

**TOWN OF GREENFIELD
PLANNING BOARD**

October 10, 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, the following members are present: Tonya Yasenchak, John Bokus, Nathan Duffney, Michael Gyarmathy, Robert Roeckle, Thomas Siragusa, and Stan Weeks. Charlie Baker, Town Engineer, is absent.

MINUTES – September 26, 2017

T. Yasenchak states that the Board just received the minutes from September 26, 2017, so they will be reviewed and voted on at the next meeting.

OLD BUSINESS

WITT CONSTRUCTION – Amendment to Subdivision/Site Plan Review

Case#506, Old Stone Ridge

T. Yasenchak states that it has been requested to review Witt's case first as the representative must leave. She explains that this is regarding the reforestation. This case was recently reviewed and changes were to be made that Cooperative Extension had requested. We have a letter from Cornell Cooperative Extension to G. McKenna dated September 20, 2017 and it is read into the record. A letter was also received from a number of Old Stone Ridge residents requesting that the neighborhood receive all they are due in the matter of the reforestation and this letter is read into the record. She states that we do not have a public hearing on this. The Planning Board is not an enforcement board, only a review board, and that is why we have had Cornell Cooperative Extension and Blue Neils do the reviews. Our Town Building Inspector is also not an expert in trees and this is something that he typically does not do. We do have the letter from B. Neils in addition to the letter that he did provide us earlier that talked about the trees that they did see and there is a certain mortality rate that is expected to happen and that is why the number of trees were planted. We did not expect all of them to live and the number that was selected was due to that projected mortality rate. B. Neils felt we were still within those parameters. S. Weeks states that he would have expected a more detailed determination by the Code Enforcement Officer. T. Yasenchak agrees and states that this is typically not our job, it is something that the Building Inspector asked us to review but it should really be his determination. B. Duffney states that the letter from CCE states that B. Neils deems this 'portion of the reforestation as satisfactory'. T. Yasenchak states that in B. Neils previous letter he did address the plantings and part of what he said was not followed was the burlap. M. Gyarmathy states that he does not have any questions and concurs with S. Weeks and T. Yasenchak's comments; it is not this Board's job to oversee this portion of whether the trees were planted correctly or not. R. Roeckle concurs, requested documentation was received from CCE and he is not sure if the Code Enforcement Officer went with B. Neils at the time. T. Yasenchak states that this Board did not determine the bond and has no responsibility for release of the bond, that is the Town Board. The Planning Board has nothing that it can make a motion on, we can maybe make a motion on a recommendation or just a statement to the Building Department that says that we have received and reviewed letters from Cornell Cooperative Extension and we feel that the letters received should be enough for our Code Enforcement Official to make a determination. Board agrees. T. Yasenchak states that the next step would be discussions with G. McKenna and the Town Board in all issues regarding the bond which is not the responsibility of the Planning Board. R. Roeckle asks if copies of the reports have been sent to the Town Board. T. Yasenchak states that she does not know, but that would be part of G. McKenna's

process. R. Roeckle asks if we can make a recommendation that the Code Enforcement Officer refers those reports to the Town Board. T. Yasenchak states that we can do that, that the Code Enforcement Officer should forward those reports as well as any other correspondence that has been received from neighbors to the Town Board.

RECOMMENDATION: The Planning Board has received and reviewed letters from Cornell Cooperative Extension and feels that the letters received should be enough for our Code Enforcement Official to make a determination. The next step for Witt Construction would be discussions with G. McKenna and the Town Board on all issues regarding the bond, which is not the responsibility of the Planning Board. The Code Enforcement Officer is requested to forward the reports from Cornell Cooperative Extension as well as any correspondence that has been received from neighbors to the Town Board.

