

**TOWN OF SKANEATELES PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
December 18, 2018**

Joseph Southern
Donald Kasper
Scott Winkelman
Douglas Hamlin
Scott Molnar, Legal Counsel
John Camp, P.E. (C&S Engineers)
Howard Brodsky, Town Planner-Absent
Karen Barkdull, Clerk

Chairman Southern opened the meeting at 6:30 p.m. The meeting minutes of November 8, 2018 were previously distributed to the Board and all members present acknowledged receipt of those minutes.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Hamlin and seconded by Member Kasper to approve the minutes as submitted. The Board having been polled resulted in the affirmance of said motion.

RECORD OF VOTE

Chair	Joseph Southern	Present	[Yes]
Member	Donald Kasper	Present	[Yes]
Member	Scott Winkelman	Present	[Yes]
Member	Douglas Hamlin	Present	[Yes]

The meeting minutes of November 20, 2018 were previously distributed to the Board and all members present acknowledged receipt of those minutes.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Kasper and seconded by Member Hamlin to approve the minutes as submitted. The Board having been polled resulted in the affirmance of said motion.

RECORD OF VOTE

Chair	Joseph Southern	Present	[Yes]
Member	Donald Kasper	Present	[Yes]
Member	Scott Winkelman	Present	[Yes]
Member	Douglas Hamlin	Present	[Yes]

Escrow Request

Applicant: Tim Green/owner Loveless Farm Development 1194 Greenfield Lane Skaneateles, New York 13152	Property: 2783 West Lake Rd West side 051.-02-18.1 Vacant land: East side 053.-01-39.1
---	---

There is an outstanding invoice for legal services rendered that will required additional funds from the applicant to process.

WHEREFORE a motion was made by Member Kasper and seconded by Member Hamlin to increase the escrow account in the amount of \$1,500. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmance of said motion.

Public Hearing- Special Permit

Applicant: John Swygert
104 Airline Lane
Hummelstown, PA 17036

Property: 3101 East Lake Road
Skaneateles, New York
Tax parcel: 039.-01-01.0

Present: Robert Eggleston, Architect;

The proposal is for the installation of a boulder retaining wall to assist with the erosion control with the existing seawall. A site visit was conducted on December 1, 2018, and during the visit it was noted that the applicant is having EDR submit an application to OGS and NYSDEC for a boathouse, which is not under town jurisdiction. The boathouse is shown on the site plan for informational purposes only. There has been some concern about the boathouse and plans expressed by a neighbor, Linda Cohen, and the applicant will be submitting modifications to the plan, requesting that the public hearing be left open until next month.

WHEREAS, a motion was made by Chairman Southern and seconded by Member Winkelman, the Planning Board declared this application a Type II action and not subject to further review under SEQR. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmance of said motion.

At this time, Chairman Southern opened the Public Hearing and asked if there was anyone in favor of the proposal. No one spoke in favor of the proposal. Chairman Southern asked if there was anyone who wished to speak in opposition or had any other comments on the project. Linda Cohen, 1910 West Lake Road, has been a property owner for over 30 years. She has concerns with the project and is sending a letter to OGS with her concerns. The concerns are the 40ft x 43ft x 15ft boathouse connected to the shoreline by an 80ft x 8 ft dock immediately located by her property. The proposal will block access to her property as well as obstruct her view of the lake. The applicant had proposed moving the dock further north however; this is not a remedy to the impact of a permanent structure of this magnitude set out into the lake. She continued saying that it is an extreme over-development with a multiplicity of negative impacts and she strongly opposes it. There is no precedent set on such a large structure set out on the lake. Any major storm events could cause damage to the structure and could cause damage down-wind of the property.

John Cherundolo, neighbor to the north, commented that this is the first that he has heard of the proposal to move the boathouse and dock further north. He has not seen a boathouse this large that far out into the lake attached to the long dock. He is also concerned with the proposed wall and buildup of the grade of the property. The house being built is very close to both sides of the property with a larger house than the previous dwelling. The grade has been increased and he is concerned about the wall pushing more water on his property. Larger boathouses located that far into the lake have not happened before and he is concerned that it will cause environmental issues as well as impact views.

