

**TOWN OF ESOPUS
PLANNING BOARD MEETING
JANUARY 9, 2013**

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Roxanne Pecora
Fred Zimmer
Margaret Yost
Michael Minor
Mike Manicone
Rich Williams

BOARD MEMBER EXCUSED: Darin DeKoskie

ALSO PRESENT: Myles Putman , M.L. Putman Consulting

Chairperson Pecora called the meeting of the Town of Esopus Planning Board to order at 7:00 p.m. beginning with the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag. Roxanne advised the public of the building's fire exits and roll call was taken.

MINUTES: Board members were asked if there were any changes or corrections to the minutes of the December 12, 2012 meeting.

Roxanne made the following changes: Page 2, paragraph 2 under Public Hearing, line 2 left out w from was; Page 3, paragraph 3 last sentence add He would like to see; Page 12, paragraph 1, sentence 1, add Board requested that he will make the owner aware; Page 12, paragraph 1, sentence 1, remove the word not and add there will only be one access . Margaret made the following changes: Page 5, paragraph 4, remove the last he would like to thank them; Page 5, paragraph 4, sentence 2, he feels that it will not be that bad; Page 4 last sentence, the people will be able to see the back of her home and along the side of her home.

RICH MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF DECEMBER 12, 2012 AS AMENDED SECONDED BY MICHAEL. ALL MEMBERS WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 6-0. VOTE WAS AS FOLLOWS:

Fred.....yes
Margaret.....yes
Michael Minor.....yes
Mike Manicone.....yes
Rich Williams.....yes
Roxanne.....yes

VOUCHERS:

NY Planning Federation Dues (2013).....\$ 250.00
 Daily Freeman (Public Hearing Notice – Gordon).....\$ 12.60
 Daily Freeman (Public Hearing Notice – Decicco).....\$ 13.05
 Daily Freeman (Public Hearing Notice – Highland Vineyard/Beechstone) 13.50
 Daily Freeman (Public Hearing Notice – Ferguson).....\$ 14.85
 April Oneto (secretarial services).....55 hours

FRED MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE VOUCHERS AS READ, SECONDED BY MARGARET. ALL MEMBERS WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 6-0.

PUBLIC HEARING:

RICH MADE A MOTION TO OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING FOR HIGHLAND VINEYARD/BEECHSTONE LLP CASE #2012-25 MINOR SUBDIVISION SECONDED BY MICHAEL MINOR. ALL MEMBERS WERE IN FAVOR.

Chairperson Pecora read the Public Hearing Notice placed in the Daily Freeman. Copy placed in file. Chairperson Pecora asked if there was anyone present to speak regarding this application.

Dennis Cooper stated that he was here to present this application for the Public Hearing.

No one was present to speak on this application.

FRED MADE A MOTION TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING FOR HIGHLAND VINEYARD/BEECHSTONE LLP CASE #2012-25 MINOR SUBDIVISION SECONDED BY MARGARET. ALL MEMBERS WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 6-0.

Fred.....yes
 Mike Manicone.....yes
 Margaret.....yes
 Rich.....yes
 Michael Minor.....yes
 Roxanne.....yes

OLD BUSINESS:

**HIGHLAND VINEYARD INC./BEECHSTONE REALTY: Case #2012-25 –
 Minor Re-subdivision – 103 Burroughs Drive @
 Broadway, West Park; SBL: 80.001.5-16**

Myles reviewed M.L. Putman Consulting Report dated 1/9/13. Copy was placed in the file.

Dennis Cooper was present to represent this application.

MICHAEL MINOR MADE A MOTION TO DECLARE A NEGATIVE DECLARATION PURSUANT TO SEQR FOR HIGHLAND VINEYARD INC/BEECHSTONE REALTY, CASE #2012-25, SECONDED BY MARGARET. ALL MEMBERS WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 6-0. VOTE WAS AS FOLLOWS:

Fred.....yes
Mike Manicone.....yes
Margaret.....yes
Rich.....yes
Michael Minor.....yes
Roxanne.....yes

MICHAEL MINOR MADE A MOTION TO GRANT FINAL PLAT APPROVAL FOR HIGHLAND VINEYARD/BEECHSTONE REALTY, CASE #2012-25, MINOR RE-SUBDIVISION CONDITIONED UPON RECEIPT OF 6 PAPER MAPS AND 1 MYLAR SIGNED BY THE AUTHORIZED OFFICIALS OF BEECHSTONE REALTY AND RECEIPT OF A \$2,000 CHECK FOR THE RECREATION FEE SECONDED BY RICH. ALL MEMBERS WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 6-0. VOTE WAS AS FOLLOWS:

Fred.....yes
Mike Manicone.....yes
Margaret.....yes
Rich.....yes
Michael Minor.....yes
Roxanne.....yes

Chairperson Pecora recused herself at 7:20 PM. Fred Zimmer, Vice Chairperson, took over.

