

TOWN OF GREENFIELD
PLANNING BOARD

April 11, 2017

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 T. Yasenchak, John Bokus, Michael Gyarmathy, John Streit, Stan Weeks and Robert Roeckle alternate. Thom Siragusa and Butch Duffney are both absent. Charlie Baker the Town Engineer is present.

MINUTES—January 10, 2017

T. Yasenchak asks if anyone has any revisions that they wanted to make to them.

MOTION: M. Gyarmathy

SECOND: J. Streit

RESOLVED that the Planning Board waives the reading of and accepts the minutes of January 10, 2017.

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

Noes: None

Absent: Siragusa and Duffney.

MOTION: Weeks

SECOND: Gyarmathy

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board waives the reading of and accepts the minutes of February 14, 2017.

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

Noes: None.

Absent: Siragusa and Roeckle.

PLANNING BOARD CASE

Gary LaMothe Case# 590

Canty Road

Area Variance
TM# 151.-2-107.2

T. Yasenchak explains what happens with a public hearing. J. Cromie is present for the applicant. T. Yasenchak states that she was absent the last meeting so she is going to turn it over to the vice-chair S. Weeks to discuss because he has also been in contact with the Town Attorney, regarding some of the legal questions regarding this application. Because this was noticed as a public hearing we will still have the public hearing. S. Weeks asks J. Cromie to present the project so that everyone in the audience can hear. J. Cromie states that G. LaMothe's wife passed away January 20, 2017 their wish is that she be buried on their property. J. Cromie states that their parcel is 23 acres and the parcel is separated from their house just adjacent to it. J. Cromie states that behind their house on their property is a small rise and that is where they want to place the burial plot. J. Cromie states that they are asking for 20x20 that would accommodate twelve graves, and it would only be a family cemetery. J. Cromie states that the current zoning law burial plots have to come before the Planning Board for the site plan review. Site Plan Reviews require survey's where the building is going to be located, where the structures are going to be set and public access all sorts of things of that nature. J. Cromie states that none of which really relate to a private family cemetery, and we have asked the Planning Board to waive those requirements my understanding is that they would because this just does not make any since in this case. The concerns that came up at the last meeting such as how does one get to the cemetery after the property has been transferred out of the LaMothe family and how does one find the private family cemetery on that property. J. Cromie states that Mr. LaMothe could create an easement for him and his daughters who do not own the property and the easement would be a 25' strip which would go right along the edge of the subject property adjacent to his house and that would be in any type of setbacks of 25' to go along the line of his house and directly to the cemetery plot 20x20 and 25' around. J. Cromie states that, is plenty of room to get around for hearses also by in the easement that there is a cemetery plot by record. J. Cromie states that he is also purposing that on the ground Mr. LaMothe has agreed to stone markers so that the cemetery is well documented and there was a question about if there would be a headstone and he will be having a headstone for his wife. S. Weeks states that it is very complete and we will open the public hearing at 7:08 and ask if there are any comments or questions from the public. No comments from the public. Public hearing is closed at 7:09. S. Weeks states that he has been writing to the town attorney and asked him how much detail should we have on the location of the plot and as you recall someone mentioned a survey and some of us thought that's a relatively expensive requirement if we require that and then there was a discussion about 4 stones at the corners and maybe a GPS coordinate at the corners which seemed to make since to me I think that we felt that was our prevue and not necessarily the Town Attorney in terms of how we would identify it. S. Weeks states that the question that we did ask him and we have not gotten an official written response at this point. We asked specifically regarding the process of approving it and respect the state regulations and SEQRA and I think we would do a very simple SEQRA. S. Weeks states that there was discussion future access to the cemetery if the surrounding property was sold. S. Weeks states that he did get the Town Attorney by phone this afternoon and he stated that he was not going to give us anything official by phone and I believe you have contacted the Town Attorney regarding this as well. J. Cromie states that he spoke to him yesterday and he sent him whatever he could find and faxed something to him the morning it's like looking for a negative the way the law reads it talks about cemetery corporation, private cemetery corporation, public cemetery corporation but, it does not deal with these types of small plot cemetery and I spoke with someone from the cemetery coordination yesterday and he wasn't sure but, he did know that such cemeteries or burial plots do exist and he said the major problem you have is access afterwards but, exactly how they would interrelate in the laws that deal with private or public corporation cemeteries., he wasn't really able to answer. S. Weeks states that the Town Attorney in asking me he said would it be acceptable to the applicant if by our next meeting which is April 25, 2017 if you and he have communicated he would suggest