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

SARASPA ROD & GUN CLUB – Site Plan Review

Case#605, Porter Corners Road

T. Yasenchak recuses herself. S. Weeks states that we had considerable discussion over the last several meetings and the applicant was going to speak to its Board and come back to us with suggestions about what we might do to modify the request. Lou Renzi, counsel for the Club, states that George Dunfey, Director of the Trap and Skeet program, is also present. Their understanding to date is that the Board is generally interested in approving the proposal based on concessions that the Club would be willing to make for the neighbors. What the Board is asking of the Club, which has been an extremely good neighbor all these years, is a political solution to a legal problem. In order to continue the good neighborliness and foster that spirit of community unity, the club is willing to, if the Board is willing to approve, make the hours for the trap and skeet ranges the same as for the other ranges, which he believes are 9:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m., Monday thru Sunday. The Club would be willing to concede to the neighbors and the community that they would not use those ranges (the trap and skeet ranges) on Monday's. The club has provided for this Board and for its consideration a decent amount of evidence of what the noise level is, would be and he does not believe it is excessive. Those Board members who were able to visit the club were able to observe for themselves. It is quite a long way to the neighbors from where they are shooting. Those who spoke in opposition did what folks so often do in these kinds of meetings, just simply speculated about the excess noise and all the extra bother that might be attendant to allowing the membership to use those skeet ranges at the same times as the other ranges, but there isn't any evidence of any of that. It is just speculation, but the Club went to a lot of expense and he believes that their technician explained all that on the record. It was a lot of money to spend in order to provide the Board with the kind of information that they believe is reliable and makes sense. It shows that this really isn't a problem in the making. What they are asking to do are the things that they used to be able to do and somehow that got changed along the way. For all those reasons, L. Renzi believes that this application ought to be approved. T. Siragusa states that at the last meeting we talked about the berm and there were discussions with perhaps Stewart's as a donor for dirt to go around that particular field. G. Dunfey states that they are currently in communications with Stewart's. It is not a guarantee that they are going to get that dirt but the Club has offered that they will take all of it. They would like to finish the berm on the 50 side all the way down, wrap around the back by the power lines and then come back down the side, wrapping the whole shotgun field. They do not have a problem doing that, the problem is that they are a not-for-profit club; they just cannot go out and buy truckloads of dirt. T. Siragusa states that the Club just bought property, they own property on either side and he is sure that wasn't free. They are working towards a solution, they didn't mention that. He is a little disappointed that they had to make a political statement and basically state that this proposal was unnecessary and under objection. He asks what the reason was for that, he heard what was said, he just wants to know what the reason was. What

was the reason for talking about why they are under objection? Why did they have to make the statement that they are under objection and didn't think that it was necessary? L. Renzi states that the last time he was here he did hear objections to it, he heard 'your' objections to it and he hopes those have been somewhat satisfied by the things that the club has agreed to do. He does understand that the president, Gerard Moser, is working on the berm issue, certainly wants to do that, we all want to do that and he is a very conscientious kind of individual. L. Renzi states that he has confidence that it is going to happen, however, it isn't a done deal and therefore he couldn't stand here and promise that was going to be and act like it was a done deal, that would be wrong. What he was trying to do was represent his clients. He is also a member of the club. T. Siragusa states that is not what he asked L. Renzi. L. Renzi states, was I trying to pick a fight with you, no. T. Siragusa states that he just wanted to know how L. Renzi came to that little dissertation there about why he is objecting. L. Renzi states that for quite a few years he sat as council to the Zoning Board of Appeals in a neighboring town, a fairly sizeable town. He sat here with board members and listened to many, many applications and many, many objections to those applications, and it was always a case of speculation versus realism. T. Siragusa states he is curious, was that L. Renzi's opinion or the SaraSpa Board's opinion. L. Renzi states it is his opinion. T. Siragusa states that L. Renzi is representing SaraSpa, why would we get his opinion. L. Renzi states that he does not know how to answer that. An application before a Zoning Board or a Planning Board or even a Town Board all have very similar characteristics. You have folks who come in and ask for things to happen and then you have other folks who come in... T. Siragusa states that he thinks it is rude to come in and dismiss every neighbor as speculative and wrong, and if that is only L. Renzi's opinion and not SaraSpa's opinion he would like to know that because it doesn't sound like SaraSpa to him. L. Renzi states that he is sorry that T. Siragusa thinks that is rude, it is accurate. Folks who come in to complain or who oppose, very rarely come in with any data that gives the Board anything to work with. T. Siragusa states they just have to get you that. S. Weeks states that the applicant has given a proposal and he would like to hear Board members respond and/or react to that. J. Bokus states that as far as the berm, is he correct in saying that the applicant is in favor of the berm, it is just a matter of if the Stewart's deal of free fill doesn't come about they are in a financial bind. G. Dunfey states that it won't be free but they have to get it hauled out. It will be a win for the club and the neighbors. J. Bokus states that if that falls through, it is cost prohibitive to get the fill from somewhere else at the going rate. L. Renzi states to reiterate the non-profit and, as T. Siragusa mentioned, they bought property and hired a logger to selectively log it, to pay off that property as well. J. Bokus states that the issue was that the applicant asked for expanded hours and the Board asked if the Club's Board would give some concessions. They have – one being not on Mondays and the second being the berm, but that might not happen for a while if the deal with Stewart's falls apart. R. Roeckle asks what size berm they are talking. G. Dunfey states that the normal berms they have are approximately 15' tall, they have a flat top of probably 6' and then they taper down. The biggest problem with having berms is that they have to maintain them. They have to call people in with machinery to pull it all back up. They are trying to get vegetation to grow on most of them so that will help with blockage of the noise. R. Roeckle states that he appreciates the reduction in the day, one day is better than no days. Currently they have Tuesday and Wednesday, and Saturday and Sunday, so they are getting one more day, but extended hours on all the days. M. Gyarmathy states that he was hoping for a little bit of a concession from the Club. He realizes that they are trying to do all they can to build those berms and he realizes that they put a lot of work and energy into what they have there, and he thinks they are doing a good job, but this berm is not a guaranteed thing. That is where his concern lies. L. Renzi asks how critical an item in M. Gyarmathy's mind is that and was he one of the folks who visited. M. Gyarmathy states absolutely and he thinks it would do a lot to deaden the noise throughout the neighborhood. He states that he lives a little ways away and he hears the noise on the weekends, so he knows what this is about. L. Renzi asks about the rest of the week. M. Gyarmathy states that he did not pay that much attention, he is not home enough during the week. T. Siragusa states that if we could add the berm to the agreement, he would be ok with it. B. Duffney asks what the hours and days for skeet are now. G. Dunfey states Saturday and Sunday, 9:00 to 2:00 and Tuesday and Wednesday, 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. B. Duffney states that ultimately if they had their choice they would like to go the same times as the other ranges. G. Dunfey states yes, ultimately, but they recognize the realities and they are trying to show that the club is a good neighbor so they are willing to make a concession of one day a week to not shoot at the trap and skeet ranges. If the Board feels

