

TOWN OF GREENFIELD

PLANNING BOARD

December 11, 2012

REGULAR MEETING

A regular meeting of the Town of Greenfield Planning Board is called to order by T. Yasenchak at 7:00 p.m. On roll call, the following members are present: Tonya Yasenchak, Nathan Duffney, Michael Gyarmathy, John Streit, Stan Weeks and John Bokus, Alternate. Thomas Siragusa and Lorna Dupouy are absent. Charlie Baker, Town Engineer, is present.

MINUTES – November 13, 2012

MOTION: B. Duffney

SECOND: S. Weeks

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board waives the reading of and approves the minutes of November 13, 2012, as submitted.

VOTE: Ayes: Duffney, Weeks, Yasenchak

Noes: None

Absent: Dupouy, Siragusa

Abstain: Bokus, Gyarmathy, Streit

MINUTES – November 27, 2012

MOTION: B. Duffney

SECOND: M. Gyarmathy

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board waives the reading of and approves the minutes of November 27, 2012, as submitted.

VOTE: Ayes: Duffney, Gyarmathy, Yasenchak

Noes: None

Absent: Dupouy, Siragusa

Abstain: Bokus, Streit, Weeks

PLANNING BOARD CASES

CHRISTOPHER & GERARD CHWAZ – Special Use Permit

NYS Route 9N – extension

Christopher and Gerard Chwaz are present and are seeking an extension on their special use permit. T. Yasenchak reads from G. McKenna's notes that the applicants were granted an extension a year ago as the applicants were waiting for DOH re-approval of their septic system. She asks the applicants how that is going. G. Chwaz states that they are still waiting for DOH approval. T. Yasenchak states that their building permit is current and expires on January 12, 2013. She asks if they will be renewing that. G. Chwaz states that they will and that they are working on the inside of the building. C. Baker states that there are no changes so it is really just a matter of re-approving it.

December 11, 2012

RESOLUTION – C. & G. Chwaz, Special Use Permit

MOTION: B. Duffney

SECOND: J. Streit

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board grants a one year extension of the Special Use Permit to Christopher and Gerard Chwaz for property located at 2 Spier Falls Road, TM#112.-1-24.2, as follows:

- **One year extension of the Special Use Permit to expire January 13, 2014**

VOTE: Ayes: Bokus, Duffney, Gyarmathy, Streit, Weeks, Yasenchak

Noes: None

Absent: Dupouy, Siragusa

SEAN CROTTY – Site Plan Review

Plank Road

Sean Crotty and Gary Robinson, PE, are present for the application. G. Robinson states that this property is located in the KROD and therefore requires a special use permit to construct a single-family residence. He was originally hired to find a way to put a septic system on this property. He describes the site and the location where they are planning the home placement. They have done test holes and perk tests. The house will be at the highest spot and G. Robinson states that he does not believe it will be visible. It will be a one-story home at approximately 20-feet in height. G. Robinson states that he does not see that there are any items that they will not meet in the KROD regs. They are looking at a peat moss septic system. They will not have 50% windows on any façade. S. Crotty states that the house will have a shed roof sloping towards Plank Road. T. Yasenchak states that the KROD overlay district regs are 105-113. S. Weeks states that he is intrigued by the peat moss system and asks for a little explanation. G. Robinson explains the system. B. Duffney asks for clarification on the location and states that he has no issue with this. J. Streit states that the main consideration in the overlay district is whether or not it would be visible from far away. The applicant has stated that they are going to keep most of the vegetation; they are going to have one story with glass. He asks if that will be visible from below. S. Crotty states that one of the things that they have done by not being at the lowest level, by trying to get up to where a passive solar house would actually work, so some of that deals with how much sunlight you can get in the winter. The whole area above and below the house location is wooded, so the only trees that he would be taking down would be for the winter time and they would be higher than you would see from any of the roads. He states that there is a variety of vegetation, a lot of deciduous trees in front of them, also a pretty good amount of fir and pine forest all around. He states that the reason the peat system is going in is to decrease impact on the area. There is the possibility of making the home net zero and part of that is the solar heat in the wintertime. In terms of the impact on anyone below them, he states that they really can't see any of the neighbors from that site, even in the winter. He states that he cannot say that there isn't anyone in the area in a private home who wouldn't look up and at some point in the wintertime see their lights. He does know that it would be broken up quite substantially by the vegetation. T. Yasenchak states that she does not have the elevations of the other sides, but the main side looks like more than 50% windows. S. Crotty states that this is not the final design and once they get that, there will be less than 50%. He will provide the final elevations to the Board as soon as he gets them and that will give the percentage of windows. G. Robinson asks if that is something that G. McKenna would enforce at his level. He states that they will meet the 50% or less. T. Yasenchak states that is something that we might be able to do as a contingency, but it is something that is required as far as the overall approval. She states that the Board typically asks to see the elevations of the house before giving the approval; it is not just up to G. McKenna to make those determinations. S. Crotty states that he knew that was a requirement and he will provide the plans. SEQRA is discussed. C. Baker asks if the applicant can define a little more the location on Plank Road. This is done. C. Baker states that the only question he has is regarding the turbines and if they are going to be roof mounted. S. Crotty states that he is backing away from that after talking with the solar PV guy the other day. The PV panels are getting much better, more efficient

