

Planning Board
TOWN OF BRUNSWICK
336 Town Office Road
Troy, New York 12180

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD April 5, 2012

PRESENT were CHAIRMAN RUSSELL OSTER, MICHAEL CZORNYJ, FRANK ESSER, KEVIN MAINELLO, DAVID TARBOX and VINCE WETMILLER.

ABSENT was GORDON CHRISTIAN.

ALSO PRESENT were JOHN KREIGER, Code Enforcement Officer, and MARK KESTNER, Consulting Engineer to the Planning Board.

Chairman Oster reviewed the business agenda for the April 5 Planning Board meeting which includes the site plan application of McCauley (public hearing at 7:00 p.m.), commercial subdivision and site plan application by Reiser Bros. (public hearing to continue at 7:15 p.m.), and amendment to site plan by Johnston Associates.

The Planning Board opened the public hearing on the site plan application of Charles McCauley. Attorney Gilchrist read the Notice of Public Hearing into the record, stating that the notice had been published in The Troy Record, placed on the Town Sign Board, mailed to all owners of adjoining properties, and was placed on the Town website. Chairman Oster requested the Applicant to give an overview of the proposal. Mr. McCauley generally reviewed the site plan, which proposes to site and operate a seasonal ice cream concession trailer to be located at the Tamarac Plaza on Route 2. Mr. McCauley generally reviewed the trailer location, electrical hookup to the trailer, water usage, wastewater handling, area proposed for picnic tables, and seasonal operation from May 1 to Columbus Day, generally 3:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. Chairman Oster then opened the floor for receipt of public comment. Joe Castiglione, 4005 Route 2, owner

of Guiseppi's and the Sunoco Station, stated that he operates a permanent establishment, not a temporary one, and that he is required to have full water and septic with full bathrooms, and he anticipates that any patrons of this seasonal concession trailer will simply walk over and use the bathrooms at his store rather than have bathrooms available for this seasonal concession trailer, that he pays taxes based on operating 12 full months not on a temporary basis, that ice cream sales will be messy and require multiple cleanups and should require bathroom facilities, and that he is concerned that his bathrooms will be used to support this temporary concession trailer.

James Tachik, 387 Brunswick Road, questioned why a proposed tenant is the Applicant on this site plan application, rather than the landlord, and that the landlord should be required to be present, and further questioned whether any approval for this site plan application would be limited to Mr. McCauley, or could be transferred to a different tenant, and whether the approval would be limited only to ice cream concession or any retail use. Chairman Oster did respond that a proposed tenant or contract vendee can be an appropriate Applicant on the site plan application, in the event there is written authorization by the underlying property owner in the file. In this case, there is written authorization by the underlying property owner for this site plan application.

Frank Brennanstuhl, 27 Dusenberry Lane, questioned why this proposal is not being located in one of the empty storefronts in the existing plaza, and if it will be approved for an outside temporary trailer location, then the location should be on the side of the facility and not out on the front grassed area, that children from the soccer fields will be walking very close to Route 2 and across an access road and parking lot which raises a safety issue, and whether the same rules regarding signs are applicable to a temporary seasonal concession trailer as opposed to the plaza building. Chairman Oster responded that while the Planning Board had previously discussed the option of installing a gate in the fence between the soccer fields and the Brunswick

Plaza, this was merely a suggestion, and that the Applicant did speak with the Town of Brunswick, which owns the fence, and determined that the fence was installed for two primary reasons, including the fact the plaza owner at that time did not want parents of soccer players parking in the plaza parking lot and walking to the soccer fields, and that the Town was not in favor of having kids from the soccer fields walking over to the plaza through the parking lot. Chairman Oster reiterated that the addition of a gate to that fence was not a requirement of the Planning Board, but merely an option to investigate, which the Applicant complied with. Chairman Oster confirmed that the Town of Brunswick is not in favor of placing a gate in the fence between the soccer fields and the Brunswick Plaza. Hearing no further comment, the Planning Board closed the public hearing on the McCauley site plan.

