

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

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING HELD AUGUST 20, 2015**

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

ABSENT was KEVIN MAINELLO.

ALSO PRESENT were MONICA NANN-SMITH, Brunswick Building Department, and WAYNE BONESTEEL, P.E., Review Engineer to the Planning Board.

Chairman Oster reviewed the Agenda for the August 20 meeting.

The Planning Board has noticed a Public Hearing to be held on the site plan application submitted by BBL Construction Services, LLC on behalf of Albany Medical Center for a proposed urgent care facility. Chairman Oster had previously recused himself from consideration of this application, repeated that he is recused from considering this application, and left the Planning Board desk. Member Czornyj took the position of Acting Chair for this site plan application. Member Czornyj reviewed the procedures for Planning Board public hearings. The Notice of Public Hearing was read into the record, with that Notice having been published in the Troy Record, placed on the Town sign board, posted on the Town website, and mailed to owners of adjacent properties. Member Czornyj requested that the applicant present a brief overview of the project. Kevin Moore and Eric Landry of BBL Construction Services, LLC were present for the applicant. Mr. Moore stated that the project entailed the interior renovation of approximately 4,500 square feet of existing space located at the Brunswick Plaza to be fit up as an urgent care facility for Albany Medical Center. Mr. Moore explained that the only exterior renovations included the

addition of an ADA ramp, attachment of an awning over the back entrance for use of ambulance pick-up (if necessary), and the relocation of the entrance door. Member Czornyj opened the floor for receipt of public comment. Debbie Nichols, 249 Hillcrest Avenue, stated that this use was a wonderful idea, that there was a need for this facility in the community, and this would provide a value to Brunswick. Hearing no further public comments, Member Czornyj and the Planning Board closed the Public Hearing on this site plan application.

The Planning Board then opened the regular business meeting.

Member Czornyj then asked the Planning Board Members to review the draft Minutes of the August 6, 2015 meeting. Upon motion of Member Tarbox, seconded by Member Casey, the Minutes of the August 6, 2015 meeting were unanimously approved without amendment (Chairman Oster remained recused from the meeting).

The first item of business on the Agenda was the site plan application submitted by BBL Construction Services, LLC on behalf of Albany Medical Center. Member Czornyj wanted the applicant to confirm that there were no changes to the proposed site plan. The applicant confirmed there were no changes to the proposed site plan. Member Czornyj also wanted to confirm that the Brunswick Building Department had made a determination that this proposed use of the space in the Brunswick Plaza, consisting of an urgent care facility, was consistent with the permitted uses within the Brunswick Plaza Planned Development District. Ms. Nann-Smith confirmed that it was the determination of the Brunswick Building Department that this use is consistent with the uses allowable in the Brunswick Plaza Planned Development District. It was confirmed that the Rensselaer County Department of Planning referral had been received, and that the County Planning Department had no comments and that local consideration shall prevail. Member Czornyj wanted to confirm that there was no proposed use for this facility as an emergency room

or emergency care facility. The applicant stated that the proposed use is for urgent care only, and not for emergency room – type use. Regarding the potential use for ambulance, the applicant explained that this was limited to the situation where a patient came into the urgent care facility with what he presumed was a minor issue, but needed transport to a hospital; in this case, an ambulance would be called and the patient would be picked up via the back door by the ambulance for transport to a hospital facility. Member Czornyj wanted to confirm that the Planning Board was reviewing only the site plan to the extent of providing urgent care facility – type use, and not emergency room – type use; and further, that if any uses in addition to the urgent care facility – type use are proposed, then the applicant will need to apply for an amendment to the site plan which will then need to be reviewed by the Planning Board. The applicant concurred with that statement. Member Tarbox asked which hospital would be used to transport patients. The applicant stated that the choice of hospital was patient-determined. Member Czornyj asked whether any of the Board Members had further questions or comments. Hearing none, Member Casey made a motion to adopt a negative declaration under SEQRA, which motion was seconded by Member Wetmiller. The motion was unanimously approved, and a SEQRA negative declaration adopted. Thereupon, Member Wetmiller made a motion to approve the site plan subject to the condition that if there were any services in addition to the urgent care facility – type use, then an amended site plan would need to be submitted to be reviewed by the Planning Board. Member Tarbox seconded the motion subject to the stated condition. The motion was unanimously approved, and the site plan approved subject to the stated condition.