Kathleen Zapata, 1906 West Lake Road, supports what Linda has already said. She inquired however, the boathouse is even possible since that are not allowed. Chairman Southern explained that there had been a legal decision made in the courts that determined that New York State retains jurisdiction of the lake up to the mean high water mark. Ms. Zapata commented that it does not make sense to restrict something that is on shore but allow it on the lake where it is more detrimental. Their property is two properties over from the applicants and she is opposed to the project.

Paul Cohen, 1916 West Lake Road, commented that the boathouse that is designed for two very large boats and the area has children and residents that use the lake. The proposal is an assault on the whole region of that lake to have the boathouse built.

Holly Gregg, inquired if the plan was to build the dock and put the boathouse at the end of the dock. Chairman Southern stated that the boathouse and dock are beyond the mean high watermark and not under the town’s jurisdiction. Mr. Gregg commented that this could happen all over the lake and the town couldn’t comment on it. Counsel Molnar stated that there are cases on point and they are recent in that we are prohibited in regulating anything beyond the mean high water mark. The state of New York owns everything under the high water mark including the ground beneath the water. Property owners can make application to construct a dock or other structure in accordance with the OGS website. There is a process and certain activities permitted by right such as a simple dock or a slip for your boat. There is a process to obtain state approval that they would welcome comments from interested parties.

Mr. Eggleston commented that they have just met with the Cohens yesterday and respectfully request that the public hearing remain open until next month’s meeting.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Kasper and seconded by Member Winkelman to keep the public hearing open and continue the public hearing on *Tuesday, January 15, 2019*. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

Public Hearing Subdivision

Applicant: Thomas Harvard
 2618 Rickard Road
 Skaneateles, New York 13152
 Tax parcel: 036.-01-04.3

Present: Robert Eggleston, Architect;

The application is for a two-lot subdivision with a dwelling located on the existing lot. The existing ponds, federal wetlands, and buffers are shown on the plan with a proposed shared driveway. The driveway will cross over the new lot. The existing property owner is subdividing the land so that they will have a dwelling on one lot and the parents on the second lot. Member Winkelman commented that the area has the headwaters that lead to Wityh Creek in the Town of Spafford and eventually to the lake. Mr. Eggleston noted that the new lot would be subject to implementation of the small-scale stormwater management guidelines. Counsel Molnar recommended that the board consider site plan approval for the lot as a reasonable condition given the proximity to the wetlands, and the utilization of the small-scale stormwater management.

Counsel Molnar recommended to the Board that the application be an Unlisted Action and reviewed the short form SEQR with the Board. In evaluating, each of the criteria set forth in Part II:

Part II	No or small impact	Moderate to Large impact
1. Will the proposed action create a material conflict with an adopted land use plan or zoning regulation?	X	
2. Will the proposed action result in a change in the use or intensity of use of land?	X	
3. Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of the existing	X	

community?		
4. Will the proposed action have an impact on the environmental characteristics that caused the establishment of a CEA?	X	
5. Will the proposed action result in an adverse change in the existing level of traffic or affect existing infrastructure for mass transit, biking or walkway?	X	
6. Will the proposed action cause an increase in the use of energy and it fails to incorporate reasonably available energy conservation or renewable energy opportunities?	X	
7. Will the proposed action impact existing public/private water supplies and/or public/ private wastewater treatment utilities?	X	
8. Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of important historic, archeological, architectural or aesthetic resources?	X	
9. Will the proposed action result in an adverse change to natural resources (e.g. wetlands, water bodies, groundwater, air quality, flora and fauna)?	X	
10. Will the proposed action result in an increase in the potential for erosion, flooding or drainage problems?	X	
11. Will the proposed action create a hazard to environmental or human health?	X	

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Winkelman and seconded by Member Hamlin, the Board declared this application to be an Unlisted Action, and after review of the SEQR short environmental assessment form and determined that the proposed action will not result in any significant adverse environmental impacts.