The Planning Board then continued the public hearing on the subdivision and site plan application by Reiser Bros. for property located on NYS Route 2 and NYS Route 278. Attorney Gilchrist read the Notice of Public Hearing into the record, stating that the notice had been published in The Troy Record, placed on the Town Sign Board, mailed to owners of property adjacent to the project site and also to owners within the Langmore Lane neighborhood, and also placed on the Town website. Chairman Oster requested that the Applicant present an overview of the project, including the most recent project changes. Scott Reese, on behalf of the Applicant, stated that the proposal now included a three-lot subdivision of property located in the B-15 Zoning District, that on one lot located at the corner of Route 278 and Route 2 a gas station/convenience store is being proposed, that on the next lot to the south located along Route 2 a restaurant/bank/retail building is being proposed (with no current specific tenant or final end use), and that the third commercial lot located at the intersection of Route 2 and Langmore Lane is vacant and not being proposed for current construction. Mr. Reese reviewed the revised on-

site septic plan, and the increased greenspace for the project site. Mr. Reese also reviewed the soil/gravel removal plan, which given the project revisions has resulted in less total volume of material proposed to be removed from the site. Chairman Oster stated that this application had been the subject of a previous public hearing which had been left open, and that given the changes to the application, the Planning Board felt it appropriate to continue the public hearing so as to allow the public to become aware of the proposed project changes and be allowed to comment. Chairman Oster then opened the floor for receipt of public comment. Kathy Murray, 69 North Langmore Lane, and president of the Tamarac Regional Homeowners Association, stated that this area is known for its scenic vistas, rolling hills, quality of rural life setting, aesthetic values, rural lifestyles, and a very peaceful location; that the subdivision plan for the Brook Hill Subdivision did not show anything concerning a commercial development being pursued along Route 2 and Route 278, and that the possibility of future commercial development was left wide open with no pre-planning; that this proposal would change the rural character of the area; that Route 2 is a scenic byway; that there are no sidewalks or bike lanes on Route 2 for safety; that this area cannot safely handle additional traffic which would be generated from this project; that the Town's Master Plan states that development should not impair the quality of life; that if this project is completed it would result in increased asphalt, dumpsters, lights, noise, and traffic congestion; that the area cannot support three gasoline stations for only 1,300 people living in the Cropseyville area; that even if this is built, it may result in another empty mall or retail location; that the Applicant "accepted by default" restriction on commercial development by pursuing residential development in the Brook Hill Subdivision first; that this entire proposal should be reviewed rather than being reviewed in bits and pieces; and also handed up written comments to the Planning Board dated April 5, 2012 for the project file; and that a petition

signed by almost 50 residents of the Brook Hill Subdivision and Tamarac area homeowners association was handed up for the file. Kathryn Romano, 15 Brook Hill Drive, stated that her property was directly above the Route 2/Route 278 intersection; that when she bought her property from the Applicant there was discussion of “small quaint shops”, with no mention of a gas station, convenience store, restaurant or sports bar; that the size and height of the buildings are not appropriate; that this proposal will negatively impact her quality of life; that her property will be impacted by odors and smells of cooking; she is concerned about a sports bar and the serving of alcohol; that a bar/restaurant should not be allowed so close to Tamarac School; that a bar/restaurant could give rise to violence; that this proposal will result in increased noise and traffic; that she will be impacted by dumpsters located behind these proposed buildings; that the proposed berms and buffers will not work, resulting in a very stressful and potentially unhealthy impact; that this site is too small for the proposed uses; questioned whether there was any noise ordinance in the Town; and that this project should be denied; and further handing up a copy of written comments dated April 5, 2012 for the file. Gary Washock, 13 Long Hill Road, commented on increased traffic, safety concerns, stormwater compliance with wetlands and streams in close proximity, and stated he agreed with the concerns of both Kathy Murray and Kathryn Romano, and that this project should be denied. Jane Qualkensteen, 81 North Langmore Lane, stated she had moved into her home in 2011, that the area is quiet and scenic and light pollution will impact the ability to see stars at night, questions how this project can move forward when there are restrictions on her property as to location of clotheslines due to the beauty of the area. Gladys Washock, 13 Long Hill Road, also agreed that light pollution would impact the scenic quality of the area and the ability to see stars, that this would remove the quality of life, that a third gas station in this immediate location is ridiculous, that this would