that the berm is a must have, they will try to figure out a way to do that. S. Weeks states that he agrees with M. Gyarmathy that the applicant has not conceded a whole lot in terms of saying that they will only have one off day in trade off for expanding all the other hours extensively. He is disappointed about that. He is not sure that they can guarantee that they are going to have a berm and that is where it gets a little confusing for him. If we allow these expanded hours and the berm doesn't come to be, then he is uneasy with that. He thinks that is more than he would like to see in terms of expanded hours without some other way to mitigate the issue. The other thing that was mentioned a couple of different times was to make sure that they posted the property and that was not mentioned tonight. L. Renzi states that is something they want to do as best they can and goes on to explain that the club discussed this and if you are a property owner you know what can happen with posting. You can spend a lot of time and money and effort, go around and post the whole place or part of it, and within a short period of time those trees aren't there, vandals come along and rip the signs down, etc. The last thing they want to come in here and set themselves up for is for a few posted signs to be knocked down without their knowledge and then have someone come running in here trying to revoke their special use permit which was made conditional on posting. That is really why he would advise the club to not let that become a condition of the use permit itself. Will he and has he advised them to do the posting anyway, yes sir, absolutely and they do intend to do that. They would like that to be a gentleman's agreement and not a condition of the permit, because they don't think that would be fair. G. Dunfey states that he has not walked all the property but he is pretty close to saying that there is 50 to 60 percent of the property which is already posted. The new property next to Sandra Arnold- Spaulding, they have spoken to her and if she gets posted signs they would put them up for her and they would put signs up also. M. Gyarmathy asks if it is in their bylaws or rules that there is no hunting on the club's property. G. Dunfey states yes, they do not permit hunting. He states that he did hunt with someone who would remove posted signs and that was the last time, it is a legal document and you cannot pull it down and burn it. They don't know if it is done here. L. Renzi states that they are happy to say that yes, they intend to complete the process and do the best they can with it and continue it over time, but they would ask that it not be a condition of the permit. S. Weeks states that it would probably be a condition that we understand that it is the intent to post the property. Is that a problem, that we understand that it is the applicant's intent to post the property? L. Renzi states that he does not have authority to make commitments to the Board that are not in hand yet, they are doing their best. He believes that G. Moser will succeed, but they are not there yet. He would like to get his arms around the idea of how tall and how much of a berm this is going to be and if anyone has had a chance to put some numbers together to figure out what kind of resources it would take to actually build it. B. Duffney states that the reason he asked about hours, some of the Board members feel that they applicant is not giving enough. They are talking about the berm. He asks if they would be willing to possibly give up the Friday, giving them Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday and because of the berm situation, if the berm goes in and goes all the way around, could they come back to the Planning Board for the other two days. S. Weeks states that an applicant can always come back before this Board. L. Renzi states that what is being suggested is making 2 days dark on the skeet range and embody a future trade of one of those days for the berm. T. Siragusa states that his feeling is that the berm would do more good in general for noise mitigation than a day would. He thinks the berm is more important than a day. M. Gyarmathy agrees. S. Weeks states that his sense is that we are not at the point of approving this until we have something firmer about the berm issue. L. Renzi asks if we can table the matter. S. Weeks states that we would be very willing to table and thanks the applicant. S. Weeks offers that the application can be on the next agenda. If the applicant is not ready to discuss at that point, please notify the Board. L. Renzi states that he is pretty sure that they will not have enough time to get things lined up. S. Weeks states we will schedule this for the following meeting.