Chairman Oster then returned to the Planning Board desk for the additional Agenda items.

The next item of business on the Agenda was the site plan application submitted by Arax Properties, LLC for property located at 616-630 Hoosick Road. Chairman Oster noted that there

were members of the public present who were interested in the application, but that the meeting tonight is limited to hearing responses to public comments submitted by the applicant, that additional public comment will not be taken at this meeting, and that the Public Hearing will be continued on notice at a later Planning Board Meeting. Linda Stancliff, RLA of Creighton Manning, was present for the applicant. Ms. Stancliff generally reviewed the site plan, which includes two (2) proposed retail buildings, one being 6,900 square feet and the second being 4,000 square feet; providing a total of 66 parking spaces with single access off Hoosick Road opposite Leonard Avenue. Ms. Stancliff stated that the current site plan submittal has a last revision date of June 18; that the Public Hearing on this site plan was opened on August 6, 2015; and that Creighton Manning had submitted to the Planning Board a written response to the public comments through letter dated August 18, 2015. Ms. Stancliff also confirmed that the applicant was preparing its submission to NYSDOT for its work permit for the driveway entrance off Hoosick Road. Chairman Oster requested that Ms. Stancliff review the August 18, 2015 letter by Creighton Manning. Ms. Stancliff stated that the second retail building, being approximately 4,000 square feet in size, was now limited to retail use and that no restaurant or bar use is being proposed; the hours of operation for this retail plaza will be Monday through Saturday, 7:30 a.m. to 9:00 p.m., and Sunday from 9:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.; that deliveries to this retail plaza would be made by tractor trailer and small truck, to be done during regular business hours, and will include approximately two-three deliveries per week; that the proposed use is in compliance with the Brunswick Zoning Ordinance for the B-15 Zoning District; that no blasting was being proposed for the project construction; that stormwater would leave the site via an existing pipe connection to the New York State drainage system along Hoosick Road, and would not be discharged to Leonard Avenue; that the stormwater plan included an underground chamber for stormwater

maintenance, and that the post-construction run off rate will be less than the current pre-construction run off rate; that a traffic evaluation had been performed for the project, which included traffic trips based on a restaurant use because that was the highest use/most trips generated, even though a restaurant has been eliminated from the application, and the existing traffic evaluation will continue to be used as a worst case scenario; that the traffic evaluation showed an additional 28 trips during the A.M. peak, and 36 new trips during the P.M. peak; that these additional trips compute to two new trips every 2 minutes, which is less than a 2% increase concerning the current volume on Hoosick Road, which is significantly below the threshold criteria to warrant a more detailed traffic evaluation by NYSDOT; that an existing left turn lane exists for Leonard Avenue at the location of the proposed entrance driveway; that this site redevelopment reduces the existing curb cuts at this area of Hoosick Road from 4 to 1, which represents an improvement to the total number of curb cuts at this location; that the project does not meet the signal warrant requirements for the addition of a traffic signal at this location; and that NYSDOT has reviewed the proposed location and configuration of the proposed driveway and found it to be acceptable. Chairman Oster wanted to confirm that the August 18, 2015 response letter prepared by Creighton Manning is part of the application record. Chairman Oster noted that since the restaurant use has been eliminated, the comments concerning odors, dumpsters, and potential vermin have been addressed; that the issue of light spillage has also been addressed in the Creighton Manning August 18 letter; that concerns regarding stormwater runoff have been addressed by Creighton Manning in the August 18 letter; and that as to the issue of impact on property values, Chairman Oster noted that this property has been zoned commercial B-15 since the adoption of zoning in the Town of Brunswick in the late 1950s, and that this proposed use is a permitted use in the B-15 zone, and that this commercial use is in compliance with the