that he would respond to us in writing and to you and then would have the easement all spelled out and we would be able to complete this process at the next meeting. J. Cromie states that he has 2 things for the Board 1.) What he sent to the Town Attorney which is a copy of the draft easement and 2.) The first page of the SEQRA that he forgot to include what we are asking for. S. Weeks asks if that is agreeable to the applicant as far as you know. J. Cromie states he needs to have his wife buried by the first or second week in May, so if we could wrap things up by then I think it wouldn't be a problem. S. Weeks states that is our goal in this process. S. Weeks ask the Board if they are in agreement with that all the Board members agree. T. Yasenchak states that with this extra time possibly J. Cromie could have something written up regarding the easement language about the access. S. Weeks states that he sent a copy of the draft easement language to the Town Attorney and passed one out for each of us. J. Cromie states that he hopes they approve everything.

Collura, J. Case #591
940 Locust Grove Road

Minor Subdivision
TM# 112.-2-24.1

Dave Barrss is present for the applicant. T. Yasenchak states that this project is a subdivision and also is a public hearing. D. Barrss states that this is a four lot minor Subdivision on Locust Grove Rd. and Griffin Rd. and they are purposing three six acre lots and one fifty acre lot. D. Barrss states that all lots are buildable location for house, septic, and well. D. Barrss states that they did take distance measures for all driveway locations and he situated the driveways where the next one point of sight distance and found acceptable locations. T. Yasenchak states that we are opening the public hearing at 7:15 and are there anyone hear that would like to speak regarding this project. All board members agree to close the public hearing no one is present to speak regarding this project at 7:16 p.m. T. Yasenchak states that C. Baker asked about the site distance which you did respond can you tell us what the design speed and what the minimum requirements are and what that standard is just for the record. D. Barrss states it is an aster standard that we work with. T. Yasenchak states that C. Baker is not present at tonight's meeting and I don't have any additional review from him and I don't know if he has any additional questions I think that was the only question that he had. T. Yasenchak asks the board what they think regarding the continuation of review of this. S. Weeks states that he recalls there weren't many issues besides the site distance. M. Gyarmathy states that the site distance is the only issue that he is aware of. T. Yasenchak states that we can go forward and review SEQRA. T. Yasenchak states that as a Board we can vote on this project with contingency of if C. Baker has any additional questions that the applicant would meet the engineering criteria that would be designated from C. Baker does the Board feel comfortable with that. The Board member all agree it is. T. Yasenchak asks D. Barrss asks if that would be ok with the applicant and himself. D. Barrss states yes they would be very happy with that. The Board goes through the short SEQRA form, R. Roeckle asks if we were in the workshop session. T. Yasenchak states that we are treating this project and the G. LaMothe project because they were the projects that were affected by the snow storm. T. Yasenchak states that all the questions to the SEQRA were no except numbers 4, 5, 6, 9, and 12A were yes. T. Yasenchak goes through part 2 of the SEQRA form and all answers were no to all of the questions except number 2 and the answer was small. T. Yasenchak states that part 3 of the SEQRA form is a determination of the SEQRA form and we can complete this part as well. All the Board members agree to check the second box.

MOTION: R. Roeckle
SECOND: M. Gyarmathy

Votes: Yasenchak, Bokus, Gyarmathy, Streit, Weeks, and Roeckle.

RESOLUTION: Jeffery Collura Minor Subdivision.

RESOLUTION, that the Planning Board approves the minor subdivision to Jeffery Collura case # 591 with upon contingency of the applicant will need any additional comments, questions or requirements from the Town Engineer following his review.

Piper, P Case# 594
87 Brigham Rd.