464 MAPLE AVENUE LLC – Site Plan Review

Maple Avenue, Case #606

Eric Carlson is present. T. Yasenchak states that when the applicant was here last the Board asked for some additional information and we received some. She explains that site plan review is required under

our solar regulations for a non-residential use. Regarding the panels being mounted at the same angle as the roof surface – that is what it appeared to be from the picture, is that correct? E. Carlson states that they are not facing the front yard, so we should be able to skip over that. T. Yasenchak asks if they are still on the same angle. E. Carlson states they are. T. Yasenchak asks how far they stick up off the roof. E. Carlson states within inches and explains there is a diagram. T. Yasenchak states that we ask that the panels be black, brown or dark gray. E. Carlson states that it is all black as well as the rails. There will be no signs or lighting attached to this. T. Yasenchak states that one other item is where any other equipment will be located. E. Carlson states that they will be mounted adjacent to the service panels on the back of the building. He states that the first submission included the inverters. T. Yasenchak states that the Board did not get that, the first submission was just the site plan and SEQRA. E. Carlson reiterates that they will be on the back of the building, adjacent to the electrical service panels. In this case, the back of the building is to the north side towards Bob West's property. T. Yasenchak asks if there will be any other kind of utility lines going to the commercial building. E. Carlson states that from the panels to the inverters, the lines are all inside the building. T. Yasenchak asks how often these need to be maintained, etc. E. Carlson states very little to no maintenance. T. Yasenchak asks if the panels are owned or leased. E. Carlson states owned. T. Yasenchak states that there are certain requirements from the building department side of this regarding attaching these to a roof, space to the ridge, etc., and that will all fall under the building permit. R. Roeckle states that he assumes that the trusses were designed to support the additional weight. E. Carlson states that there were. T. Yasenchak states that the only other question we have is the potential for glare. She asks what the property is to the right, south. E. Carlson states that Greg Slywka has the chiropractic office and his wife owns the hair salon in the back. He states that with the positioning of this building, the glare should not reflect down at all. S. Weeks questions that the service entrance for the property is at the building. E. Carlson states that it is. S. Weeks states that it is interesting that what the applicant provided does not say anything about glare. Usually there is some comment about panels and testing for glare. E. Carlson states that he switched panels from the last meeting to a very residential friendly, black colored panel that actually cost him some wattage and power on the system as it turns out that the commercial panels which have more power also have a silver band typically. S. Weeks states that when it talks about the front cover, it does say it has anti-reflection technology, he had missed that. B. Duffney questions that these are supposed to last 40 years. E. Carlson states that theoretically they would last forever. What they do is deteriorate every day. They advertise different levels such as 90 or 95% after 20 years and after 40 years they might be producing 80% of the original power. B. Duffney states that if these are on here forever, and you have 20 year shingles, how are you going to replace the shingles? E. Carlson states that you have to pull them off. B. Duffney asks how far these will sit from the eaves. E. Carlson states that he believes the code is 3' on all sides. What is interesting about the code is that it requires 3' of space to walk around for a fire fighter, but when they go there and see that it is trussed, they are not going to go on the roof anyway, so it makes very little difference.

