

Town of Enfield Planning Board Meeting
September 5, 2007

Members Present: Virginia Bryant, Ann Chaffee, James McConkey, Rich Neno Sr., Calvin Rothermich, Debbie Teeter, Doug Willis

Guests: Peggy Hubble - Town Board liaison, Elizabeth Allen, Kay Banfield, Roy Barriere, Kate Callahan, Ken Donley, Ann Muckey, Antonia Newhart, Cliff Newhart, John Rancich, Bruce Varner

Call to order 7:05 p.m.

Introductions

Co-chair J. McConkey welcomed members of the community to the meeting and invited them to provide their names for the minutes. He then provided an overview of the Planning Board's intended work for this meeting. He reiterated the Planning Board's role as advisory to the Town Board and its commitment to providing protection for those living near the wind farm project. He also explained the Planning Board's need to take action to comply with SEQR requirements.

Privilege of the Floor

- Bruce Varner provided information regarding town ordinances that address wind power. He thanks the Planning Board for drafting what he believes to be a good law. He encouraged the board not to reduce the current setback in draft law of 1.5 times the total height of a wind tower. He thinks this is reasonable and consistent with what other municipalities have done. He reiterated this is a great draft law, and cited the provision of easements as a means of reducing setbacks. A setback of 1.5 protects liability of the town. He would like to see something about nonparticipating homes, and would prefer a 1000' setback from homes.
- Ken Donnelly, who lives directly across from the proposed project, echoes the importance of maintaining the 1.5 setback as a minimum. He's not opposed windmills, he supports green energy, he just wants protection for the neighborhood.
- Kay Banfield, also a neighborhood resident, was concerned about strobe lights at the top of the towers as she observed in Germany. J. McConkey explained that the lighting would need to be in accordance with FCC regulations, and this topic is addressed in the draft local law.
- Cliff Newhart mentioned a French Academy of medicine study, which cites problems with low-frequency noise. This organization recommends a 1.5 km (4900') setback from residence. This issue is of grave concern to him.
- Bruce Varner reiterated the importance of the 1.5 setback.
- Ken Donnelly also questioned tower safety and lightning storms, especially in view of the adjacent gas line.

August 1, 2007 Minutes: Motion by A. Chaffee to approve, seconded by C. Rothermich, approved without dissent.

Old Business

Draft Wind Ordinance

- V. Bryant reviewed possible changes to the draft document discussed at the working meeting with Planning and Town Board members. These are primarily small adjustments to current language. Motion by V. Bryant to change this document to a local law rather than a municipal ordinance, seconded by D. Teeter. Yes - 5, Abstain - 2, motion approved.
- J. McConkey referred to page 1 item #4: Applicant Requirements. He said that many of these are required as part of the SEQR, and recommends changing the introductory sentence to "... applicant shall provide to the Planning Board 1) a completed Environmental Assessment (EA) long form, and 2) If not included in EA long form, the following:"

- For consistency and clarity, it was suggested that "Board" be changed to "Planning Board" throughout document
- Motion by J. McConkey to change Item #4: Applicant Requirements as suggested above and change "Board" to "Planning Board" throughout the document, seconded by R. Neno. Yes - 6, Abstain – 1, motion approved.
- For clarity, it was suggested that "Town of Enfield" be inserted before "building code" on page 2, current #9 Under Item #5, "General Standards", the town does not have a special permit process, so this needs to be removed, and this item also needs to specify that the Enfield Code Enforcement Officer will confirm the standards have been met.
- Motion by D. Teeter to insert "Town of Enfield" before "building code" on page 2, current #9 and re-write #5, General Standards, as discussed above, seconded by V. Bryant, approved without dissent.
- Under Additional Information: this section should include something about liability insurance, but it will need to be specific.
Page 4: 5.4: Landscaping; motion by C. Rothermich to strike this section, seconded by D. Teeter, approved without dissent.
Page 4: 5.6 Scenic Resources: motion by D. Teeter to strike this section, seconded by V. Bryant, approved without dissent.
- Pg 5: 5.9 remove item #5, "Town of Enfield designated", as there are none.
- Page 6: #6 and #2: The Planning – this is not a waiver, and should be elsewhere in the document.
Pg 5: 5.11 Motion by V. Bryant to add "... at each tower site and project-associated structures. Emergency number, contact information and emergency procedures shall also be posted at the Enfield town hall, Enfield fire station and on file with the appropriate local law enforcement agencies." at end of #1, seconded by R. Neno, approved without dissent.
- D. Teeter asked the developer if he could provide a map that would show where towers could be sited based on the set backs currently proposed. Her understanding is that, generally speaking, the location in general is good for wind power production, and that siting will likely have more to do with where they can actually go than engineering recommendations.

Subdivision Regulations

The board reviewed the Town of Dryden form and agreed to use as a template for Enfield. V. Bryant will edit it to reflect Enfield's information and provide it to the Town Clerk for use when someone requests it.

Meeting adjourned 8:44 p.m.