only result in chaos, and that the Applicant should think about the community that they are intruding on. Shawn Nealon, 54 Wygmore Lane, stated that he is a lifelong resident of the Town of Brunswick, that he welcomes this proposal, that he thinks competition is good, that providing more opportunities keeps business and money in the Town of Brunswick, that Route 7 and Route 2 are the only major arteries in Town and that they must locate businesses there, that the Town must have businesses to mitigate residential property taxes, that this is a reasonable proposal, and that the proposed new commercial uses will be good for the residents of the Town. James Gardner, 11 Brook Hill Drive, stated that between the existing Stewart's Shop, the trucks from the quarries, and Tamarac School there is already noise and light pollution in this area; that he has had many discussions with Henry Reiser, and that he is not opposed to commercial development at this location if the development is done properly; that he is definitely not in favor of having a sports bar located at this site; that this area is not the idyllic situation that other speakers have created, and that the Applicant should be given a chance to address all issues raised by the public; and that given the proximity of his property to the project site, he has more to lose than anyone from this project other than the Murray's. Brenda Beaudoin, 46 Buck Road, stated that her daughter and granddaughter had recently moved into the Brook Hill Subdivision; that while the Town needs commercial development, a sports bar and a gas station at this location is not a good idea; that this proposal will result in unreasonable traffic and safety impacts. Chairman Oster noted that he had discussed the application documents with Mr. Kestner, and that apparently the application drawings are not complete, and that a full stormwater report had not yet been submitted, and therefore he is recommending that the public hearing remain open. Chairman Oster repeated that the purpose of reconvening the public hearing were to get the initial comments of the surrounding property owners, and that the

Applicant will need to respond to these comments. It was the unanimous opinion of the Planning Board members that the public hearing should be kept open, and adjourned to be reconvened at a later date.

The Planning Board then opened the regular business meeting.

The draft minutes of the March 15, 2012 meeting were reviewed. Upon motion of Member Czornyj, seconded by Member Wetmiller, the minutes of the March 15, 2012 meeting were unanimously approved as drafted.

The first item of business on the agenda was the site plan application by Charles McCauley to conduct a seasonal ice cream concession trailer to be located at the Tamarac Plaza on Route 2. Chairman Oster noted that the McCauley site plan now includes the area noted for picnic table use and the crosswalk on the access road to the parking lot. Member Mainello inquired whether the picture of the façade of the concession trailer is part of the record, and whether that specific façade will be binding on this proposal. Attorney Gilchrist stated that the picture of the façade of the concession trailer is part of this application file, and the Planning Board can condition any action on this application to require that specific trailer façade or equivalent. Chairman Oster inquired what the rear of the concession trailer would look like from the Route 2 vantage point. Mr. McCauley stated that it would look like the rear of a small house, somewhat similar to the sheds being sold at the Shed-Man business on Route 2. Chairman Oster confirmed that Mr. McCauley had spoken with the Town of Brunswick concerning a gate to be installed in the fence between the soccer fields and the Brunswick Plaza lot, and that the Town was not in favor of installing a gate since the fence was initially put in at the request of the plaza owner to avoid parents of soccer players parking in the plaza parking lot and walking to the soccer fields, and also to reduce the events of children walking from the soccer field area into the

parking lot at the Brunswick Plaza. Chairman Oster confirmed that the Applicant did address this issue. Member Czornyj stated that he still had a significant concern regarding children walking in close proximity to Route 2 to get around the fence to get to the ice cream concession trailer from the soccer fields, and that the ice cream concession trailer would be attractive to small kids who might be at the soccer fields. Mr. McCauley responded that there was already a crosswalk across Route 2 at the location between the soccer fields and the Brunswick Plaza near the fence, and that in his opinion there was at least 13 feet between the end of the fence and the shoulder of Route 2, which should provide adequate room for any children walking from the soccer fields to the Brunswick Plaza. Member Czornyj thought that this safety issue should be studied further, and inquired whether the Planning Board could require a study of that issue. Attorney Gilchrist stated that the Planning Board could require additional information on that safety issue in the event the Planning Board deemed it significant. Mr. McCauley responded that he had already agreed to install a crosswalk across the entrance road to the parking lot, and that kids may already be coming from the soccer fields to the Brunswick Plaza to go to the Subway Shop and the other shops located in the plaza. Member Czornyj asked who would paint the crosswalk and maintain it. Mr. McCauley stated that he would paint the crosswalk and maintain it. Chairman Oster asked whether the trailer would be removed at the end of the season. Mr. McCauley stated that he planned to move the trailer off the Brunswick Plaza site at the end of the season, and bring it back in the Spring. Member Tarbox stated that he was also concerned about the safety of children and could not support this application the way it is now because it is an attraction to small kids from the soccer fields going over to the concession trailer near Route 2 and through the parking lot at the Brunswick Plaza, and stated that he felt this project should also not be approved since there was existing open retail spaces in the Brunswick Plaza in which this