Minor Subdivision
TM# 138.-2-9

Now we are into our workshop projects. These are projects that have been submitted and we are reviewing for determination or to take any action on we are just looking for completeness. Patrick Piper and Scott Masse are present as the applicant. His is requesting for a minor subdivision on Brigham Road. P. Piper states that he currently owns 44 acres on Brigham Road and Scott Masse has agreed to purchase a small keyhole lot. T. Yasenchak states that you note on the application that the plans were prepared by D. Barrss. P. Piper states that we have not actually had the survey done yet. T. Yasenchak asks if D. Barrss will be the one doing preparing them. P. Piper states yes he will. T. Yasenchak states that she has provided an aerial view of the property with the contiguous lots so that you will know what the Board is looking at I just thought it would help them with what they are seeing, what the neighborhood would look like and that could see what the larger parcel would look like. T. Yasenchak states that there is already a house located on the property, it sits at the bottom of the hill., and the property goes up and the driveway would be along the left of the property, the north east side. T. Yasenchak states that she will open it up to the Board and the only question she has as you go forward you will need better map and actually have a survey that shows the meets and the bounds, also shows the driveway. T. Yasenchak states that we have requirements that we ask for such as if someone has an extremely long driveway over 500' we require notes to be placed on the plans that would show pull-offs for emergency vehicles and those things need to be put on the map when we get to the point of discussing them. Also we do require a 40' wide piece of property that would go up to that flied lot and if the frontage is angled it's not just the frontage that is 40' wide. P. Piper states that we are basically going to paroling the east property line all the way back. T. Yasenchak states right it's 40' wide so it may be that the frontage a little bit wider just because of the angel but, the driveway width would be 40' and also we do require site distance at that driveway so that we know that it meets the state requirements for being able to safely pull out of the driveway and that is something that D. Barrss is aware of. S. Weeks states that this will be a key hole and we have specific requirements for the driveway and it needs to be built to those specifications and they are spelled out. R. Roeckle asks if he is in front of the ZBA for the remainder of the lot because they don't have enough frontage. P. Piper states yes. R. Roeckle states that it looks like they are going to need a frontage variance. R. Roeckle states that other than the final plans with the well and septic and the proposed locations no further questions at this time. T. Yasenchak asks if the application has been provided to the ZBA. P. Piper states yes. T. Yasenchak states that the ZBA meets once a month and that is the first Tuesday of the month and its pending now they would be reviewing your project. T. Yasenchak explains the process of the ZBA's process.

T. Yasenchak states that they can't take action until the ZBA approves this but, it does give you time to get this information to us, like the driveway notes on the map and so forth. M. Gyarmathy does not have any additional questions other than the ones that have been already asked. J. Streit asks if there is an existing home on the property. P. Piper states yes. J. Streit asks what size will this lot be. (The lot that has the existing home on it.) P. Piper states that it will be approximately 38 acres total. J. Streit states the keyhole lot is on the west side of the property. P. Piper states yes. J. Streit states no further questions. J. Bokus states no questions at this time. T. Yasenchak asks if the applicant has any questions for the Board. T. Yasenchak states that to talk to your surveyor and make sure you look at our regulations about what notes we require for a minor subdivision what information we need and the site distance for the driveway that is not listed but that is required. Have your surveyor put all that together after you get your Zoning Variance we should be able to take action. P. Piper asks how often do you meet. T. Yasenchak states that we meet twice a month and once you get your ZBA approval we will be able to meet on the second Tuesday in June, that is our workshop meeting, because hopefully by that time you will have a survey to us with all that information on it and we could do a complete review and if we deem the application complete at that time we would be looking at making a determination and take action on your project the next meeting. S. Masse has a question I need a survey before I get an approval. Am I hearing that correctly. T. Yasenchak states that we need specific information and you have heard that we don't have any major issue with this project but, we can only look at what information is provided to us. This isn't not necessarily to scale its hand drawn. But, once we see something from D. Barrss we can give you any additional comments. But, to be honest a minor subdivision of this nature we've already given you all the comments that we would give to someone. We can't rule on something until there is a Zoning Variance that's been approved. S. Masse states that he didn't want to leave without asking the question. T. Yasenchak states that's ok in order for us to be able to rule on a subdivision accurately we need to see that survey and we hold everyone to that standard.

Witt Construction Case # 3674
Middle Grove Rd. & Lester Park Rd.

