



PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
VIRTUAL -WebEX
November 17, 2020

C. Howard Post, Chairman, opened the meeting at 7:30 p.m.

Present: C. Howard Post, William Creen, Ken Goldberg, Carole Furman, Mike Tiano, Daniel Ellsworth, Len Bouren, Robert Hlavaty (alternate), Adriana Beltrani (Town Planner, NPV).

The draft minutes of the October 20, 2020 Planning Board meeting were reviewed. A motion was made by Goldberg, seconded by Furman, to approve as written. Board vote: Bouren-no comment heard, Tiano-Aye, Ellsworth-no comment heard, Furman-Aye, Goldberg-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Creen-Aye, Post-Aye. Motion carried.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Site Plan/SUP, Stillwater Getaway/De Gagne & Depalma, off Pond Lane. This public hearing was held open from the October 20, 2020 Planning Board meeting due to notification requirements. De Gagne was present for the meeting but could not be heard. Beltrani-the applicant is looking to build four rustic cabins on their property, they currently live on an adjacent parcel. Access will be via an existing driveway through the parcel in which they live. There will be no running water in the cabins, potable water will be provided, and compostable toilets will be used. Outdoor grilling facilities will be provided. Post-anyone present for this public hearing?

- Lauren Ruberg, 9 Darlene's Way-what is the general purpose, Airbnb? Post-for overnight guests in a rustic setting, more like camping. It is an allowed usage in this district with a Special Use Permit.

No further questions were presented. A motion was made by Creen, seconded by Furman, to close the public hearing. Board vote: Bouren-no comment heard, Ellsworth-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Furman-Aye, Creen-Aye, Goldberg-Aye, Post-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye. Motion carried, public hearing closed at 7:39 pm.

Beltrani-at this point all relative questions have been answered, we can put SUP conditions in the resolution. Post-will add the review of the SUP in 1-year to ensure that all regulations are being met. No further questions from the Board. A motion was made by Goldberg, seconded by Ellsworth, to approve the site plan and special use permit with the condition that it will be reviewed in 1-year for compliance. Board vote: Bouren-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Ellsworth-Aye, Furman-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Goldberg-Aye, Creen-Aye, Post-Aye. Motion carried.

2. Major Subdivision, Timothy & Kimberly Keefe, 255 High Falls Road. Presented by the owners/applicants. The applicants are proposing a three lot subdivision of a 6.8-acre parcel, containing an existing house. They would like to create two additional 2-acre lots buildable lots, leaving the existing house on the third 2.8-acre lot. The Town Highway Superintendent has already reviewed the access for all lots and had no concerns with issuing curb cuts, when necessary. No culverts will be necessary. Septic approval has been received, verbally, just awaiting the paperwork from the Health Department, will forward upon receipt.

Post-anyone present for the public hearing? Any questions/concerns? None.

A motion was made by Creen, seconded by Furman, to close the public hearing. Board vote: Tiano-Aye, Furman-Aye, Post-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Goldberg-Aye, Creen-Aye, Ellsworth-Aye. Motion carried. Public Hearing closed at 7:45 pm.

Board Comments: Goldberg-does the applicants' responses answer the Planner's comments in their review? Beltrani-addressed most comments, setbacks are now clear. The subdivision map has been updated as requested. Post-we did receive a letter from neighboring property owners', Robert and Samantha Dederick. One of their requests is that the owner let any potential buyers know of the existence of the gun club in the near vicinity. Beltrani-that is not something that the Planning Board can control/address. Post-pollled the board for questions: Tiano-none, Ellsworth-none, Furman-none, Goldberg-none, Hlavaty-none, Creen-none, Bouren-no response.

A motion was made by Ellsworth, seconded by Goldberg, to approve the 3-lot major subdivision. Board vote: Tiano-Aye, Ellsworth-Aye, Furman-Aye, Post-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Goldberg-Aye, Creen-Aye. Motion carried.