RESOLUTION – 464 Maple Avenue LLC, SEQRA

MOTION: B. Duffney

SECOND: T. Siragusa

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board completes Part II of the Short Form SEQRA. All questions are answered and the second box is checked, indicating that this will not result in any significant negative environmental impacts for the application of 464 Maple Avenue LLC for Solar Panel Site Plan Review for property located at 464 Maple Avenue, TM#153.13-1-13.

VOTE: Ayes: Duffney, Bokus, Gyarmathy, Roeckle, Siragusa, Weeks, Yasenchak

Noes: None

Absent: None

RESOLUTION – 464 Maple Avenue LLC, Site Plan Review

MOTION: B. Duffney

SECOND: J. Bokus

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board approves the application of 464 Maple Avenue LLC for a Site Plan Review for the installation of Roof Mounted Solar Array for property located at 464 Maple Avenue, Tax Map #153.13-1-13.1, per the application submitted and the following:

- **It has been noted that the panels are parallel to the roof**
- **It has been noted that the panels will be less than 18 inches from the roof**
- **The panels and the rails are all black, we have noted that the panels have anti-reflection technology as noted in the specifications provided**
- **The applicant has noted that the inverters will be on the north side of the building and will be building mounted**
- **The panels are owned and not leased**

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

R. Roeckle asks that the applicant provide a copy of the inverter information for the file. E. Carlson states that he will do that.

HIGH PEAKS SOLAR – Special Use Permit
(Jenkins) NYS Route 9N, Case #600

Kevin Bailey is present for the application. T. Yasenchak states that the last time that the applicant was here they needed a zoning variance, the Zoning Board has granted a variance and now the applicant is back before the Planning Board. She states that the last time that the applicant was here we did ask for additional information about the panels, etc. She does not believe that we have received anything. K. Bailey does not recall. T. Yasenchak states that we have several pages of requirements for ground mounted solar and what is required to be provided for that. She reviews some of that information for the applicant. It is all listed in the requirements. K. Bailey states that he does not recall being asked for more information. He states that he was not given any information requesting further information; he was not given specific requirements. He is aware that this Town has its own requirements. They have been waiting for 5 months to build a residential system and he does not think they are being treated with any sort of respect as a business person and contractor who works under time constraints, weather, etc. He is happy to provide that information, however he asks that it be presented appropriately. T. Yasenchak states that she will find the minutes where we specifically said that we have this as our zoning code. We told the applicant at that meeting to go talk to the building department and that that would be given to him. She indicates it is on line and we told him months ago that we needed this to be submitted. It clearly lists out the information. We have other solar companies come and they have been able to give us the required information, it is not difficult and is probably something that he has already given to the owner. All we have received is a picture which shows no specifications on dimensions, etc. The information for the site plan is a good start but there is more information that we need. We are not being difficult, it is something we asked for months ago and we literally could have given approval tonight if this had been provided. She provides a copy to the applicant. The minutes of the July meeting indicate that we specifically told the applicant to look at the information and provide it to us. She states that she is sorry, we have never been called anti-business, we are definitely for small business, we are definitely for residents and families to be able to be energy conscious, this is something that we put a lot of work into so people could do this in their homes. She really takes offense for this Board that he would come in and not bring us this information when he has had months to do it and then blame us for being non-friendly. K. Bailey states that he is here. T. Yasenchak states that the information has not been provided, we have specific requirements for a site plan review and there is nothing that we can do. The applicant has totally tied our hands, our regulations are specific. We need to have that