December 11, 2012

and so for the same amount of money, because of the State of New York's tax incentives, putting up one extra ground mounted PV panel is going to take the place of those wind turbines. He states that they are going to basically make it an all electric house with the PV panels supplying the electric power as much as possible. C. Baker asks where the PV panels will be located. S. Crotty states that he has the guy coming up tomorrow to take a look. They will be ground mounted and there will probably be 3 poles, probably 12' tall. C. Baker states that he thinks that should be shown on the plans as well as topography, so that the Board can get a good idea of the lay of the land and he would like to see it all the way down to the adjoining neighbor. G. Robinson asks if USGS is ok. C. Baker states that is fine. G. Robinson states that if anyone would like to visit the site, they would be happy to meet someone there. T. Yasenchak states that since there are going to be 3 poles at 12', she would also like to see that on the plans as it increases the amount that the applicant is going to be cutting. In order to get the winter sun, how much do they really need to cut? C. Baker states that he would also like to see a limit of clearing on the map because they are in the KROD and how much of a visual impact there will be. B. Duffney states that if they take the evergreens down, they would allow a lot more sunlight in the wintertime. T. Yasenchak states that since it is going to be a little different, she would like to see all the changes on the plans. T. Yasenchak states that topo should be included; more information about the panels; elevations of the house, etc. Because this is a site plan review, the Public Hearing is a "may" so the Board is not bound to have one. This is discussed. B. Duffney states that this is basically the last parcel on the road; he believes that the property surrounding this is all owned by the Pompas; and he does not believe we should have to have a public hearing.

RESOLUTION – S. Crotty, Public Hearing

MOTION: J. Streit

SECOND: B. Duffney

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board waives a public hearing for the Site Plan Review application of Sean Crotty for property located at 374 Plank Road, TM#123.-2-29.

VOTE: Ayes: Bokus, Duffney, Gyarmathy, Streit, Weeks, Yasenchak

Noes: None

Absent: Dupouy, Siragusa

G. Robinson states that he will put the USGS on the plans; show the solar panels and where they are going to be located; clearing limits that are proposed; and all four elevations. T. Yasenchak states that there is a buffer that is required. S. Crotty states that he will go out and mark the building site if anyone does want to visit the site.

CASEY CORNELL – Minor Subdivision

South Greenfield Road

Casey Cornell and Jim Vianna, Surveyor, are present. A public hearing is opened at 7:32 p.m. J. Vianna reviews that this is a 14.25-acre parcel that they wish to subdivide into 3 lots. Lot 1A will be about 3 acres around the existing house and the other two lots will be approximately 5.75 acres each. This also involves a lot line adjustment with the neighbor to the west for 37' of road frontage to make lot 1A zoning compliant. He states that he has added the keyhole notes to the plans along with the DEC note. He has shown a proposed house location on lot 1B to show that there is sufficient area for a house, which is shown as 40 x 60; the septic area with an expansion area; and he has added a turnaround area for emergency vehicles. He states that a purchaser would have to come in with a detailed plot plan. There being no public comments, this public hearing is closed at 7:36 p.m.

M. Gyarmathy states that the applicant has provided everything that was asked for and obviously there is plenty of room to build a good sized home there. Board agrees. C. Baker states that J. Vianna has done a very nice job with the mapping and answered all his questions. T. Yasenchak asks if there is anything

December 11, 2012

additional from the neighbor, maybe a letter of intent. J. Vianna and C. Cornell state that it is in the lawyers' hands. T. Yasenchak states that the Board could make a decision but it would be contingent on that deed reference.