3. Site Plan/SUP, Hacienda de Leyenda, 33 Blue Mountain Road. Presented by Richard Rothe/ Engineer and Gary Harwick/owner. Public hearing was opened at 7:50 pm. Rothe-currently operates as an Airbnb. The main house has 5 bedrooms, each with an ensuite. There is also an Airstream camper located on the property that is utilized for overnight guests. Currently the property can accommodate 16 guests overnight. The site plan proposed will add 4 additional 1-bedroom cabins to the property for up to 8 more overnight guests. The event barn proposed will be for special events, retreats and small weddings (up to 100 guests). There is an additional space proposed for a yoga and sound healing studio. If anyone present would be able to make their comment and then we can address all of them at the end. Post-would like to avoid repeat questions. Goldberg-this use is permitted in this district but only with a Special Use Permit, the Board has the authority to put restrictions in the resolution, if approved, to ensure that all standards of the zoning law are followed. Referenced §7.3.1 of town zoning law, but can be found in §245.34: <https://ecode360.com/13646959>. Creen-part of the property is already operational, do they have a Special Use Permit (SUP) in place already for that? Rothe-no it operates as an Airbnb at this time, which does not require that. Beltrani-would like to add that §245.11(g) of the SUP requirements outlines the following for this particular use:

- Outdoor lighting, except for safety features, shall be extinguished by 11pm or completely shielded from neighboring properties.
- Any use of outside loudspeakers/sound systems can only be used between the hours of 8am-10pm.
- A 40' landscaping buffer must be put in place to all property lines, except the street line, in which case a 20' landscaping buffer must be installed.

Post-let's move forward with public comments:

- Sarah Chianese-Caterer in the area and has been working with the owners with the current Airbnb for food and beverage catering. The owners work hard to abide by all laws and work to ensure that they are operating within the code. They operate with integrity and use local vendors to keep business in the area. They handle the Airbnb professionally. Speaking in favor of this project, as it will bring more business into our community.
- Lisa Ellerby, 11 Blue Mountain Church Road-we are adjoining neighbors to this property have experienced trespassing onto our property with the current operation, our property is less than 40' to the current house being operated as an Airbnb. The noise is loud and the lights are bright. We have asked them to turn down the music but it continues after 11pm. There are loud

bands on the weekends. They have dumped on our land, there has been shooting of explosive targets, light pollution and affects the wildlife in our area. This proposed additional use is not conforming to our area, and does not fit in with the character of the neighborhood. They currently do not respect the wishes of this community, we are not comfortable. The current Airbnb is enormously promoted on the internet.

- Richard & Linda Barr, 97 Blue Mountain Church Road-this proposed use will affect our wildlife. It does not fit in with the character of the neighborhood and should not be allowed. There has been gunfire on the property by individuals that have rented it. Loud music and noise need to be controlled.
- Lauren Ruberg, 9 Darlene's Way-born and raised in the area and this proposed use will create too many transients for the small community. It does not fit in with the character of the neighborhood. The visitors that already use the Airbnb are not respectful of the neighbors, they do not pick up after their dogs when taking them for walks. Many negatives about the current use of the property, would not like it to get larger with more transients. Many of the people renting the property use our private road, Darlene's Way, as a turning point. Not fair to those of us that have to pay for the upkeep of this road.
- Joan and Bayley Silleck, 44 Blue Mountain Church Road-have lived across the road for 26-years, initially there were no issues with the Airbnb but then there loud noise and shooting have occurred. The owners did apologize for the incident with the shooting. There are so many lights. The proposed alteration will be detrimental to our neighborhood. The commercial expansion will change our community and the lifestyle of those living here. The proposed cabins look like containers off a freight ship and do not fit in.
- Edward Eilenberger, 542 Blue Mountain Road-concur with the noise issues, there have been explosions, gunfire and loud music. There is a big issue with a venue as proposed being in the middle of a residential neighborhood.
- Peter & Agnes Barber, 53 Blue Mountain Church Road-our property is adjoining this parcel and we can see everything that happens from the driveway. The noise is loud and the parking will be an issue and the effects of additional parking areas with seepage of vehicle leakage into the ground. The septic holding tanks, is there an overflow containment system proposed? Pond contamination that will run into the reservoir. The traffic will be increased and there are no speed limit signs on the road. Where are the people attending the events being brought in from? Concerned with the outdoor event noise/music. With the additional people on the property the noise levels will increase dramatically. With the increase in transients no one will know who is in the neighborhood. If all fairness the noise levels have been adjusted lately but the increase in events and individuals using the property will bring it back up. This type of proposed use would work better in an area where the 14-acres were secluded, we are all on top of each other. The impact on the neighborhood with the events? What about alcohol, do they need a liquor license for these events? Who is responsible?
- Carol Barrance, 74 Burnett Road-the proposed use will create an increase in unfamiliar faces in the community. This proposed use will turn a residential home into a commercial use. Blue Mountain Church Road is a beautiful road and it was not built for the increase in traffic that the proposed use will create.
- Stuart Weissman, 40 Blue Mountain Manor-we live around the corner and this proposed use is not cohesive with the area, it does not fit in this residential neighborhood.
- Stephanie Cranston, 542 Blue Mountain Road-live across from the Ellerby's and we see the lights all night. How will the proposed use affect the water table, water use? Will the drilling of additional wells, if required, have an effect on our water system?