PUBLIC HEARING:

FERGUSON d/b/a “Aberdeen-on-the-Hudson: Case #2012-10 – Special Use Permit/ Site Plan– 1723 Broadway, US Route 9W), West Park; SBL: 80.001-3-23.1

RICH MADE A MOTION TO OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING FOR FERGUSON, CASE #2012-10, SPECIAL USE PERMIT/SITE PLAN, SECONDED BY MARGARET. ALL MEMBERS WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 5-0. VOTE WAS AS FOLLOWS:

Rich.....yes
Michael Minor.....yes
Margaret.....yes
Mike Manicone.....yes
Fred.....yes

Fred stated that he would like those present to keep their comments to 5 minutes or less.

Steve Grim - He is here representing his family who own Riverby National Historic Landmark and a couple of parcels to the north on the same side (John Burroughs). Their concern is that as nearby neighbors if this Board is going to approve they would be allowed at least a probationary period to determine if the activities that are proposed are a problem of noise and a problem of traffic and whether or not these problems would devalue their properties. Everything that he has heard so far is tentative and speculative and it would be unfair if they were not allowed to object once this gets started.

Albert Karnath owns the property contiguous to the school. He said that since the school has opened they have been wonderful neighbors. The students are considerate. He is in total support of anything that is reasonable. He feels that there is nothing wrong with letting business continue. He has been a business consultant for many years and this will provide jobs and it is a positive thing. He thinks that anything they do will have a positive effect in West Park. He feels that this business is a positive step in the right direction.

John Busick – 1725 Route 9W, West Park – He is adjacent to the south borderline of the school. John stated that this is not about the school it is about the Special Use Permit for a wedding venue. He stated that some of the Board members were kind enough to come down and visit the location. It was certainly obvious when they drove into his driveway to see not a well groomed area which hindered the ability for him to sell his property. His concerns this evening and throughout the past year have been the inability for him to sell his property. On the Web Site for the Town of Esopus, there are goals and guidelines. There are nine stated but he is sure there are others. Out of the nine there are four that pertain to his situation. He feels that the Planning Board has a responsibility to place their judgment according to these goals. Some of them refer to protecting the value of buildings and property, protecting the privacy of residents and neighboring properties. He has attended all these meetings the past year. He has had great difficulty with his neighbor on the borderlines. The lines that were placed there before she even had it surveyed and there was encroachment and he still has stumps on his property. Clearly the applicant does not know where the lines are. His major concern is the inability to sell his property and the devaluation of the property and what he has gone through. He has proof of comps from a similar business in Milton, New York. An individual with a similar

business in Milton got up and stated that adjacent property values have increased due to his business. He investigated this and went to the Town of Milton Assessor's Office and he has documents to show that neighboring properties of a similar business have all been depreciated by 25%. He stated that he wants this as part of the record because he was told that he was wrong. He would like them to dispute the documents that he has. He also has documents showing from people who came to look at his property. At least two were serious and one made an offer contingent upon a contract that he would have with the purchaser that the wedding business would not go in next door. This shows a direct connect with what is proposed even before ground is broken and his inability to sell this property. He holds the Planning Board, the Building Department and the Zoning responsible for his loss of income and the inability for him to sell his property. This is directly connected to what is proposed. He has invited his real estate agent who basically can summarize what has happened since he has been his agent for the last couple of years.

John stated that he is glad that the owners of the Stonehedge Restaurant are here tonight because they have major concerns as well. He stated that when he first began to listen to the meetings a lot of things were overlooked. One specifically that was quite obvious was that the neighbor's business parking lot was used when the school was given a certificate of occupancy before the parking lot was properly finished. That overflow went to his neighbor's property without any permission. The proposed business cannot accommodate the additional parking spaces that are needed for the advertised parties of the wedding. Will the overflow parking again go to the Stonehedge? This is a no brainer. He feels that they all pay high taxes in West Park when you are on the river.

Larry O'Toole (Real Estate Broker) – 82 Eagles Nest Road, Hurley – He has represented John Busick for the last two years in the sale of his property. He first became aware of this issue through an article in the Daily Freeman about this proposed project. Once he became aware of this he had to disclose this as a real estate agent to anyone he showed the property to. He showed this property to approximately 15 people maybe a little bit more. Each time he had somebody who either had questions or came back and looked at it for a second or third time. They could not get over the hump of buying a piece of property that would be next to what the applicant is proposing. He did have a real offer from somebody who did want the property. The couple stated that they could not purchase it unless they were assured that this did not happen next door to them. Whoever buys the bottom half of John's property will be even closer to the business location. He tries to maintain as much optimism of selling a property to his client as possible but he is very pessimistic about selling John's property with this about to happen next door. He stated that if he was going to buy a piece of property himself and this was the case he would have to pass on it.