RESOLUTION – C. Cornell, Minor Subdivision – SEQRA

MOTION: B. Duffney

SECOND: M. Gyarmathy

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board completes Part II of the Short Form SEQRA. All questions are answered "no" and the second box is checked, indicating that this will not result in any significant negative environmental impacts for the Minor Subdivision of Casey Cornell for property located at 77 South Greenfield Road, TM#138.-1-51.11.

VOTE: Ayes: Bokus, Duffney, Gyarmathy, Streit, Weeks, Yasenchak
Noes: None
Absent: Dupouy, Siragusa

RESOLUTION – C. Cornell, Minor Subdivision

MOTION: S. Weeks

SECOND: B. Duffney

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board approves the application of Casey Cornell for a Minor Subdivision for property located at 77 South Greenfield Road, TM#138.-1-51.11, contingent on:

- **Receipt of the acquisition of the additional .296 acres from Pratt at which time the site plan and subdivision map would be revised**

VOTE: Ayes: Bokus, Duffney, Gyarmathy, Streit, Weeks, Yasenchak
Noes: None
Absent: Dupouy, Siragusa

T. Yasenchak states that as soon as the contingency is met, the applicant can bring in the revised maps and she will sign them. J. Vianna asks to verify that approvals are good for 6 months.

CASEY CORNELL – Major Subdivision

Humes Road

Casey Cornell, Jim Vianna and Gary Robinson are present for this application. G. Robinson reviews that this is a 95-acre parcel on Humes Road, in the LDR district, that they are seeking to subdivide into 13 lots. All setbacks are on the plans and each lot has 250' minimum of frontage. They did go out with C. Baker, did test holes and all lots are suitable for on-site septic. Proposed house, septic and well locations are shown and all meet separation distances. They are proposing to change the road a little and straighten it out in one location. There will be a cul-de-sac at the end, which they have discussed with C. Baker. He asks about the center of the cul-de-sac. C. Baker states that typically they are left natural and are part of the right-of-way. G. Robinson explains that there is a road there with an existing stormwater system, that is essentially side-road drainage. They would like to do is the same thing, they have a road profile with side drainage ditches and they would put in culverts for all the proposed driveways, keep the slopes low so it doesn't look like a drainage ditch but like a swale. They would like to make it a nice country look; the lots are so large, they would like to try to keep it green down through there so that there is not a ditch along there. When they did some infiltration testing, although the perk tests were fine, when they were in the ground in what would be an infiltration system, the rates weren't good enough. They will work on finalizing details for the next meeting. They may go with a pond system and he discusses this. G. Robinson asks regarding the basins if the Town owns the property or do they have a maintenance easement. T. Yasenchak states that

December 11, 2012

typically we have maintenance easements. G. Robinson discusses the DEC wetlands in relation to the stormwater. C. Baker asks the total length of the road. G. Robinson states it is about 3100'. He states that they have a typical road cross-section that he believes meets the Town's requirements. They would work with the Highway Department to see about the base work and then working out the paving. T. Yasenchak suggests talking with W. Barss sooner rather than later. She states that yes, it has been an existing road, but it has not had this type of use, the intensity of the use when it is built out. In the past we have had input from the Highway Superintendent regarding what would be required as far as road bonding, etc., to make the road something that, although it exists, would be brought up to Town standards. G. Robinson states that they will have a discussion prior to the next meeting. S. Weeks asks if the utilities will be underground. J. Vianna states that there is an existing secondary line that serves the residence there now. That will be abandoned and the utilities will come up along Humes Road. The existing house and barn will be removed and one garage will be staying. S. Weeks asks if an existing pond can be used as a catch basin. C. Baker states that it can potentially be used as a discharge point, but any drainage that connects to it has to be pre-treated. The same is true for any discharge to the wetlands. B. Duffney states that he has logged this property and knows every bit of it. He states that the only thing W. Barss might talk to them about is that about 6 years ago the road washed out right in front of the little barn, right down to the ledge rock. C. Cornell states that that is the area where they are going to straighten out the road. B. Duffney states he has no issues. J. Bokus states that he has no issues, it looks like a very nice project. M. Gyarmathy asks about the average distance from each house to the road. G. Robinson states that they are just showing one proposed location to show that a house will work on the lots. C. Baker states that he has not done a complete detailed review at this point, generally the concept looks good and we have talked about a lot of the issues. He feels that the applicant is headed down the right path, it is just a matter now of digesting all the information that has been presented. T. Yasenchak states that it looks good, all of her questions to date have been answered. She feels that it is a good layout. It is important for the Board to know where the catch basins are and how they are going to manage the stormwater so that C. Baker can look at it and we can see how the other lots will be affected. The applicant has submitted the long form. We do need to see the additional information before going through the long form. G. Robinson asks about lead agency. T. Yasenchak asks R. Rowland that those letters be sent out. J. Vianna states that they have had the wetlands delineation; DEC took responsibility for some and ACOE for others. ACOE has done a walk-thru and accepted their delineation and they are expecting a JD letter.