At this time, Chairman Southern opened the Public Hearing and asked if there was anyone in favor of the proposal. A signed approval letter from two of the neighbors was submitted. Chairman Southern asked if there was anyone who wished to speak in opposition or had any other comments on the project. No one spoke in opposition or had other comments.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Chairman Southern and seconded by Member Winkelman to close the public hearing. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

Member Winkelman commented that the proposal is for large lots that are hidden off the road, and with the size of the lots, there will be a lot of extra land for the wetlands to percolate. It is also positive that the board will be reviewing the new lot at time of development. Chairman Southern stated that the site plan review should be a required condition for the newly created lot prior to issue of a building permit.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, upon a motion made Member Scott Winkelman, duly seconded by Member Donald Kasper, and after an affirmative vote of all Members present, as recorded below, the Town of Skaneateles Planning Board hereby **APPROVES** the Subdivision, with the following conditions:

1. The Final Plan Re-subdivision of Lot 9 of the Blue Heron Subdivision, dated October 25, 2018 prepared by Ianuzi & Romans Land Surveying, PC be updated with a note placed conspicuously on the map to clearly state that Lot 9A is subject to site plan review by the Town of Skaneateles Planning Board for intended construction of any improvements, so that storm water drainage will

be addressed, and submitted for the Planning Board Chairman's review and signature within 180 days from the signing of this resolution; and

2. That the Applicant shall obtain all necessary permits and approvals from any agency or authority having jurisdiction over the Property or Application; and
3. The Subdivision Map and deed transferring the property must be filed in the Onondaga County Clerk's Office within sixty-two (62) days of the signing of said Map, or the Subdivision approval shall be null and void. Proof of said filing shall be immediately forwarded to the Secretary of the Planning Board upon receipt by the Applicant and/or Applicant's representative.

RECORD OF VOTE

Chair	Joseph Southern	Present	[Yes]
Member	Donald Kasper	Present	[Yes]
Member	Scott Winkelman	Present	[Yes]
Member	Douglas Hamlin	Present	[Yes]

Sketch Plan Special Permit

Applicant: Jack Gordon
680 Sheldon Road
Skaneateles, New York 13152
Tax parcel: 023.-05-01.1, 02.0, & 03.03

Present: Jack Gordon, Applicant;

The applicant is requesting a special permit to continue to use of the properties for a wedding venue. Events have been occurring for over ten years, and their intent is to retire in two years. Chairman Southern inquired if the applicant was considering marketing the properties as a wedding venue when they sell. Mr. Gordon commented that it does not make much money so it may not be effective to market it that way. There are no proposed physical changes to the property.

The size of the event range from 75 to 150 people, and when there is more than 100 in attendance, they use tents as the barn cannot accommodate large groups. Catering services and portable rest rooms are utilized at the events, both of which are coordinated by the people running the event. Parking is off the street and in the field to the east.

Mr. Brodsky had provided feedback that a new survey should be provided to the board in addition to providing coverage and building size information. Sheldon Road has a posted speed limit of 35 mph. A site visit will be conducted on January 5, 2019.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Winkelman and seconded by Member Kasper to schedule a public hearing on *Tuesday, January 15, 2019 at 6:30 p.m.* The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

Continued Review –Major Site Plan Review

Applicant: John Vaughn 10357 Fallon Parc Blvd #105 Orlando, FL 32832	Property: 2595 & 2591 West Lake Road Skaneateles, New York Tax parcel: 055.-03-10.0 & 055.-03-34.0
--	---

Present: Robert Eggleston, Architect;

The applicant is requesting an amendment to the 2014 approval for location of the access driveway to reflect the location back to the driveway nestled along the hedgerow similar to the approved 2011 plan.

Rudy Zona prepared a Grass Depression Basin Detail (JD-1) that provides a close up detail of the drainage basin by the road. The existing driveway that was built by the prior owners was partially completed and will continue to a future dwelling. The driveway will have a swale that will run along the drive and collect the water feeding into the approximately two-foot deep grass depression to collect and retain stormwater. There will be check dams along the swale leading to the basin. The basin then would flow to the swale that leads to the creek. Member Winkelman inquired what type of storm the basin would be built. Mr. Zona stated that the road is 4-5 feet high that the basin is lower so that the run off would drain to the basin. If there were storm events that cause the basin to overflow, it would drain in the farm field.

Member Winkelman inquired on the size of the culvert under the road. Mr. Zona said that it is 30 inch. Member Kasper inquired if the drainage basin would be recognizable to the farmer. Mr. Zona stated that it would be grass and the rest would be open farm field. He continued saying that there will be riprap around the basin to provide more protection.