business could locate. Chairman Oster also agreed that this Brunswick Plaza has several empty retail spaces, and rather than locating a concession trailer near the parking lot or on the greenspace, this business should be located in one of the existing empty retail spaces. Chairman Oster stated that it did not make sense to him to allow a concession trailer to be located on the greenspace when there were open and unused retail spaces in the existing plaza building. Mr. McCauley stated that a concession trailer is easier to approve with the Rensselaer County Health Department. Also, Mr. McCauley stated that there could be bathroom facilities available in the existing plaza building, rather than kids going over to the Sunoco Station. Member Czornyj stated that this raises another concern that kids would now be going through the front parking lot from the concession trailer area to go to the bathroom within the plaza building. Member Czornyj also was concerned that Mr. McCauley's site plan showed a crosswalk having been painted from the used car sales location to the Brunswick Plaza retail buildings, but that in fact that crosswalk had never been painted as required on the site plan for the used car sales. Member Czornyj asked whether the Planning Board could require compliance with the prior used car sales site plan before acting on any further site plans for the Brunswick Plaza. Attorney Gilchrist stated that it was within the Planning Board's discretion to require any outstanding compliance issues be resolved prior to acting on an additional site plan for this location. Member Tarbox asked whether this site plan would be limited to Mr. McCauley's use of a concession trailer. Attorney Gilchrist stated that the site plan would not be limited to Mr. McCauley, but would rather be an approved use at the Brunswick Plaza in the future, but such approval would be limited to ice cream concession, at the specific location depicted on the site plan, with a specific trailer façade or style if required by the Planning Board. Member Wetmiller inquired whether the site plan would need to be modified if there were any changes to the

wastewater or septic proposal. Attorney Gilchrist stated that an amendment to the site plan would be required if a change to the site was necessitated, but that the Planning Board had no jurisdiction over the septic or wastewater compliance. Mr. Kestner did state that he had contacted the Rensselaer County Health Department regarding this proposal, and that the County Health Department had no record of any applications having been made for this facility. Chairman Oster inquired of the Board members as to their opinion of this proposal. Member Esser stated that Member Czornyj makes a valid point regarding the safety of children, and that he would support the proposal if the trailer were located on the east side of the access road to the Brunswick Plaza parking lot, and a gate were installed in the fence between the Brunswick Plaza and the soccer fields, but that he was not in favor of the proposal as currently presented. Member Mainello stated that he did not have any problem with the site plan as proposed, if in fact there was strict compliance with the site plan limitations and requirements. Member Czornyj stated that he had significant concern regarding safety, and was also of the opinion that this matter should not proceed until all compliance issues regarding this prior site plan for the used car sales area are resolved. Member Wetmiller stated that he was concerned regarding an additional use in the parking lot area or the greenspace area at the Brunswick Plaza when there are existing retail spaces that are vacant within the plaza building. Member Tarbox stated that he was concerned regarding safety, and cannot support this proposal in its current form. Chairman Oster stated that he tended to agree with Member Wetmiller, and that while he had no problem in concept with an ice cream concession trailer, he felt that its approval at this location was not proper since there were a number of empty retail spaces in the plaza building which could be utilized for this use. Mr. McCauley stated that the project would probably not work financially if there was a requirement to locate the ice cream concession within one of the existing tenant

spaces in the plaza building, and that the concession trailer proposal could work economically given the more limited Health Department requirements. Based on this discussion, the Planning Board directed Attorney Gilchrist to prepare a proposed resolution for action on the site plan. This matter is placed on the April 19 agenda for further discussion.