STEWART'S SHOPS – Site Plan Review

Middle Grove Road

Tom Lewis is present for Stewart's. He states that Stewart's is investing in shops to make them look better. This addition to the Middle Grove store will help improve the internal circulation and will result in less deliveries. He indicates that they have had requests for kerosene and they are proposing a kerosene pump. A public hearing is opened at 8:03 p.m. Brian Wilcox, Middle Grove Road, states that they live directly behind the Stewart's Shop. He states that there is very little vegetation behind the store, there is a lot of stuff happening behind the store and there is nothing there that buffers their view. He sees a lot of people behind the store doing things that they shouldn't be doing. He is concerned as to what is going to be removed as far as trees that are existing now. Is there going to be anything that will block their view? He states that the previous minutes indicate that there is going to be one additional light pole and he asks where that is going to be, and the one light that is going to be on the building. In the minutes it states that there is nothing that is going to change the drainage. He knows that it is only a 20 x 40 addition, but the way that the drainage runs behind the store now, the ditch runs right where that addition is going to be. If that is going to be filled in, where is the water going to go? B. Wilcox asks where the compressor is going to be for the new walk-in freezer, is it going to be on the roof and if so is it going to be enclosed? If they are taking down trees, they already end up with a lot of garbage in their yard, is there anything that is going to prevent that from being in their yard more. Lora Brown, Middle Grove Road, states that she was frustrated with the recent construction at the Shop. She had a lot of problems with the construction trucks parking in front of

