and the Village could find out what their plans are.

Chuck Rizzone asked about page 62, and wondered if it is realistic to put costs in the plan? The numbers are ballpark, and somewhat accurate. Lawrence felt it was better to take a stab at the cost estimates. If you don't put them in, the public will comment that there are great ideas in the Plan, but will question what the cost would be. Chris Church thought that some estimates were fine, but thought that the amount stated for striping of parking spaces was low. Steve Ferranti felt these were accurate costs. Chuck Rizzone said he would like to be as realistic as possible.

Carolyn Schlifke discussed bicycle lanes, and wondered how many bicycles you see on Main Street. She feels there is too much traffic. Because of the close proximity of the street and sidewalk, she would rather see a wider pedestrian realm and parking used in that area, not a bicycle lane. Lawrence stated that the preferred Alternative 2 does not include bike lanes. The environment is already constrained. The committee agreed that they will not actively pursue adding a bike lane on Main Street. In addition, the idea of being able to circumvent Main Street via the proposed greenway will help. Carolyn felt the further away the businesses can be from the traffic, the better. Lawrence felt it could be looked at in the future if the conditions of Main Street change. Carolyn agreed with this approach.

Vic Paquet discussed the Main Street Context Zones on page 40 and felt the figures could be clearer. He felt it should be clarified that the context zones do not continue north or south of Main Street. Kate felt the labels are hard to see. Vic also felt that figure 10 on page 44 was hard to see. Dan Howard commented that these are easier to read when they are in color.

David Brody stated that on page 47 the picture shows a bump-out that doesn't appear on Alternative 2. These are conceptual in nature and that is why they are different.

Dan Howard commented on page 54 and asked the committee if it is preferable to have the trees in the median or along the sidewalk where there are median treatments. The committee felt they were better in both areas. Chris Church stated that there is an issue with survivability of trees. Lawrence felt the median was just wide enough to support trees. Ideally it would be better if it was wider. Chuck Akers discussed the use of Cornell University structural soil (CUSS) to help the trees survive. One of the issues in the median is the size of the tree; the Tree Board has been looking at staying on the sidewalk and using CUSS. Lawrence felt this is too specific at this point, and should be addressed when it happens. Carolyn used the UB area as an example. Things other than trees can be used. Lawrence felt you should use trees wherever possible, but that it doesn't need to be planned out at this time. Chuck Akers stated that lilacs were the tree chosen by the Tree Board so as to have a signature of a downtown village.

Vic Paquet clarified that in figure 23, S. Ellicott is shown as a one-way street, but it is not.

### ***Section 5 - Village Focus Areas***

David Brody stated that he liked this entire section. The rest of the Committee seemed to be in agreement.

Lawrence asked about the Long Street issue as it pertains to density. He then gave a presentation as to how he came up with the different densities and referenced a book called

“Visualizing Density.” He hoped this would create consensus among the committee members.

Paul Iskalo stated that if you have industrial zoned areas that you want to change, it is cost prohibitive to put only two or three homes in. If you want to incentivize industrial to be turned into residential, you have to allow enough density for someone to come in, buy the property, abate it, reclaim it, and then build residential. If you don't do that, it will stay the way it is. Lawrence added that while everything is not allowable, you do have to have some level of economics. He also felt the committee was in favor of different types of housing. Chuck Rizzone felt there wasn't a lot of resident comment on this. The rest of the committee felt that we had input at the public meetings. Vic Paquet felt that redevelopment in a denser fashion is an issue in the Village. Lawrence clarified that what he is showing applies to higher density areas. What is in place now with Exceptional Development isn't the best mechanism. Character and scale are often more important than density.

Density was then discussed. Under the current code, 17 units per acre are allowable, which equates to 15 units per acre built density.

Kate Waterman-Kulpa was concerned that the park land is protected already and we should be talking about density without the park land being included. Lawrence stated he could make the calculation without the park land. It bumps it up somewhat higher. Chuck Rizzone compared this to taking a house on Mill Street and saying its low density because of Amherst State Park. Paul Iskalo asked what we have heard that the residents want to see there. Kate stated they would like to transition the industrial into residential. She feels the residents want to see a similar density of single or 2-family homes. Paul Iskalo discussed the market reality. There is a small possibility that it could be cost effective at some point to have this type of housing, but it is highly unlikely. If it's not achievable, what's the next solution? Kate reminded him that the Plan should put forth what is the ideal. Chuck Rizzone thought that due to the same reasoning of feasibility, there is a 4-story hotel on Los Robles, and feels this caused a loss of character in the Village. We can still take the small park land and make it a better park land in the mean time. Lawrence stated that the plan addresses this. Chuck felt there's a lot more you can do with the park – plant flowers and trees, add a fountain or a gazebo. Dan stated that this would address the current park land, but not the other land that is around the park and is not desirable as industrial. Paul clarified so the committee did not misunderstand his comments; he is not a home builder or a residential builder, but is trying to explain the realities of the situation. David Brody stated when he talks 4 or 5 or 6 stories, he is talking in the Main Street area, not other areas. He is concerned about parking and green space. Density gives you the ability to do all the other things you want to do. If the issue isn't just density, but the size and scale and look of the buildings, maybe we can build buildings that are very nice. There are beautiful neighborhoods in urban settings that are 5 and 6 stores high. We have a sense that density is negative. If it's controlled, it can answer a lot of questions. There are trade-offs and incentives that can be given to achieve other things that are important to the plan. He asked that people not be so afraid of density in the right places. Chuck Akers stated we're talking about a piece of property that is a park and is industrial. Something will happen there. Lawrence also reminded the Committee that we're talking about 9 or 10 developable acres, not a relatively large area. The amount of change to the Village is small.