comprehensive plan recently adopted by the Town of Brunswick which seeks to develop the Route 7 corridor for commercial purposes. As to traffic, Chairman Oster noted that traffic on Hoosick Road/Route 7 is an issue for NYSDOT and not the Town, since the highway is a State highway under the jurisdiction of NYSDOT. Attorney Gilchrist stated that while Chairman Oster was correct concerning NYSDOT jurisdiction, the Planning Board is responsible for reviewing traffic issues under the State Environmental Quality Review Act, but that the Planning Board should take into account the traffic evaluation performed by the applicant as well as comments by NYSDOT which has primary jurisdiction over Hoosick Road. Member Czornyj asked whether the traffic evaluation was limited to the two retail buildings in Phase I only, or whether any potential use for Phase II of the project had also been included in the traffic evaluation. Ms. Stancliff stated that the traffic evaluation was based on the commercial uses in Phase I only, and that if any use in Phase II is pursued in the future, which is speculative at this time, then a further traffic evaluation will need to be undertaken for Phase II which will include the traffic generated through Phase I on a cumulative basis. Chairman Oster felt that the public comments had been addressed by the applicant, and that the matter should proceed to re-opening the public hearing on this application for the September 3 meeting to commence at 7:00 p.m. The Planning Board Members concurred in this procedure. Ms. Stancliff stated that the current site plan with last revision date of June 18 did not include the increase of the privacy fence from 6 feet to 8 feet, nor did it include the installation of the replacement of the post mounted lights along the western drive with bollard style lights, even though these issues were addressed in the August 18 letter. Ms. Stancliff said that the site plan would be updated accordingly, and filed with the Town. Member Czornyj had a question concerning a pie-shaped piece of this site located to the rear, which he thought may be zoned residential R-9. Both the applicant and the Building Department will check this site plan in relation

to the zoning map to confirm that all commercial uses are located within the B-15 Zoning District. This site plan application has been referred to the County Planning Department, and the recommendation has already been received. Chairman Oster wanted to confirm that the site plan had also been forwarded to the Brunswick No. 1 Fire Department. Ms. Stancliff confirmed that the site plan had been provided to the Brunswick No. 1 Fire Department, and that the comments of the Fire Department are being addressed. This matter is placed on the September 3 Agenda for the re-opening of the public hearing to commence at 7:00 p.m.

The next item of business on the Agenda was the site plan submitted by Oakwood Property Management for the Oakwood Property Management Planned Development District. Rob Osterhoudt, P.E., of Bohler Engineering, was present for the applicant. Chairman Oster stated that the Planning Board had previously requested an analysis on the issue of the proposed emergency access route located on the utility right-of-way from this proposed project to Northstar Drive within the North 40 subdivision. Chairman Oster noted that this PDD site is divided between two fire district areas, including Brunswick No. 1 and the Center Brunswick Fire Company. Chairman Oster noted that he had received information on mileage from both the Center Brunswick Fire House and the Brunswick No. 1 Fire House to the project site, using different access routes. Chairman Oster also noted for the record that while the issues of having this PDD site in one fire company district, as well as the fact that the Spiegletown Fire Company seemed to be the closest fire company to this project site, have been raised, he in no way was suggesting or directing that fire district boundary lines be changed or various fire department jurisdictions be amended as part of the review of this Oakwood Property Management PDD site plan. Gus Scifo of the Brunswick No. 1 Fire Company was present, and Chairman Oster asked him to review the calculations he prepared together with Michael Lewis, the Assistant Chief for the Center Brunswick Fire

Company, both in terms of mileage and time from the Center Brunswick Fire House and Brunswick No. 1 Fire House to the project site over various routes. Mr. Scifo reviewed that information, which is part of the project review record. Mr. Scifo made the point that the times listed in the submission to the Planning Board do not include time for volunteers to leave their homes and arrive at the respective fire houses. Member Wetmiller asked about the typical response time for volunteer firefighters to get from their homes to the fire house. Mr. Scifo stated that this varied greatly, depending on the time of day and the particular day of the week. On the issue of two (2) fire companies servicing the project site, Chairman Oster noted that the northern portion of this project site is within the Center Brunswick Fire Company district, and that the southern portion of the project site is within the Brunswick No. 1 Fire Company district. Mr. Scifo explained the difference between a “fire district” and a “fire protection district”, noting that both the Center Brunswick Fire Company and the Brunswick No. 1 Fire Company are fire protection districts. Mr. Scifo also stated that the Spiegletown Fire Company is a fire district, which raises separate tax issues. Mr. Scifo also stated that while the Spiegletown Fire Company has a ladder truck, it does not have a bucket together with the ladder truck, and that the Brunswick No. 1 Fire Company has the ladder truck with a bucket. Chairman Oster asked Mr. Scifo to explain what would happen at this site in the event of a structure fire. Mr. Scifo stated that a call would go into Rensselaer County, the address of the structure would be entered, and the particular company that covers that address would automatically be identified. Mr. Scifo did say that in connection with a structure fire for an apartment complex, there would be an automatic mutual aid call. In this case, Mr. Scifo stated that a mutual aid call would be automatic because the Center Brunswick Fire Company does not have a ladder truck, and Brunswick No. 1 does have the ladder truck with bucket, and the Spiegletown Fire Company has a ladder truck. Chairman Oster thanked Mr. Scifo