- Lauren Klein, 31 West Saugerties Road-my family has lived in the area since 1945. The noise with the music and explosions has been unfair to the neighborhood. Frequently go to the cemetery on the road and the current traffic makes it difficult to cross the road. The current conditions are unfair to the neighborhood and an expansion should not even be considered.
- Anthony Masasi, 86 Blue Mountain Church Road-if a septic holding tank is proposed, how often will it be pumped? Already have trespassers come across my property, this will be increased with an expansion. Does not work for the neighborhood.
- Ian and Justyna Leverich, 505 West Saugerties Road-this does not seem fair to the neighbors, the proposed use is a commercial project in a residential area that would disrupt the neighbors way of life. What are they paying in taxes, do they get some type of tax break?

Rothe-would like to address the questions and concerns. Many are speaking about the shooting in November 2018. Since that event it has not occurred again and the owners have taken precautions to ensure that it does not. Ask the neighborhood residents to be patient and give the owners another chance to iron out the ripples in running the business, if the Site Plan/SUP is approved. Since the application includes a SUP, the Planning Board will have the ability to impose conditions on the property and how it is developed/operated. They will address lighting and ensure that it is downward facing and not an issue. It gives the Board the opportunity to address neighbor's concerns. There is no noise ordinance in the Town of Saugerties but under the SUP regulations the hours are regulated. If an event will include the servicing of alcohol, the catering company would be responsible, as it would fall under their liquor license. If individuals bring alcohol on the property themselves they will be responsible. The majority of the traffic for the property will happen twice a day during a normal rental (not including events) with an average of 68 trips per day, averaging 5 trips per hour in the am and 6 trips per hour in the evening. The owners would like to offer a shuttle service to minimize the traffic impact during events. Events would be a maximum of 100 attendees. Harwick-would like to address the shooting that occurred on the property. We were very upset with this situation and have implemented more stringent regulations in our contract, including a significant bond of \$2,500 per rental. The even bond would be somewhere around \$5,000 to ensure that the individuals responsible for the rental agreement follow all the rules and regulations. Our hope is to create a space for wellness events and our main focus is on small groups of people coming together to connect. We are thinking there would be approximately 40 individuals on site for a retreat and they would not be scheduled for every weekend. To address the private road being used as a turnaround-we have a separate gate with an entry code, no one should be using that private road.

Post-there are definitely a lot of public comments and viewpoints to consider. Are there any further comments? None. A motion was made by Goldberg, seconded by Furman, to close the public hearing. Board vote: Bouren-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Ellsworth-Aye, Furman-Aye, Post-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Goldberg-Aye. Motion carried. The public hearing was closed at 9:11 pm.