December 11, 2012

her house in no parking areas. This was finally rectified, but she is mostly here to find out if this does get improved what is the timing of the construction, how long will the construction last, when will it take place, etc. T. Lewis states that it is not their intent, and he would personally work very hard to not aggravate any of the neighbors. He states that he will give the neighbors his card with his phone number. As to timing, he does not know when the construction will be taking place but he can e-mail the neighbors in advance to let them know when it will be and how long it will take. If someone is disrupting the neighbors, they should call him. He states that they are looking to get better, not aggravate people. T. Yasenchak asks if they just work on weekdays or do they plan to work on any weekends. T. Lewis states that he is fairly sure that they do not work weekends and he does not mind limiting it to just weekdays. As to the construction trucks, he states that he thinks that they are a reasonable company who responds to neighbors and those are the kinds of things that they will work with the neighbors on. He cannot answer satisfactorily the issue of some of the customers going to the back of the building and dumping garbage, other than that the neighbors should go and ask the manager to clean it up. As to the drainage, there will absolutely be nothing worse and the chances are that it will improve. He states that he is sure that the Town Engineer will make sure of that. C. Baker states that that is not the Town Engineer's responsibility, it is up to the applicant to assure the Town that that is the case. T. Lewis states that Stewart's is assuring the Town that that is the case. He reiterates that the neighbors should contact Stewart's if it is anything other than that. As to buffering, they would be happy to do either landscaping or fence, and they will leave that up to the Board or the neighbors. T. Lewis explains the question regarding the extra lighting. Any lights to the rear of the building are for safety. He states that the compressor is not on the plans, they can try to do it on the side if possible, but he believes it is usually on the roof. B. Wilcox states that typically the compressors are on the roof. T. Yasenchak states that one of the questions the Board had last time was about the buffer. T. Lewis reiterates that they are happy to do either landscaping, evergreens or a fence. T. Yasenchak states that G. McKenna's notes do say that the setbacks comply with the Zoning, but the current buffer regulations would apply. J. Streit asks if there could be a contingency that the buffer be worked out between the neighbors and the applicant. T. Yasenchak states no, but it could be a contingency of approval that a certain buffer or fence be in place. Mrs. Wilcox states that she would prefer a fence because they have had people steal bikes and put them in their woods, etc. B. Wilcox states that if it is trees, people can go through the trees. T. Lewis states that he does not believe that they have to remove anything that is there, but they would be happy to do a fence. He states that if that is a contingency, they will send the neighbors an updated plan. S. Weeks states that he likes the idea of the fence, but he would like to know where the compressor is going to be. T. Lewis asks if he can go make a phone call to find out. T. Yasenchak states that is fine and refers to the code, 105-121, regarding buffers, which states that an opaque fence can be used. L. Brown states that she is to the side of the store property and that the Scotch pines that were planted about 17 years ago are all dead now. Arborvitae were planted and those have been great as far as her view of the parking lot. She asks if the greenery requirement could apply to the side as well so that it blocks more of their view into the property. T. Lewis states that it is on the roof now, they would like to have it on the roof of the new one, but if the neighbors would rather have it on the ground they can do that. B. Wilcox asks if there will be anything containing it. T. Yasenchak states that it could be on the ground with a buffer around it or is he saying on the roof with a buffer? T. Lewis states that is correct, there is a blanketing material. T. Yasenchak states a sound-deadening material. She states that the code does allow for an opaque fence. J. Bokus asks if the fence would go on the property line. R. Rowland states that the code requires that fencing be at least 2-feet on one's own property. S. Weeks states that his only question would be is the drainage an issue. C. Baker states that he has been to the store many times, he has not specifically concentrated on the back area and in lieu of it being raised as an issue, he would like to see something from Stewart's identifying the area. Show some topo in that area, show if it is a low point, is it currently collecting water or is there positive drainage away from there. J. Streit asks if the row of Scotch pines can be extended along the side of the parking lot. L. Brown indicates on the map for T. Lewis and he states that they will be happy to do that. C. Baker states that there is one thing in G. McKenna's comments regarding vehicle impact protection around the kerosene. T. Lewis states that he believes there were to be bollards there but it isn't on the map. He will bring that information back. J. Streit states that he thinks that for the Board to feel that the questions raised are mitigated, there should be a site

December 11, 2012

plan showing where the additional extension of the planting would be, where the fence would go and the nature of the buffering of the compressor. The public hearing is adjourned at 8:23 p.m.