for that explanation, and repeated that both he and the members of the Planning Board have respect for the volunteer firefighters, and that the inquiries of the Planning Board are merely to generate the data on which the Planning Board must rely to make its determination regarding the emergency access road for this project. Chairman Oster stated that both he and Member Czornyj had also driven the various routes identified in the Fire Company submission, and concur with the distances. Member Czornyj also noted that the times set forth in the Fire Company submission were very close to the times noted by Chairman Oster and Member Czornyj. Chairman Oster reiterated that in relation to any comment regarding the location of Fire Company district boundary lines and which company should be responding to this project site, he was in no way implying that districts needed to be changed, but was raising questions regarding information needed by the Planning Board to make its determination in this case. Chairman Oster asked about the type of emergency gate the Fire Department was proposing for the emergency access road in this application. Mr. Scifo stated that it would be the same type of emergency gate which was required for the Duncan Meadows Apartment Project. Chairman Oster then raised the issue of the surface of the emergency access road, and the Fire Department's request that it be a 26 foot wide paved roadway. Mr. Scifo stated that the Brunswick No. 1 Fire Company was not authorized to take its emergency equipment off pavement. Chairman Oster asked whether this was a New York State regulation or just a Fire Company policy. Mr. Scifo stated that it was primarily a company policy, and that both Brunswick No. 1 and the Center Brunswick Fire Company generally did not take equipment off pavement. Member Tarbox asked what happens when a fire is located along a dirt road, and said that there are a few dirt roads within the Town. Michael Drinkwine, Assistant Chief of the Center Brunswick Fire Company, was in attendance, and stated that in a case of a fire at a structure on an existing dirt road, the company would take the equipment onto the dirt road, but it is recommended that the

equipment not go off pavement. Mr. Drinkwine firmly stated that the Center Brunswick Fire Company would respond to the emergency call, even if it is on a dirt road. Member Tarbox then asked about the distance from the Northstar Drive cul-de-sac to the project site, which Mr. Osterhoudt confirmed was about 1,100 feet. Further discussion was held concerning the response times as noted on the Fire Department submission. Chairman Oster then raised the issue of the proposed emergency access road for this project, which will be at a substantial grade, and the Fire Departments are proposing that it be a 26 foot wide paved roadway. Chairman Oster noted that the construction of such a roadway is a substantial expense, but that it must be reviewed in relation to impact on response times for emergency vehicles. Mr. Drinkwine stated that the emergency access road would be gated at both ends. Chairman Oster stated that the Planning Board should also consider whether this road would be used by other vehicles, including motorcycles, ATVs, or other vehicles. Chairman Oster stated that the Planning Board needed to consider the impact to response times for emergency vehicles, and whether the change was in the nature of 30 seconds or several minutes. Mr. Drinkwine stated that the emergency access road should be included even if it saves 30 seconds, and asked whether 30 seconds was important to the Planning Board Members if there was an emergency at their homes. Attorney Gilchrist then counseled the Board that it must make any determination concerning the need for this emergency access road on reliable data, and that any determination must be based on reliable and substantial evidence in the record. Attorney Gilchrist further counseled the Board that in order to obtain that data, the Planning Board should consider retaining an expert, a technical consultant that could provide both reliable data and expert opinion on the need for an emergency access road on this project as it relates to emergency response times and overall public safety. Attorney Gilchrist suggested that the Planning Board coordinate with Laberge Engineering, and retain a consultant with expertise in the field of