WHEREAS, a motion was made by Member Hamlin and seconded by Member Kasper, the Planning Board adopted and ratified its prior SEQRA determination for the Application, which was a determination that the Application constitutes an UNLISTED ACTION and after review of a Full EAF by the Planning Board under 6NYCRR 617.20 resulted in a negative declaration. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, upon a motion made by Member Donald Kasper and seconded by Member Douglas Hamlin, and after an affirmative vote of all Members present, as recorded below, the Town of Skaneateles Planning Board **APPROVES** the minor special permit/site plan, with standard conditions and the following additional conditions:

1. That the Special Permit/Site Plan Approval shall expire if the applicant fails to comply with the conditions stated within 18 months of its issuance or if its time limit expires without renewal; and
2. The Site Plan 1 of 1 dated November 19, 2018, Grading Plan C-1A through C-1C, Grass Basin Detail JD-1 dated December 6, 2018, and Narrative dated November 1, 2018 prepared by Robert O. Eggleston, Licensed Architect, be strictly followed; and
3. The berm by a future dwelling as shown on Grading Plan C-1B be tied back to the existing grade; and
4. That the Applicant shall obtain all necessary permits and approvals from any agency or authority having jurisdiction over the Property or Application. and
5. An as-built survey be submitted to the Codes Enforcement Officer with verification of conformance of completed project within (60) days of completion of the project.

RECORD OF VOTE

Chair Joseph Southern Present [Yes]

Vice Chair	Donald Kasper	Present	[Yes]
Member	Scott Winkelman	Present	[Yes]
Member	Douglas Hamlin	Present	[Yes]

Continued Review – 9 Lot Subdivision

Applicant:	Emerald Estates Properties, LP	Property:
	3394 East Lake Rd	2894 East Lake Rd
	Skaneateles, New York	Skaneateles, New York
		Tax Map #036.-01-37.1

Present: Donald Spear, Applicant; Robert Eggleston, Architect; John Langey, Legal Representative; Rudy Zona, RZ Engineering

Mr. Langey began by saying that the public information meeting was last month and that they had submitted their responses to the comments to the board. A preliminary run through of the SEQR long form was completed a couple of months ago and that the board is now ready to make a decision regarding the determination of the SEQR. He continued saying that they believe that there should be a negative declaration based on the additional information provided to the board.

Counsel Molnar stated that based on the volume of information that has been provided to the board, the board could consider a special meeting date so that the board can run through the formal SEQR as the board has received all of the information provided by the applicant, interested parties, replies from the applicant, and additional information provided by interested parties, to reflect upon to move SEQR along. Mr. Langey said that they were under the understanding that that was going to happen tonight.

Counsel Molnar stated that there were two to three things that he would like to discuss. There is a code section (§148-27B) that authorizes the Planning Board when the water supply is questionable that the Planning Board can request additional information from the applicant regarding the availability of potable water. This information may be helpful in the SEQR determination. Mr. Langey stated that Rudy had consulted with a well driller and there is information in our responses that addresses the quality of the water in the area. Mr. Zona commented that quite frequently well drillers drill down 400-500 feet to obtain potable water, and have done it recently on Collard Road at 200 feet. Mr. Eggleston commented that this information is in the November 20, 2018 letter and drilling 200 feet to obtain water on the east side of the lake is typical. Chairman Southern commented that operation with a half or one gallon a minute seems low flow of water. Mr. Zona said that it is pretty common and mitigatable easily with a storage tank. He continued saying that a storage tank is better for low-pressure wells, allowing water to be brought up slowly, store it, and then use the water as needed. It helps to flatten out the peaks in pumping. Mr. Langey commented that the report from Castro well drillers includes reports from other drillers who have done work in the area that there is more water on the east side than the west side of the lake. He continued saying that he does not believe there is any objective evidence that says that there is a well water issue. Mr. Eggleston said that the person who made the comments about the water admitted to running his well for over an hour, and you will get cloudy water running it that long. Mr. Zona added that with shale, there are veins of water that run through it as opposed to traditional soil that does not necessarily have water. Member Winkelman commented that his brother-in-law on Rickard Road has problems with his well.