Minor Subdivision
TM# 164.-1-83

J. Bokus recused himself from this project due to the fact that he is a neighbor. John Witt is present for the application. J. Witt states that they were here last month and you had some questions regarding this project we have a site plan A and a site plan B. J. Witt states that we included a project that we did about 25 years ago Autumn Lane that has a simple maintenance agreement with a shared driveway and there hasn't been any problems with the 5 lots on this project, it has worked out very well. J. Witt states that we have also included a letter from DEC saying that the wetlands have been fine and surveyed and complete. J. Witt states that the digital maps that you have requested are from 1995- 1997 Lot line adjustment from April 30, 1997. Site plan A is 6.4 acres. Site plan B would be 17.8 acres. Subdivision D has a shared driveway we talked about the plans and they would like to see a private lane verses as having independent driveways and the difference there is the site distance remains the same. J. Witt states that he also added emergency vehicle turn arounds on Lot 4. J. Witt states that they also noted that the easement listed on lot 4 to be clarified to the Waldron property to the east. Lot 4 driveway is outside the buffer. T. Yasenchak asks what is the width of that driveway. J. Witt states 12'. T. Yasenchak states just for the Board the information that J. Witt has submitted this is at the request of our town engineer C. Baker he was familiar that this property had been subdivided in the past so he wanted to see what the history was. M. Gyarmathy asks why J. Witt prefers the lane rather than the separate driveways. J. Witt states

that when you have this kind of land the road is more attractive entrance to private land. J. Witt states that if you go Autumn Lane off of Meadowbrook Road it's a lane we did of 5 lots over 25 years ago it's nice and you can eliminate one cut so I think it makes since and it's one less culvert. J. Witt states that he met with clients this afternoon and is interested in one of the lots. J. Witt feels it's a better project. T. Yasenchak the mailboxes would be on the lane and that's something that the mailman would do on the lane not the road. J. Witt states that Saratoga will. T. Yasenchak asks about the emergency services. T. Yasenchak states that we have had problems in the past with shared driveways when something has to be fixed with a road or a lane that needs to be taken care of by the town in the past that is why we haven't because of the history. J. Witt states that they all have legal frontages if there is a problem they can run there driveway out and they could block them off if someone didn't pay. J. Witt states that typically the homes they build are pretty nice homes and to maintain he lane is typically \$200. A year and J. Witt feels it is an attractive solution, and it has worked well for 25 years on Autumn Lane. J. Witt states that we have had houses turned over 3 different times and never had a problem. M. Gyarmathy states that we have a couple private roads in the town and over the years we are still having reoccurring problems with them and I think that our comprehensive plan reflects the Towns position on shared driveways. M. Gyarmathy states that he just wanted to hear J. Witt's perspective. J. Witt states that he understands and thinks if you have a more complicated longer lane it would be difficult but, this is only a few hundred feet long. J. Witt states that he put the lane in and paves it and it will be good for 20 years then we will have to repave it. J. Streit asks what is the length and width of the driveway of lot 4. J. Witt states that the property along the Waldron property is 139.9 and we are going to go another 8' and then we are going to have that turn around at 500'. R. Roeckle states if you move forward with the shared driveway each of those lots will have to have complete easement across the entire roadway. S. Weeks states that he is not a fan of shared driveways and I think it is a bad precedent that have set in the past and we continue to say that the Town and the developers may be OK with it it's the future residence of the shared driveways that he is concerned about. S. Weeks states that personally he would not buy property with a shared driveway, there will be future problems. T. Yasenchak asks the Board if they feel the applicant's application is complete and schedule a public hearing but, in all fairness decide which plan we would like the applicant to go forward with. T. Yasenchak asks J. Witt which proposed plan do you want us to continue with. J. Witt states that he understands the reservations and respects them but, he knows from a practical point to curve cuts make a lot of common since from a mail box delivery getting the postal service off the main roads and more of a lane than a driveway every driveway has their own driveway off the lane and he feels that it is a win for everybody and the only down fall is if the neighbors get into a dispute. T. Yasenchak states that you have heard our reservations it cannot be a private lane it can it has to be a driveway and why we say that is because the private lanes that were created years ago people put a street sign up and because they say this is my address and we don't want any complications. T. Yasenchak states that we have seen people getting upset and have the money to pay but, because they don't like their neighbors they. T. Yasenchak states that we can say the application is complete referencing one particular one you have heard our reservations you know that if we deem it complete and we continue with our review there may or may not be approved with the way you want it and it may lengthen the time. J. Witt states that he would like to poll the Board. T. Yasenchak, M. Gyarmathy, Roeckle, S. Weeks vote against the shared driveway. T. Yasenchak states that they will proceed with Plan A- SEQRA Form Presented. T. Yasenchak states that we have driveway language notes that need to be put on the plans, also for every driveway over 500' is required to have pull off for emergency vehicles, wells and septic's, and have those put on the plans, go through the list of information that we have required for the plans those are all in our Zoning Regulations. T. Yasenchak asks if you could get that to us by 4/18/2017. T. Yasenchak states that we are setting a Public Hearing for 4/25/2017.