emergency response and emergency planning, who could review the application documents, data prepared by the Fire Departments as submitted through their memorandum, analysis of the Fire District maps, the road layout within the North 40 subdivision, and provide both data and guidance to the Planning Board on this issue. The Planning Board concurred that retaining an expert consultant on this issue was appropriate. Chairman Oster did state that the issue of emergency response times is important to the Planning Board, even if it is 30 seconds, and that is why the Planning Board is retaining a consultant to provide reliable data and expert opinion on this issue for assessment by the Planning Board. Member Casey raised the issue about the relative distances of the Center Brunswick Fire House, Brunswick No. 1 Fire House, and the Spiegletown Fire House in relation to the project site. There was additional discussion regarding the fire districts, mutual aid, and the equipment available in each department to address an emergency situation at the project site. Chairman Oster asked were there any personal vehicles of volunteer firefighters who would be using the access road. Mr. Scifo and Mr. Drinkwine stated that only trucks and chief vehicles would use the access road, and possibly fire police, and not individual firefighters responding to a call. Mr. Osterhoudt concurred that Laberge Engineering would be retaining a technical consultant on the issue of the emergency access road, and would coordinate with Mr. Laberge on that issue. Mr. Osterhoudt also confirmed that he would provide to Mr. Laberge the most up-to-date site plan for review by Mr. Laberge. Mr. Osterhoudt also stated that he was continuing to review the stormwater plan for the project site, and would be meeting with Mr. Laberge shortly to further review this stormwater plan. Mr. Osterhoudt confirmed that he understood the technical consultant on the emergency access issue would be at the applicant's cost, but requested that he be provided with a quote for the technical consultant to review with his client. Mr. Osterhoudt also confirmed that there were no changes to the site plan since the last Planning

Board Meeting. Member Czornyj asked whether this site plan application should be forwarded to the County Planning Department at this time for review, given the outstanding issue of the emergency access road. Attorney Gilchrist stated that the application should be forwarded to the County Planning Department at this time, and that the County Planning Department could also provide any comment it wished on the emergency access road. Mr. Bonesteel asked about the general stormwater plan. Mr. Osterhoudt reviewed the stormwater plan in general, which includes seven (7) stormwater detention areas to treat run-off as close as possible to the source, that these detention areas had been conceptually sized and that further geotechnical investigation would need to be performed for final design, that the details must be worked out on final layout and design and that he would be meeting with Mr. Laberge. Mr. Osterhoudt did confirm that all NYSDEC stormwater requirements must be met. Member Casey had questions regarding the specific soil conditions, and whether any calculations had been made for specific buildings. Mr. Osterhoudt stated that further geo-technical work would be performed in connection with specific construction plans. This matter is placed on the September 3 Agenda for further discussion, including the issue of the emergency access road.

Two items of new business were discussed.

The first item of new business discussed was a minor subdivision application submitted by Robert Pollock, requesting a 2 lot subdivision at 720 Hoosick Road. Greg Bessler, of Creighton Manning, was present for the applicant. Robert Pollack was also present. Mr. Bessler explained the proposed 2 lot subdivision, which seeks to divide the existing commercial lot located at 720 Hoosick Road, which currently is the location of the Pioneer Savings Bank as well as a detached commercial building with individual retail spaces. Mr. Bessler explained that the proposed subdivision divides off the Pioneer Savings Bank parcel, identified as lot no. 1, with the balance

of the parcel including the detached commercial building with retail spaces being a separate lot, identified as lot no. 2. Mr. Bessler stated that this parcel is located in the B-15 Zoning District, and is not part of the Brunswick Plaza Planned Development District. Mr. Bessler stated that two waivers are requested in connection with the application. The first waiver concerns the requirement that there be a 7 foot offset from the property line for pavement, and that this waiver is necessary because there is an existing parking lot and the proposed lot line goes through the parking lot. The second waiver requested is for the green space requirement. Mr. Bessler explained that the current lot, housing all of these commercial buildings, has 36.99 percent green space; when subdivided as proposed, the resulting lot no. 1 has 44 percent green space, while the proposed lot 2 has only 31.52 percent green space. Since the site plan regulations require 35 percent green space, the applicant is seeking a waiver of the green space based on existing conditions for proposed lot no. 2. Mr. Bessler said that the issues regarding access, traffic circulation, parking, and utilities between the two lots are being addressed through a proposed cross-easement agreement, which has been submitted to the Town for review. Chairman Oster confirmed that the Planning Board does have jurisdiction to consider the waivers for the pavement offset as well as green space. Member Czornyj asked whether this application should be reviewed as a minor subdivision or as a waiver. Member Wetmiller asked whether a commercial subdivision could be treated as a waiver under the Town's subdivision regulations. Attorney Gilchrist reviewed with the Planning Board Members the provisions for waiver of subdivision, which provide that any request for a waiver of subdivision for the purpose of constructing other than one single-family dwelling must meet with the unanimous approval of the membership of the Planning Board present and constituting a quorum. Member Czornyj thought that this application should be treated as a waiver even though it is a commercial application, and made a motion to treat the