Member Kasper inquired what the water flows for Weaver. Mr. Zona said that it was 2.5 gallons a minute. Member Winkelman inquired who dug the wells for Weaver, Goldmann, and Nangle. Mr. Camp will reach out to determine the information. Member Winkelman inquired about the water storage tank capacities need for a single-family dwelling. Mr. Zona said that the county uses the guidelines of 110

gallons a day per bedroom, so there could be a 300-gallon tank for a three-bedroom dwelling. Mr. Eggleston said that in the Village you do not typically see a dwelling use 300 gallons of water a day.

Counsel Molnar said that another issue is the cut and fill calculations for building the road and copies will be provided to the board. Member Winkelman said that the excess was going to be stockpiled on lot 11. Mr. Eggleston stated that it was 82,000CY, and that a comment was made that it would cover 11 acres one-foot deep; we would not spread it out one foot deep. Mr. Zona said that some of it would be used for berms Member Kasper said that what is being excavated is all shale. Mr. Eggleston said that some of the shale could be used as a base for the road. Mr. Camp said that he could look at the calculations to determine what shape and volume the pile would take. Member Hamlin stated that it would be helpful for a clearer explanation of how the excess will be stored. Mr. Camp said that they could calculate that out and let the board know how tall the cone would be if it was not spread out. Mr. Zona said that in the cut and fill, they had proposed 2-3 acres to stockpile the spoils. Mr. Eggleston commented that the public comment was that one foot high would be 11 acres, and then 6 feet high would be two acres. Mr. Zona said that you would not spread it one foot deep but has it in a smaller space because you will not want to erosion control it all. Member Winkelman said that that is the key to the open space is to ability of the land to accept water and percolate. Spreading shale over it turns it into a parking lot. Mr. Eggleston said that lot 11 was chosen as it has the biggest building envelope. Member Winkelman inquired if the stockpile would be in the building envelope and Mr. Eggleston stated that it would be located in the building envelope. Mr. Zona said that the stockpiles are 12-15 feet when they are working with it and then they are leveled after the work is completed. The building envelope for lot 11 is 2.7 acres. Mr. Camp commented that presumably you would not want to build on top of the fill.

Mr. Langey inquired if there were any other concerns that need to be addressed as the dry run there were very little concerns at that time. Counsel Molnar stated that the board should reflect on the dry run of the SEQR in addition to the additional items provided, the public information hearing and responses, comments from interested parties, and the comments made tonight concerning the water and cut and fill, which are all very important for the SEQR review process. Chairman Southern commented that there should be a formal SEQR review as the board's position may not be the same as the dry run since additional information has been provided.

Member Hamlin inquired when the board should discuss the consideration of Serenity LLC versus an establishment of a homeowners association (HOA). Counsel Molnar said that it could be discussed at any time, as it is very important to the board and the applicant. Mr. Langey said that if Scott, the Planning Board attorney, agreed that our proposal is equal to or better than protection provided by an HOA, then under the regulations, it is an option the developer can pursue and that you were going to get back to John Delaney on your thoughts. Counsel Molnar said what we talked about is that the section of code does not say equal to or better issue, the code section says,

“131-2G(12) The Planning Board may waive the requirement of a private road maintained by an HOA if it finds, after consulting with the attorney for the Planning Board or the Town Attorney, that a common driveway maintained pursuant to a recorded maintenance agreement executed by the applicant as a condition of subdivision approval, will provide the same protections to lot owners and the Town as would a private road owned by an HOA, and that the requirements and HOA functions described above will be properly fulfilled by such a common driveway and maintenance agreement.”

Mr. Langey inquired what is lacking from the Serenity LLC language. Counsel Molnar stated that the Planning Board has an option; they may waive the requirements of an HOA. The board needs to discuss the issues and determine if they wish to grant such a waiver. Mr. Eggleston said

that the six-page document that was submitted to the board is what you are evaluating. Counsel Molnar said that there are several pieces of information to evaluate the establishment of a HOA versus an independent not-for-profit entity and the benefits to the holders of the common facilities that are vital to this project, including the road, conservations areas, drainage, and water tanks. Mr. Langey stated that they are proposing something to take care of all of those things by another name. Member Hamlin stated that the HOA is a big process and has oversight by the AG and locally managed by the homeowners, adjudicated by the state. Counsel Molnar said that the regulatory framework has a benefit to the town and burdens the applicant because there is an offering plan and a there is an offering by which documentation creating its bylaws are subject to review and approval by the Attorney General (AG). Member Hamlin said that his concern is with the third and four homeowners, years from now that is all part of the same agreement that is part of the same HOA as a more established product than a contract for a specific purpose. Mr. Langey said that it would be recorded just like an HOA. Chairman Southern stated that he feels more secure with the handling of the HOA, as there is an HOA with Butters Farm and things worked out well.