Merchant, K Case# 584
South Greenfield Rd.

Special Use Permit
TM# 151.-1-27.2

Ken Merchant is present as the applicant. T. Yasenchak states that the Board has asked the applicant to submit additional information. T. Yasenchak states that K. Merchant has provided all that has been asked of him. T. Yasenchak asks if K. Merchant has submitted a survey. K. Merchant states that he has provided an old survey. T. Yasenchak states that we only have one copy and will need more copies for all the Board members. T. Yasenchak states that there are wetlands on the property and we need those on the plans and when we do our SEQRA review we need to make sure there is no disturbance of the wetlands. T. Yasenchak states that in the wetlands there cannot be any buildings or materials in the wetlands. T. Yasenchak states that we need to be shown on the map. K. Merchant states that he will provide that with 100' buffer. M. Gyarmathy states no questions at this time don't have enough information to comment at this time. S. Weeks states that the drawing that we have is good but, needs more information like the wetlands. K. Merchant asks besides the wetlands are there other things you need. T. Yasenchak states with that everything that is highlighted on the map you will need on the new map it's all listed out in the application that is what is needs to be shown on the map. M. Gyarmathy, J. Streit, J. Bokus, no questions at this time. R. Roeckle states that it is a little odd have a storage yard on the property along with other things the law does not say anything I just don't approve of it, more of a commercial use. T. Yasenchak states that for the record it is an allowable use on this size lot going through the process of a Special Use Permit. R. Roeckle states that he understands. T. Yasenchak in your narrative you stated a future building on the property that should be shown on the property as well, any kind of storage piles, and where those would be located etc. T. Yasenchak states that we have certain requirements so there is no erosion, can't clear over a certain amount without going for a notice of intent from DEC and we need to see them on the map. T. Yasenchak states that we need all this stuff need before we can move forward with this application. T. Yasenchak states that you need to have this to us no later than the first Tuesday in May. T. Yasenchak states to the Board this is not a public hearing however, I know there are some neighbors that have some issues. T. Yasenchak asks the Board how they feel about hearing from the neighbors even though not a public hearing. S. Weeks states that he refers to the chair. R. Roeckle, M. Gyarmathy, J. Streit, J. Bokus all states it would be fine if brief. T. Yasenchak opens an unofficial Public Hearing if there any neighbors that would like to comment on this project; however, this is not a complete application at 8:06 p.m. James Lee 295 South Greenfield Road states that his property is directly across from k. Merchant's lot. J. Lee States that he is opposed to this Special Use Permit and would note that the applicant has been operating his business there illegally for a number of years and the application that he has submitted contains omissions of fact controversial project and shows disrespect to the Board and to the neighbors in terms of information that he has provided. J. Lee states that in his opinion K. Merchant `11 should be providing accurate information so the Board can make application to determine a determination. J. Lee states that he feels that you have some information but, not all. J. Lee states that he wrote a letter to the Board and please be diligent when reviewing this application, because the history of the applicant and the information that he provided J. Lee states that this is a controversial project and asks the Board to be very diligent. Todd La Rosh 297 South Greenfield Road basically lives across the street from K. Merchant states that it is very loud and there is a lot of traffic coming and going from K. Merchant's property. Angela Thrackhill 293 South Greenfield Road states there is visible pollution (diesel fuel), several commercial vehicles going

in and out of property. Unofficial public hearing closed. T. Yasenchak asks K. Merchant if he has any other information or any questions. K. Merchant states no not at this time.

Guarneri, M Case# 587
Daketown Rd.