application as a waiver of subdivision. That motion was seconded by Member Wetmiller. The motion was unanimously approved by the Board Members present, and therefore this application will be treated as a waiver of subdivision. Member Casey inquired as to the reason for the subdivision. Mr. Bessler explained that Pioneer Savings Bank is looking to purchase the property on which the Bank branch is located. Member Czornyj confirmed that this site is not part of the Brunswick Plaza PDD, but does constitute a separate lot located in the B-15 Zone. Member Czornyj asked whether this application needed to be referred to the County Planning Department. Attorney Gilchrist stated that this subdivision does not need to be referred to the County Planning Agency, and that the Rensselaer County Planning Department has elected not review subdivision applications under the General Municipal Law. Member Tarbox had a question concerning the location of the proposed lot line. Mr. Bessler explained that there is an existing grinder pump located within the parking lot area, and that Mr. Pollock wanted the grinder pump to remain with proposed lot no. 2, and that this utility issue would be addressed within the cross-easement agreement. The Planning Board Members had a question regarding the cross-easement agreement, and the applicant confirmed that the easement agreement would address access, traffic circulation, parking, and utilities. Member Wetmiller asked about ongoing maintenance responsibilities for the access, traffic circulation, and parking areas, and what happens if lot no. 2 fails to maintain those areas. Attorney Gilchrist stated that these issues will need to be addressed in the cross-easement agreement, which he will review. The Planning Board Members also generally discussed the two (2) requested waivers, and were in favor of granting those waivers as part of the action on the waiver of subdivision. Chairman Oster asked whether there were any further questions or comments. Hearing none, Member Czornyj made a motion to adopt a negative declaration under SEQRA, which motion was seconded by Member Esser. The motion was unanimously approved,

and a SEQRA negative declaration adopted. Thereupon, Member Casey made a motion to approve the waiver of subdivision application subject to the following:

1. A waiver is provided in relation to the green space requirements for lot no. 2, with lot no. 2 maintaining 31.52 percent green space;
2. A waiver is provided for the requirement for a 7 foot offset for pavement from lot lines, given that this is an existing parking lot area; and
3. Review and acceptance of the proposed cross-easement agreement by the Brunswick Building Department and Planning Board Attorney, which must address the issues of access, traffic circulation, parking, and utilities.

Member Czornyj made a motion subject to the stated conditions. The motion was unanimously approved, and a waiver of subdivision approved, together with the waivers for green space and pavement offset as noted.

The second item of business on the Agenda was a subdivision application submitted by the Patton Family Trust for property located on Pinewoods Avenue Extension. The Planning Board Members generally reviewed the proposed subdivision. Attorney Gilchrist noted that he had received a letter from William Doyle, Esq., attorney for the applicant, requesting that this matter be placed on the September 3 Agenda. After further discussion, the Planning Board Members observed that while the application sought to create three lots, one of those lots would be merged into a separate, existing homestead parcel, and could the application be viewed as proposing to create only two new lots. The Planning Board also discussed whether the application, even though creating two new lots, could be viewed as a waiver of subdivision application, since each of the resulting lots would be 13 acres in size, this would be a non-realty subdivision, and that the applicant is not proposing any construction at this time. Attorney Gilchrist stated that he would

review that issue with Attorney Doyle. This matter is placed on the September 3 Agenda for further discussion.

The Index for the August 20, 2015 meeting is as follows:

1. BBL Construction Services, LLC/Albany Medical Center – Site Plan – approved.
2. Arax Properties, LLC – Site Plan – September 3, 2015 (Public Hearing to continue at 7:00 p.m.).
3. Oakwood Property Management Planned Development District – Site Plan – September 3, 2015.
4. Pollock – Waiver of Subdivision – Approved with conditions.
5. Patton Family Trust – Subdivision – September 3, 2015.

The proposed Agenda for the September 3, 2015 meeting currently is as follows:

1. Arax Properties, LLC – Site Plan (Public Hearing to continue at 7:00 p.m.).
2. Oakwood Property Management Planned Development District – Site Plan.
3. Patton Family Trust – Subdivision.