Lawrence asked if the committee was comfortable with the range. David Brody talked about throwing in the FAR (floor area ratio) with the densities. It is the Planning Board's job is to make sure the built form conforms to the Village. Lawrence stated that you can't get that detailed in the plan. He will emphasize that this is very conceptual. The top end of the range

is comparable to, or lower than the Evans St. apartments. Something a little denser and a little more interesting fits with the Village character. David Vitka talked about providing density and density of age. People can't carry the baggage of the yard and the house any more. There are people that are looking for this. This is an opportunity to realize some of those goals. The idea is to enliven that space and improve it. It's kind of at the low end of more dense housing. David Brody asked again about working something in with FAR. Lawrence felt this would pin it down a little more than we want to. Dan referred back to the high density residential discussion on page 14. There is then an area in the back that speaks specifically to this. If that is the concern, then make sure the description is what you want it to be. The front part is broader guidance for a geographical area. Maybe the concept of FAR can be explained a little more, although it's not usually applied to residential areas. Paul Iskalo felt this was in keeping with what is out there already, and what has been built in the Village in areas such as this. Dan added that this will guide the zoning. You don't need to get too detailed at this level, and just want to provide the guidance. Kate clarified that she was not okay with this density. Dan asked if it should be a broader range. He felt that the land use map doesn't say that. Lawrence was trying to find a way to provide some variety of housing with some good guidance of how to knit this into the Village. Paul stated we are trying to define that the definition of high density residential. Lawrence asked if maximum of 16 units per acre was acceptable. Kate feels there should be less dense development in the Village and that the current zoning is incorrect. Joelle added that the density isn't really the most important issue, it's how it's designed. The number is important because it's a way to start. The committee was split on this issue. The top of the range is 16 units, which is below what the code allows for now. The bottom of the range could be dropped from 8 dwelling units per acre to 4. This will allow single-family through higher residential to be included. Paul Iskalo feels strongly that the Village is made up of many different character types. There is a lot of single family residential now. The plan talks about diversity, serving the elderly, etc. In order to accomplish those things you need to have some areas of density. There are very few areas that have that level of density. If you water down the few areas you have, you're back to all single family homes. By defining areas that would be 8 to 16 units per acre, the guide is for opportunities to provide for diversity. Vic Paquet is uncomfortable because we haven't gone through the Village and systematically identified these areas. The rest of these areas are already high density residential. Paul and Wally felt the committee has spent a lot of time on this and already identified these areas. You are not going to change single-family to high density. If that isn't going to happen, you can only look to areas that seem to be out of context. Lawrence stated there are 8 acres of land not including the park. Dan Howard added that the committee talked last week about transition and changing things to be more consistent with what's around it. There are a lot of way you can design this. Paul Iskalo added that the Planning Board would review anything that was proposed. Lawrence will change this area to state that 4 to 16 units per acre are allowable.

### ***Section 6 - Conclusions & Implementation***

Dave Brody clarified with Lawrence that "cider operation" will be changed.

Lawrence felt that many of the conclusions will be implemented into the last section. He asked if everyone could e-mail any comments they may have in the next couple of days.

The next step is to modify the plan and get it back to the committee by October 30<sup>th</sup>. The committee will meet on November 6<sup>th</sup> to review the changes. We will then hold a public hearing, perhaps on December 4<sup>th</sup>.

Lawrence stated that Long Street seems to be the most contentious issue. There are many other good ideas in the plan.

David Brody stated that we may get additional input from the public, and that we may change our minds after that public input.

Chuck Rizzone asked about additional future use of the mill from the Mill Committee. Kate suggested that this hasn't been determined yet.

### **NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting will be November 6<sup>th</sup> at 6:00 PM.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Thomas Frank, Jr., 225 C Evans Street

Mr. Frank discussed \$3M per year that Erie County will get regarding national historic district designation, the re-licensing settlement, consistency of the Plan with the Town of Amherst Master Plan, transportation issues and seasonal speed bumps; GBNRTC and the relocation of the thruway toll barrier, and Brownfield restoration.

### **CLOSE OF MEETING**

On motion by Chuck Akers, seconded by David Brody, the meeting was closed at 9:52 PM.

Unanimously Carried.