Lot Line Adjustment
TM# 149.-2-99

Mark Guarneri is present for the application. T. Yasenchak M. Guarneri states that his subdivision was approved in 2015 or 2016. M. Guarneri states that the road bond has been set his lawyer and engineer presented this back then. M. Guarneri states that the Board does not approve of shared driveways. M. Guarneri states that he was supposed to be on the agenda on March 28, and went to G. McKenna on 3/2/72017 saying that he was going to do a subdivision instead of lot line adjustment. M. Guarneri states that he has a couple questions he is unsure if the Board has all the material. T. Yasenchak states that we don't have that in front us only thing we have are your application for lot line adjustment. M. Guarneri states that he tried to do this and basically all I would need is a road bond back in place, the Planning Board review. T. Yasenchak states that she thinks that the application that we have it was an approved subdivision but, with contingencies of those items but, because those items were not fulfilled, you didn't get a road bond. M. Guarneri states no but, he has it in place and submitted it in January of 2016, I was kind of unsure if I wanted to subdivide at that time. T. Yasenchak states that we are going to have to talk to the code enforcement official about the next step because, we had you on the agenda for this. T. Yasenchak states this is a workshop and this is what this is for. T. Yasenchak states that we have to ask G. McKenna where it stands with

Prestwick Chase
Denton & Daniels Rd.

Site Plan Revision
TM# 152.-1-109.1-1-104.1, 152.-1-111, 152.-1-115

Fred McNeary and Luigi Poleshi are present for the applicant. T. Yasenchak states that they are proposing changes to PUD granted in 2014. T. Yasenchak states because it was an amendment before it has to go to the Town Board then back to Planning Board- after the amended for us to review. F. McNeary states that Prestwick has been around for 19 years and they have decided to do single family homes for residents. L. Poleshi states that they have 164 existing 3 story buildings 12 cottages duplexes. They are proposing a community building along Saratoga Blvd. They have been approved for a utilities building. L. Poleshi states that they are also proposing an indoor/outdoor pool, small kitchen area, exercise room, and possibly an area where a chiropractor may come in to treat a patient. L. Poleshi states that they are proposing 2 story 8 unit buildings, eliminating the 3 story units. L. Poleshi states that they want to do an internal loop with a side walk for the residents to walk outside. L. Poleshi states that they are proposing 2 community buildings. L. Poleshi states that the entrance would be on Daniels Rd. L. Poleshi states that the storm water similar to what was originally approved, the sewer will similar, and Prestwick has their own water and will be making additional water. L. Poleshi states that total proposed units are 221 previously approved was 284. T. Yasenchak Would these residents be individual buildings and you would be building them not someone else. F. McNeary states they are preparing approximately 3 or 4 models for residents to choose from that are rentals. S. Weeks asks what would the square feet be of these proposed homes. L.

Poleshi states 1,600-2,400 square feet. S. Weeks asks why not duplexes. F. McNery states that most residents feel isolated however, they do have 3 residents are on a waiting list for the duplexes. T. Yasenchak states that the houses seem small and will they be able to have guests stay with them. F. McNery states that guests are frowned upon by the residents. T. Yasenchak states that we need something in place as we move forward the houses seem big compared to what you originally proposed. C. Baker states that we will have storm water questions. S. Weeks asks if this will appeal to a younger clientele. F. McNery states he is hoping so T. Yasenchak suggested that they talk to the neighbors regarding their old concerns. F. McNery states that they are going in front of the Town Board on April 13, 2017.

Brittany Chase Case# 531
Brookstone Dr.

Major Subdivision
TM# 126.-1-11.5

Mike Brooks is present for the applicant. M. Brooks explains his narrative and states that they adjusted lot 7 and lots 1, 2, 7, & 8 driveways are less than 500'. M. Brooks states that they have frontage on all the lots. M. Brooks states that they looked at the water quality and rain guard and old items were also addressed. M. Brooks states that they are doing a ground water study with Army Corp. T. Yasenchak asks in January we asked you for an updated SEQRA. M. Brooks states that he will get that to them. T. Yasenchak also asks for an updated narrative would be helpful. The rest of the Board Members do not have any questions at this time. T. Yasenchak states that we need an updated SEQRA and C. Baker's input. T. Yasenchak states that they are setting a public hearing for April 25, 2017.

Meeting adjourned at 9:30 p.m. All in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Kimberley McMahon
Secretary

DRAFT

DRAFT