The next item of business on the agenda was the subdivision and site plan application by Reiser Bros. Inc. for property located at NYS Route 2 and NYS Route 278. Chairman Oster noted that there were several public comments which the Applicant will need to address. Mr. Reese initially responded that a proposed use of the commercial building proposed for the second lot to the south of the proposed gas station/convenience store is a 3,500± square foot building which is designed for potential multiple options, and that the design was made for the maximum needs for one of the potential end uses, which happens to be a bar/restaurant, which requires the greatest number of parking spaces as well as a larger area for the septic system, and therefore the lot has been designed for the maximum potential end uses allowable under the zoning code. Mr. Reese stated that while a restaurant or bar could be a potential end use for this commercial building, there is no definite end use being proposed. Chairman Oster then had Mr. Kreiger review all of the allowable uses within the B-15 Zone. Mr. Kreiger reviewed the zoning code, and recited all of the allowable uses within the B-15 Zoning District under the Brunswick Zoning Code. Chairman Oster confirmed that there is a distinction between the zoning of the site, and the site plan review undertaken by the Planning Board. Chairman Oster stated that the Planning Board does not determine the allowable uses at the site, but rather the allowable uses are listed in the Brunswick Zoning Code and placed on the Brunswick Zoning Map. Rather, the Planning Board reviews site plans pursuant to the Site Plan Review Standards for any of the allowable uses under the Brunswick Zoning Code. Mr. Reese then continued, stating that the proposed

sizes of these commercial lots need only be 15,000 square feet under the Brunswick Zoning Code, and that lots of a size of 111,000± square feet are being proposed; that under the Brunswick Zoning Code, the maximum lot coverage for this location is 40% of the lot, whereas only 3% is being proposed on this site plan; that the commercial buildings being proposed are 3,500-4,000± square feet, whereas many of the homes in the Brook Hill Subdivision are in the range of 2,000 square feet; that the proposed commercial buildings will be limited to 35 feet in height, have peaked roofs with shingles, in an effort to have the buildings fit within the character of the area; that the Site Plan Regulations in Brunswick require only 35% greenspace, whereas this proposal is for 74% greenspace; that the proposed roof elevations for the commercial buildings will be below the proposed berm height to be constructed at the rear of the project site; that down-lighting is being proposed to reduce light spillage; that the proposed entrances to the commercial lots have been identified and approved by the New York State Department of Transportation; that under the original proposal for this project approximately 130,000 cubic yards of material was proposed to be removed off-site, and with the project modifications that amount has been reduced to approximately 50,000 cubic yards; that in terms of the general character of the area, there are already gas stations, convenience stores, and restaurants located along Route 2; that in terms of stormwater, the Applicant will be required to follow all NYSDEC Stormwater Requirements; and that the potential environmental impacts of this project still need to be reviewed under SEQRA. Chairman Oster noted that some of the public commented that this area does not need another gas station, convenience store, or restaurant, and asked whether the Applicant had conducted any market study. Mr. Reese stated that the proposals were a business decision by the Applicant, and were allowable uses under the Brunswick Zoning Code. Chairman Oster wanted to confirm that a full stormwater report had not been submitted yet on

the application. Mr. Reese confirmed that given changes to the project, that a modification to the stormwater report still needed to be prepared to comply with the current NYSDEC Stormwater Regulations, and that report still needs to be submitted to Mr. Kester for review. Chairman Oster noted that many of the comments received from the public were emotional issues, quality of life issues, and addressed aesthetics and character of that location, and that the Applicant will need to address these comments in some manner. Chairman Oster did state that the public was concerned about another restaurant proposal when other restaurants had not been successful along Route 2. Henry Reiser stated that he wanted to keep his options for end use open, and was willing to pursue any of the allowable end uses under the Brunswick Zoning Code. Chairman Oster noted that there was a difference in terms of impacts between a bank and restaurant for example, and the Applicant would need to address this on the record. Mr. Reiser also stated he thought the proposal would actually reduce noise impacts to the Brook Hill and Langmore area from the traffic noises along Route 2 and Route 278. Member Czornyj stated that while there was existing noise during the day, the issue will be potential noise at night, particularly from a restaurant/bar. Chairman Oster stated that the Planning Board needed to digest all the public comments received, both verbal and written, and that the Applicant needed to submit additional information on the application, and therefore this matter is placed on the April 19 agenda for further discussion. The April 19 meeting will not be for purposes of continuing the public hearing, and that the public hearing will be continued upon due notice at a later date. Member Mainello requested Mr. Reiser to submit all restrictions included in the Brook Hill Subdivision lots to the Planning Board for review. Mr. Reiser stated that he would submit a copy of the deed restrictions for the Brook Hill Subdivision. This matter is placed on the April 19 agenda for further discussion.