information before we can take any kind of action. There is not much we can comment on when we don't have a full application. Mike Millis, states that he does not know how the Board works but it has taken them since May and it is almost November to get 3 poles with solar panels on them. It is so frustrating. T. Yasenchak states that she understands. We have an application which was given to us on June 21st and when the applicant came in in July they were given the information. She reiterates her comments. K. Bailey states that he believes he has all the information and can send it over as soon as possible. S. Weeks states that most of the specification information you can get from the supplier of the panel, they have to do that all the time for a lot of projects. K. Bailey does not feel it should be this difficult. T. Yasenchak reiterates that it might have been possible to approve this tonight if we had the information. She is sorry for the applicant's frustration but she is frustrated to come in here and have someone blame this Planning Board when we constantly work with people; we try very, very hard to work with people and we do not try to drag things out because we are volunteers, we don't like to drag things out. B. Duffney states that he is a business owner and goes into other towns to do work. He goes in ahead of time to find out what the requirements are. He indicates the information provided by the previous case. All of our requirements are in the Code Enforcement Office and you can ask any questions of G. McKenna. It is also on line. M. Gyarmathy agrees that the application is not complete. J. Bokus states that the applicant had to get variances and those are from the ZBA, and we cannot act until that has been finalized. M. Millis asks if everything is provided this week, by the next meeting could they possibly get approval. T. Yasenchak states that this is a special use permit so it is something that does require us to have a public hearing; we could possibly set a public hearing based on only if K. Bailey gets that information in within a week. We typically don't set public hearings until we have a complete application because once we make a notification then people can come in and we have to know we have a complete application. M. Millis states that they had a public hearing and no one came. Some people came to his house and he explained it and they had no problem. K. Bailey asks if the previous applicant submitted a glare analysis. T. Yasenchak states that K. Bailey can go to the Building Inspector's office and review the file. They did not do a total analysis but they gave us a packet with product information that showed the limit of glare on their property. K. Bailey states that he has all the information; it is just a lack of communication between himself and the Town. He apologizes for that, this is a new process for him. A public hearing is scheduled for October 31, 2017, contingent upon receiving the information by October 17, 2017. K. Bailey states that it is hard for him to understand the difference between the process for roof mount and ground mount and the different processes for residential systems. R. Roeckle and T. Yasenchak state that for the residential roof mount you do not need to go to any Board. It is less intrusive on the land, less intrusive visually to neighbors, etc. The Town followed State guidelines, what other municipalities are doing just so that there is a process so that it can be contained.

HIGH PEAKS SOLAR – Special Use Permit
(Gaschel) Sand Hill Road, Case #599

K. Bailey is present for the application. T. Yasenchak states that this applicant also received a variance; we need the same information as for the previous application. A public hearing is scheduled for October 31, 2017, also contingent upon receiving the information by October 17, 2017.

K. Bailey asks who he should speak to regarding the completeness of the information and if it is acceptable or will that be gaged at the next meeting. T. Yasenchak states that the applicant should be able to talk to one of the building inspectors about that.

DISCUSSION

T. Yasenchak states that she is going to talk to the Town Supervisor again about the extra hours for the assistant building inspector who is supposed to be spending his additional hours on looking at applications for the Zoning Board and the Planning Board and she does not feel that that is being done. She

is not seeing any additional help coming from that department. She will talk to the Building Department about that because these are things that should have been addressed by the Building Department when something was being brought in or if they had questions and it is coming to us. It should not get this far. S. Weeks states that the process is not working and T. Yasenchak should say it as strongly as she can and that there are some very frustrated people on this Board because of it. The public is also frustrated. T. Yasenchak states that it should never have gotten to us, something should not get to us that needs a variance. We should not be the ones figuring out that something needs a variance. They could have made this process a lot quicker if they would have known. M. Gyarmathy states that it is not this Board's job to explain codes to the applicant. It is the applicant's responsibility to read the codes or if they have questions, should ask the Code Enforcement Officer. Clearly this applicant has not even glanced at our code. T. Yasenchak states that we are having problems with other applications and people not knowing. R. Roeckle states that we are going through and finding issues that should have been noted prior to an application even being made. B. Duffney states that this is the workshop meeting and the applicant came to the workshop, and now he knows. R. Roeckle states that these two applications would have required the public hearing and because there are 3 weeks, it does give them that time. We don't know if the applicant submitted something as part of the zoning application and it should have come to the Planning Board. K. McMahon states that he did submit some information for the ZBA but it has been 2 months and she does not remember what it was, what the ZBA had asked for for additional information. T. Yasenchak asks K. McMahon to make sure that the Planning Board gets the ZBA minutes for both of those projects.

Meeting adjourned, 8:32 p.m. All members in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Kimberly McMahon

Rosamaria Rowland