Board comments were heard. Goldberg-under the current conditions the Planning Board has no control over how the property is used, as we do not regulate Airbnbs at this time. If the expansion is approved we would be able to enforce conditions to address the public's concerns. Currently they are advertising that they can accommodate up to 28 guests for corporate retreats/functions/events, when they have stated that they only have space for 16 at this time. With the proposed expansion they are looking to increase the capacity of guests up to 46. Do we trust that it will stop there when they currently are only supposed to have 16 on-site but have advertised they can accommodate up to 28? What will happen if the increase is approved, what will they actually host on-site? What is being requested is not compatible with the neighborhood. There are no conditions that the Planning Board could implement

to approve. Beltrani-note that special events are not incorporated in the use of an inn. Suggest an interpretation from the town lawyer, for future reference. The applicant does have the ability to go to the Code Enforcement Officer and request a permit for a mass gathering. Bouren-agree with Goldberg, is not compatible with the neighborhood. Creen-Agree with Goldberg. Tiano-Agree with Goldberg, opposed to using a shuttle service. Beltrani-off-site parking is not permitted unless waived by the Planning Board. Parking must be adequate on-site. Special events are separate from the inn for SUP and events are the issue, not well defined within the code. Furman-Agree with Goldberg, the fact is the property is already problematic without the expansion. Ellsworth-Agree with Goldberg, the applicants could develop a different site plan but they should get a mass gathering permit for events, when applicable. Hlavaty-Agree with Goldberg.

A motion was made by Post, seconded by Furman, to disapprove the Site Plan and SUP as presented. Board vote: Bouren-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Ellsworth-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Creen-Aye, Goldberg-Aye, Post-Aye, Furman-Aye. Motion carried, the application is disapproved. Post-the applicant could re-submit the application with an updated site plan addressing the concerns, no application fee, site plan review or SUP fee will be collected. No off-site parking is permitted. Clarification from the town attorney should be sought regarding events.

OLD BUSINESS

1. Site Plan Amendment, Wyldwyck, LLC (Agawam), Liberty Street Ext. Presented Bruce Utter, Praetorius & Conrad, P.C. Also present were Adam Friedman (Applicant), Mike Moriello (Attorney), Bruce Anderson (Cutler Anderson Architects) and Fariah Choudhary(Architect). UCPB referral recommendations were received.. There were two required modifications: paving/plowing (material to be used on roadways) and a conservation easement. There was one advisory comment regarding the addition of an access easement for the trails along the river. The applicant would not like to create an access easement to share the trail on the property. Not interested in allowing people, not staying on property, to use the trails due to liability. A letter was received from Tom Francello, 2179 Route 32, regarding fire pits. He suggested that the applicant run natural gas to the fire pits instead of using wood. Tiano-if wood is being used where is it coming from? Friedman-prefer using wood, kiln dried/bug free wood. Utter-will have to follow the radius of DEC regulations regarding trucking in wood. Post-are there any outstanding concerns? Beltrani-the applicant has addressed concerns, comfortable with this application. There was a comment brought to the Board regarding maintenance of landscape, to require a note be put on the site plan that dead or dying landscaping will be replaced and maintained to the benefit of the neighborhood. The applicant has agreed to add this note and it will be added to the draft resolution on page 3. There was one minor redline from the applicant's attorney, Mike Moriello, #2 on Page 3; "These shall be required prior to maps being signed by the Chair. Final recorded agreements copies shall be provided to the Planning Board prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy." should be added. Post-poll the board for questions: Bouren-no questions. Tiano-consider not using double yellow lines, as suggested by the Maser study, on Liberty Street Ext., it will create havoc for the fire trucks leaving and entering the firehouse. It will also cause traffic issues. Chief letter-the east side has no egress for fire trucks. When you look from the river side the building is two stories and we are told it is one floor, but we are looking in the future for possible issues. Friedman-considered trying to add fire access to that part of the building, we will adjust the car path to hold fire truck road, 12' wide, we can not provide a turnaround. Is the planning board comfortable with that? Tiano-Chief Sasso's letter said that was acceptable, correct? if the Chief is ok with that then yes. Utter-yes. Double yellow line was just going by recommendations from the Maser study but if the board does not want that, we can remove it. Post-agree to remove, no need for a double yellow line. Board comments: Ellsworth-agree that the yellow lines can be a problem and we can do

away with them. Like the changes that have been made. They should not be giving public access to the river. Furman-no comments. Hlavaty-no comments. Goldberg-dropbox draft resolution, are we voting on that tonight? Post-we can, with the suggested changes and will be reviewed. No additional comments. Creen-no comments. A motion was made by Tiano, seconded by Ellsworth, to override the UCPB required modifications and advisory comment. Board vote: Bouren-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Ellsworth-Aye, Furman-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Goldberg-Aye, Creen-Aye, Post-Aye. Motion carried.