Chairman Southern recommended that the board not waive the HOA requirement. Counsel Molnar said that determining whether the board wants to waive the HOA requirement is not an approval of the application; it would be considering the applicant's request. The discussion is ongoing, and the board may have given an indication of their views concerning a waiver of the HOA requirement. Mr. Langey said that if the applicant formed an HOA for the nine lots and it was written strongly enough to achieve what you want to achieve, is that something you would want us to consider preparing. Counsel Molnar stated that the AG would be the one to approve that scenario. The HOA would be owning common property that is partially owned by three parties that are not part of the HOA and are pre-existing. Mr. Langey commented that they could only control the lots that they can control. Counsel Molnar said that it would need to be determined if the mechanism would be approvable by the AG. Member Winkelman inquired if the other lots could opt in if they wanted to. Mr. Langey said they have made that available, but the concern is one person can spoil the soup. Counsel Molnar said that his observation is that from the board's perspective, this is a complex subdivision in a sensitive area with vital common areas portions of the subdivision that to be vested in an entity under the review of the overall plan. Given the factors, code compliance is the preferred method to advance the application versus any waiver, based on the board comments.

Counsel Molnar is not opposed to reviewing with you the suggestion that an HOA be created in order to take possession of these vital common elements of the project. That would lead towards code compliance without waiver or exception. If approvable by the AG, give the applicant and the Planning Board the comfort that it made an informed decision on it. Mr. Camp commented that it would be an unusual arrangement though, having differing sets of rights to access people's homes; their only access to their homes. It is not good planning; if you were setting this up from scratch you would not structure it this way. Good planning would allow for an equal share of the responsibilities and the rights over an asset. The responsibility would not be equal for what is being proposed, which is not good planning.

Mr. Camp inquired if the shared lakefront access is part of the SEQR discussion. Member Winkelman stated that as part of the comprehensive plan and its impacts to the lake. He continued saying that we regulated shared lakefront as this use is shared lakefront. Mr. Langey

stated that they are not proposing shared lakefront recreation. Member Winkelman said that these lots include rights with access to the lake that will have an impact to the lake. Mr. Eggleston inquired where in the comprehensive plan it is covered as opposed to the zoning, as he has not found it referenced. Member Winkelman stated the comprehensive plan discusses water quality, recreation, neighborhood, impact, and that is why we regulate share lakefront recreation because it has an impact on the neighborhood and the quality of enjoyment of the lake. Counsel Molnar stated that this could be noted and part of the SEQR discussion when it proceeds at a special meeting for that purpose. An important issue can be addressed with a lengthy discussion at that meeting.

Chairman Southern stated that he would like to expedite the SEQR determination at the next meeting. Counsel Molnar said that it was possible, with the board considering all of the information supplied and the review and discussion at the meeting. Member Kasper suggested that if John can obtain the information about the wells, it could be discussed at the January 15, 2019 meeting ahead of the SEQR meeting. A special meeting was scheduled for Tuesday, January 22, 2019 at 6:30 pm., to review the SEQR on this application.

Attorney Advice Session

WHEREFORE a motion was made by Chairman Southern and seconded by Member Kasper to enter an attorney advice session. The Board having been polled resulted in favor of said motion.

WHEREFORE a motion was made by Chairman Southern and seconded by Member Hamlin to return from attorney advice session. The Board having been polled resulted in favor of said motion.

The Board returned at 8:43 pm.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Hamlin and seconded by Member Kasper to adjourn the meeting. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmance of said motion. The Planning Board Meeting adjourned at 8:43 p.m. as there being no further business.

Respectfully Submitted,
Karen Barkdull, Clerk