THEODORE MAKKAY – Major Subdivision

Goose Hollow Road

Theodore Makkay and Rob Fraser are present for this application. R. Fraser states that their objective is to get preliminary approval and have the Board discuss SEQRA this evening. He has provided responses to C. Baker's comment letter in a letter dated November 26, 2012 and will review them at this time if the Board would like. This is done at this time. Regarding comment #3, C. Baker states that he has not done a detailed review of the revised storm water management plan, but in the previous plan the applicant took credit for 100 acres of conservation area. In order to take that credit, it has to be deed restricted. R. Fraser states that it is deed restricted. T. Yasenchak asks if that is by the "no cut". R. Fraser concurs. T. Yasenchak states that that is typically not how we have done it or seen it done. R. Fraser states that either way it will be deed restricted. It can be called a 'no cut buffer' or a conservation easement. R. Fraser states that attached to the response letter is a sample of deed restrictions, that they have used in the past, for the ACOE wetlands. He states that this is something that the Town Attorney will probably want to see, and he reiterates that they have used this language in the past successfully and ACOE has accepted it. After all comments are reviewed, T. Yasenchak explains that, going back to the conservation easement, typically it is not included in part of the lots because then we don't really have smaller lots with a conservation easement around it that is owned as open space. These are all just strips showing as a 'no cut buffer', but she does not feel that that meets the intent of open space. Typically when you do a cluster, it is open space meant for benefit of the environment or use of some sort. Just having a no cut buffer she does not feel meets the definition of the open space for cluster. She reads from the code regarding reservation of open space and the definition of open space. She states that in the past we have had a larger open space that has been sort of deeded and everyone owns a portion of that. She gives examples of other subdivisions. C. Baker states that there are two issues that we are talking about. He states that his comment, #3, is a different comment. He understands what T. Yasenchak is saying but that is a different item for consideration. C. Baker states his comment #3 is specifically relating to areas that the applicant has identified in their stormwater management plan as part of the new green infrastructure design methodologies. They have taken a chunk of this property, approximately 100 acres, and they have identified it as a conservation easement. By doing that in their stormwater management, they are allowed certain credits when they are sizing their stormwater basins, etc. In order to make that work, there has to be some guarantee that that 100 acres is in fact set aside as a conservation easement. Typically what happens is that that is in a deed restriction or there is a conservation easement that encompasses that whole entire area, the 100 acres, and a lot of times that line may follow some of those lots or may land in the lots. C. Baker states that what he is saying is that if that line lands in the lots, there should be identification to those landowners that a portion of their property is in a conservation easement and they cannot do anything with that in the future. R. Fraser states that he totally understands what C. Baker has explained and he will take care of it. T. Yasenchak states that she knows that the applicant has the open space, but then who owns that open space and then the no cut buffer is not necessarily part of the open space. R. Fraser states that the open space lot is deeded to lot #1 and they are just going to keep calling the 100' no cut buffer a 'no cut buffer'. R. Fraser states that was a little confusing but he totally understands where C. Baker is coming from and they will get that language on the plat. T. Yasenchak states that R. Fraser did a really good job of addressing all of C. Baker's questions. B. Duffney states that regarding the no cut buffer, some of these lots are pretty small. He asks if the no cut buffer means that if there are pine trees 140' tall that they would not be able to be taken out. That could be a hazard once you remove the trees on the interior of those lots. He states that he does not know what there is for timber on this property, but it could be a hazard to the home. R. Fraser states that if we have a safety issue then we can do some selective cutting. T. Yasenchak states that she thinks that it is so that no one clears that area. She states that G. McKenna is not going out to see who has cut a tree down. She thinks if something is a danger someone can take it down. B. Duffney states that he didn't know if they were going to do select harvest before they do

December 11, 2012

anything. T. Makkay states that in the 100' buffer there are no huge trees. He does indicate where there are some huge trees and there is going to be some thinning. He states that he has walked around here many times and if there were anything, they would be taken down. S. Weeks asks then what a no cut buffer means. R. Fraser states that he would think that it is an area that is not clear cut to build on. B. Duffney states that when the new zoning laws went into effect for timber harvesting, about 10 years ago, they wanted to put in a no cut buffer around the whole area, but you can select harvest. T. Yasenchak states that we have done this on other subdivisions in the past and have asked to show a limit of clearing. S. Weeks asks if there is a definition in the code as to what it is. T. Yasenchak questions that on lot #19, by the time you have the easement in there and there are the wetlands, she would like to know what the remaining space is because it looks really small. She feels that it will be a very difficult lot. She states that there is going to be a large fenced in area and the rest is all wetlands. R. Fraser states that it is a total of 2 ½ acres and roughly 1/3 is buildable. He states that the engineer, Doug Heller, used the same footprint for the house and the septic as the other lots. It works, it might not be as desirable as one of the other lots, but it is buildable. T. Yasenchak states that she has no objection, but it is an awkward lot. R. Fraser states that it may not sell, but it is buildable. T. Yasenchak states that she hopes that we are not making a difficult situation for the Town later. C. Baker reiterates that he has not completed a detailed review of everything that has been submitted. It certainly seems like they have addressed a lot of issues and are definitely headed in the right direction. He states that he would like to see G. McKenna's comments, W. Barss' comments and the Town Attorney's comments as far as the easement language goes. Lead Agency letters are discussed and will be sent out. T. Yasenchak states that we need to wait to get a response from them and C. Baker's comments before we start going through the long form. T. Yasenchak states that we can move towards final after C. Baker looks at stormwater and lead agency is taken care of. A public hearing is discussed and set for January 8, 2013 at 7:00 p.m. There is also a note from G. McKenna that an engineering escrow account needs to be set up.

DISCUSSION

T. Yasenchak states that Lorna Dupouy will be stepping down from her position on the Planning Board due to some family issues. T. Yasenchak thanks L. Dupouy, obviously we are going to miss her and we appreciate all the time and commitment that she has give to the Board.

T. Yasenchak states that if anyone knows of anyone who would be good for this Board, there will be a vacancy notice, please let her know.

Meeting adjourned 9:02 p.m., all members in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Rosamaria Rowland
Secretary