Beltrani read the draft resolution as proposed with the requested amendments discussed in the meeting. A note will be added to the site plan that the buffer landscaping will be maintained for the life of the project, applicant agreed.

A motion was made by Ellsworth, seconded by Bouren, to approve the Site Plan Amendment as written in the resolution. Board vote: Bouren-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Ellsworth-Aye, Furman-Aye, Post-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Goldberg-Aye, Creen-Aye. Motion carried.

2. Site Plan/SUP, 103 Sparling Rd., LLC, Sparling Road. Presented by Andrew Varrow, Lightstar Energy. The applicant has responded to all comments as requested. SEQR review is needed at this time. Beltrani-up to board to discuss SEQR. Post-poll the board with comments regarding SEQR: Bouren-no comment, Tiano-no comment, Ellsworth-no comment, Furman-no comment, Hlavaty-no comment, Goldberg-no comment, Creen-no comment, Post-no comment. A motion was made by Ellsworth, seconded by Tiano, to approve a negative declaration. Board vote: Bouren-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Ellsworth-Aye, Furman-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Goldberg-Aye, Creen-Aye, Post-Aye. Motion carried.

Beltrani-no further planning comments. The applicant is working on the SWPPP, decommissioning agreement and PILOT. Varrow-we can not receive the PILOT until we receive SUP approval. A motion was made by Goldberg, seconded by Hlavaty, to approve the Site Plan and SUP. Board vote: Bouren-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Ellsworth-Aye, Goldberg-Aye, Furman-Aye, Post-Aye, Creen-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye. Motion carried.

3. Site Plan, SherLilly, LLC, 51 Industrial Drive. Presented by the owner/applicant, Andi Turco-Levin. An updated site plan was submitted, the SWPPP was submitted to the Town Engineer for review. Beltrani-the board did submit the referral for this application, as required, to the UCPB but they came back with the recommendation to re-submit with additional information and classification. Some comments: event days vs. non-event days- such as number of employees on site, fluctuation of uses, parking area efficiency and design for overnight RV accommodations. The use of the overnight RV parking area as an accessory to events only. Will this area only be used on weekends? Turco-Levin-participants will arrive the night before an event, most events will be on weekends and may run up to 5-days. Beltrani-will need parking calculation, working for the resolution to outline the use of that parking area, such as “to be used the day before until the day after in conjunction with scheduled events”. Turco-Levin-there really are no employees, those that work the events are volunteers for the sponsor of the event/host. There will be a cleaning service used. There is plenty of parking, most events host 70-80 dogs, 100 at the most. Most people have 2 to 3 dogs so 66 parking spaces should be plenty. RVs will only be in the parking area for events and the space in front of them could be used for the cars that they tow in with them as additional parking, do not foresee the need. Beltrani-what will be used as the water supply to fill the proposed pools? Meals? Trip count/traffic? Curb cuts and RV parking circulation to be addressed. Turco-Levin-we will be filling the pools with a water truck. Participants will bring their own food and we may be able to get a food truck to visit

during events. People will come and go throughout the day, there will not be one time when it will be a mass exit, no scheduled meal breaks. There are no required curb-cuts, using existing. The RVs will park in the lower parking area, cars will be in the upper parking area. Beltrani-show directional signage on the site plan, with a definitive flow of traffic in and out of the property. Lighting shown with location and design, on the building and throughout the site, where applicable. The Planning Board will re-submit to the UCPB. Becky sent the site plan to the Mt. Marion Fire Department, no comments have been received. A public hearing can be scheduled.

A motion was made by Ellsworth, seconded by Furman, to re-submit the referral to the UCPB. Board vote: Bouren-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Ellsworth-Aye, Furman-Aye, Post-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Creen_Aye, Goldberg-Aye. Motion carried. A motion was made by Hlavaty, seconded by Tiano, to schedule the public hearing for the December 15, 2020 meeting. Board vote: Bouren-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Ellsworth-Aye, Furman-Aye, Post-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Creen-Aye, Goldberg-Aye. Motion carried.