The next item of business on the agenda was the site plan application submitted by Johnston Associates, to amend the existing site plan for the Brunswick Square Plaza located at Hoosick Road to add a storage shed at the rear of the existing retail building. Paul Engster was present for the Applicant. Mr. Engster confirmed that the application is now limited to installation of the storage facility to the rear of the existing retail buildings, and that the proposal to add an ATM to the front parking lot area has been withdrawn, and if the ATM proposal is pursued by the proposed tenant, that matter will need to proceed to the Town Board for an amendment to the Planned Development District. Mr. Engster confirmed that he had reviewed this matter with Mr. Kreiger concerning the setback requirements for the building location, but ultimately determined with his engineer that the original location proposed worked better on the site for several reasons, including the fact that it was located further away from Route 7 and located more to the rear of the existing building. To address any issues concerning setbacks, the proposed building has been reconfigured to a 20' x 28' footprint, with an appropriate offset from the travel lane behind the retail buildings. The Planning Board then generally discussed building location and stormwater management. The Planning Board also wanted to confirm that this use of the storage facility is restricted to Johnston Associates and tenants in the plaza, and is not available for use by the general public. Mr. Engster confirmed that the use will be so limited. Member Mainello asked what the storage facility would generally be used for. Mr. Engster stated that he would be storing lawnmowers, snowblowers, and have an area for existing tenants to store materials including outdoor chairs and umbrellas, as well as packaging materials for the UPS Store during peak holiday times. The Planning Board members also discussed the proposed height of the storage building as well as its exterior façade, and Mr. Engster stated that he would prepare a rendering to present to the Planning Board for review. The Planning Board raised the

total greenspace issue, and Mr. Engster stated that with the recent amendment to the Brunswick Square PDD adding the former DiGiovanni parcel, the storage facility will not impact total required greenspace. The Planning Board determined that a public hearing would be required for this application, and Mr. Engster concurred. Mr. Engster stated that he would have details regarding the storage facility, including its exterior, prepared for the public hearing. A public hearing has been scheduled for the May 3 meeting to commence at 7:00 p.m. It was also noted that a review letter had been received from the Brunswick No. 1 Fire Department dated April 5, 2012, a copy of which was provided to Mr. Engster. Mr. Engster stated that he had no problem with including a key to the storage shed in the Knox box already installed at the site, but suggested that mounting a fire extinguisher on the exterior of the storage building was not a good idea, and that he would have an extinguisher located inside the storage building. This matter is set for public hearing to commence at 7:00 p.m. at the May 3 meeting.

Three items of new items were discussed.

The first item of new business discussed was a waiver of subdivision application submitted by Julie Harper, 12 Berkshire Drive, Tax Map No. 113.3-1-4.15. The Applicant is seeking to divide 4 acres off an existing 9.2 acre site to be transferred to the adjoining property owner, which will then be merged into the adjoining property owners lot, and not be used for a separate building lot. The Planning Board requested Mr. Kreiger to investigate the location of the existing well and septic on the two lots. This matter is placed on the April 19 agenda.

The second item of new business discussed was a site plan application submitted by Steven Chan, 685 Hoosick Road, Tax Map No. 90.20-11-5, which is the Plum Blossom Restaurant. The Applicant is proposing a building addition to the rear of the restaurant building, which had already been commenced but is now the subject of a stop work order. The Planning

Board requested Mr. Kreiger to clarify the proposed use for the building expansion, which could affect the total required parking spaces for the site. This matter is placed on the April 19 agenda for preliminary review.

The third item of new business discussed was a referral from the Brunswick Town Board of a Planned Development District application by Dave Mulino for installation and operation of a paint ball facility on Oakwood Avenue. This matter is placed on the April 19 agenda for a presentation by the Applicant.

Mr. Kreiger also noted that he has been presented with an application to locate a church in one of the existing retail spaces in the Gateway Plaza on Hoosick Road, but that an issue concerning required total parking spaces needs to be addressed by the Zoning Board of Appeals.

The index for the April 5, 2012 meeting is as follows:

1. McCauley – site plan – 4/19/12;
2. Reiser Bros. Inc. – subdivision and site plan – 4/19/12;
3. Johnston Associates, Inc. – amendment to site plan – 5/3/12 (public hearing to commence at 7:00 p.m.);
4. Harper – waiver of subdivision – 4/19/12;
5. Steven Chan – site plan – 4/19/12;
6. Mulino – PDD referral – 4/19/12.

The proposed agenda for the April 19, 2012 meeting currently is as follows:

1. McCauley – site plan;
2. Reiser Bros. – subdivision and site plan;
3. Harper – waiver of subdivision;
4. Chan (Plum Blossom) – site plan;
5. Mulino – PDD referral.