Ellsworth-just a comment, cars can not be parked in front of the RVs, there must be adequate ingress and egress for all vehicles. Post-would like an estimate of how many cars and proper parking calculations completed. Turco-Levin-there will be 40-50 cars on-site during an event. Post-will need that directional signage shown on the site plan.

PRE-HEARING CONFERENCE

1. Major Subdivision (4-lot), Chestnut Hill Holding Group, LLC, Pine Lane. Presented by owner/applicant, Rich Rothe. The applicant would like to take an 8-acre parcel and subdivide into four (4) buildable lots. Lot #1 is proposed to be 1-acre with access via Pine Lane, curb cut has been approved and received. Lot #2 (proposed to be 3-acres) and Lot #3 (proposed to be 2-acres) will share access form an existing dirt road off Pine Lane, this dirt road/private driveway will only provide access for those two parcels. The map shows it runs into a back lot that has frontage on Route 212 but that extension has been extinguished. Lot #4, proposed 1.5-acre lot, will have access from Route 212. DOT application was submitted today. Anticipate shallow hole septic systems as done on other lots in the area. Do not think that it has to be referred to the UCPB as it is under the 5-lot minimum requirement for referral. Beltrani-does not have to be referred. Rothe-will show house locations and setbacks on the next submission. Would like to schedule a public hearing.

A motion was made by Goldberg, seconded by Ellsworth, to declare this an Unlisted Action under SEQR. Board vote: Bouren-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Ellsworth-Aye, Goldberg-Aye, Furman-Aye, Post-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Creen-Aye. Motion carried. A motion was made by Goldberg, seconded by Hlavaty, to approve a negative declaration under SEQR. Board vote: Bouren-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Ellsworth-Aye, Goldberg-Aye, Furman-Aye, Post-Aye, Creen-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye. Motion carried. A motion was made by Ellsworth, seconded by Tiano, to schedule the public hearing for the December 15, 2020 meeting. Board vote: Bouren-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Ellsworth-Aye, Furman-Aye, Post-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Goldberg-Aye, Creen-Aye. Motion carried.

2. Minor Subdivision, Kevin Carpenter, 27 Spaulding Lane. Presented by Bruce Utter, Praetorius & Conrad, P.C. The applicant would like to subdivide a 0.73-acre lot into two lots. Lot #1 will contain the existing house and be 0.4-acres and Lot #2 will be a buildable lot with 0.3-acres. The parcel is located in the public water/sewer district. Beltrani-it looks like there is an existing building on Lot #2, will that be removed? Utter-yes, it is a garage. Furman-is this a private driveway, is there a road maintenance agreement for Carpenter Drive? Utter-it is a private driveway that is maintained by Kevin Carpenter, he wants to keep it that way. A turnaround was installed to fit a fire apparatus.

A motion was made by Goldberg, seconded by Ellsworth, to declare this an Unlisted Action under SEQR. Board vote: Bouren-Aye, Tiano-recused, Ellsworth-Aye, Goldberg-Aye, Furman-Aye, Post-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Creen-Aye. Motion carried. A motion was made by Goldberg, seconded by Furman, to approve a negative declaration under SEQR. Board vote: Bouren-Aye, Ellsworth-Aye, Goldberg-Aye, Furman-Aye, Post-Aye, Creen-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye. Motion carried. A motion was made by Post, seconded by Hlavaty, to schedule the public hearing for the December 15, 2020 meeting. Board vote: Bouren-Aye, Ellsworth-Aye, Furman-Aye, Post-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Goldberg-Aye, Creen-Aye. Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

Since there was no further business to discuss, a motion was made by Bouren, seconded by Tiano, to adjourn the meeting. Board vote: Goldberg-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Furman-Aye, Bouren-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Ellsworth-Aye, Post-Aye, Creen-Aye, . Motion carried. The meeting was closed at 10:45 pm.

Respectfully Submitted by,

Becky Bertorelli
Planning Board Secretary