Karen Hlywiak – 255 Heather Lane, Kingston - She has been an event planner for over 10 years specializing in outdoor tented weddings. She just wanted to assure everyone that they can accommodate the number of cars. It would be in the contract stating that the couple would have to shuttle their guests and that the property can only accommodate a certain number of cars. This is a very common practice. She has been dealing with these issues for the past 10 years throughout the Hudson Valley, Connecticut, Westchester County, New York City. There are a lot of places that do not have ample parking but cannot use their neighbors lots for the overflow. There will not be an issue with the parking. This issue and other issues will be managed by herself and other professionals to make sure that everything is running smoothly. She stated that on this side of the river there are not a lot of areas where weddings can be held. They are usually on the other side of the river. She stated that this business will bring a lot of income to the people in the industry as well as others in the neighborhood of Aberdeen-on-the-Hudson for such things as Rehearsal Dinners, local tourism, etc. The majority of the individuals who would be renting this space would be from New York City and out of town. These couples tend to rent hotel rooms, go out to dinner and utilize restaurants and other attractions in the area. This could produce a lot of income for this area.

Veronica Kelly – 35 Sterley Avenue, Saugerties – She is a wedding and event coordinator and she works with Karen and has for 4 years in this area. She is in favor of Aberdeen-on-the-Hudson because it is going to be a local venue. She stated that some place that would be closer locally would be beneficial and provide jobs as far as photographers, florists, shuttle services, limo service, hotels, etc. She is looking forward to having a local venue that she can work at directly.

RICH MADE A MOTION TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING FOR FERGUSON, CASE #2012-10, SPECIAL USE PERMIT/SITE PLAN, SECONDED BY MARGARET. ALL MEMBERS WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 5-0. VOTE WAS AS FOLLOWS:

Mike Manicone.....yes
Margaret.....yes
Michael Minor.....yes
Rich.....yes
Fred.....yes

OLD BUSINESS:

FERGUSON d/b/a “Aberdeen-on-the-Hudson”: Case #2012-10 – Special Use Permit – 1723 Broadway (US Route 9W), West Park; SBL: 80.001-3-23.1

Applicant Maria Ferguson was present along with her attorney Mark Grunblatt.

Rich stated that he has done his best to try to understand the sensitivity of the neighbors as well as what Ms. Ferguson is trying to accomplish.

Michael Minor stated that one of the presenters at the hearing stated that there would be prohibition against having more vehicles on the site than can be accommodated. The proposal for shuttling or busing must be a new proposal because he has not seen this before. Mark stated that he believes that this was presented and he thinks it was done by letter. The Board did not receive this letter. He will make a copy and give it to the Board. Michael Minor stated that at the last meeting we talked about when the amplified sound system would be turned off and they had proposed 9:00 PM and the only ordinance that we have in the Town says 8:00 PM. Mark stated that they would like to stay with the 9:00 PM because closer to sunset would make more sense.

Michael Minor stated that he had raised the issue at the last meeting that not only does Maria own the school property but she is also an abutting neighbor and his concern was that the loss of value to her property as an abutting neighbor might be greater than any amount of money that might be earned by the wedding business. I asked her an opinion on this and she stated that it is very hard to sell properties now. He is wondering that if at some point in the future if somebody were interested in buying that property and she were interested in selling it would she curtail her operation of the wedding business to make that property more attractive. Mark asked if this was a hypothetical marketing question. Michael Minor stated that he was just trying to get an idea about the impact on property values and the quality of living in the neighborhood. This is just his concern. Mark stated that the future will tell because it is hard for anyone to prognosticate on this.

Michael Minor stated that he is kind of sorry that Mr. Busick brought up the code because he thinks there are more than 4 issues that relate to the Town Code.

To promote and protect the character rights and stability of established residences and to enhance the value of land and conserve the value of buildings these are concerns of his. This project does not propose any buildings and since these are temporary tents he does not know if we are going to enhance the value. To ensure privacy for residences; he is concerned about this. There are many more items listed in the Town Code that he feels are of concern.

He thinks the more important issues are in Chapter 123-3 which says that "this chapter is not intended to abrogate, render invalid or interfere with the application or any other administration of the lawful statutes." The lawful statutes being zoning regulations even though this is Planning Board and not Zoning Board this is one of these few cases where we interact very closely. His concern is that we are taking a look at zoning which was established for these purposes in 123-2 and yet here we seem to be doing it. It says very clearly that whenever any lawful

statute, ordinance, regulation, easement, private agreement covenant, deed restriction or other legal relationship public or private imposes controls which are inconsistent with any provisions in this chapter then those provisions that are most restrictive or pose the highest standard shall take precedent. Michael Minor stated that this troubles him greatly.

Mr. Grunblatt stated that he would like to direct the Board specifically to remembering that this is a Special Use Permit and it has already been determined that it is a use that is allowed in the zone with a permit. It is not the same thing as a broader zoning code where variances are often at issue. Those decisions have been made by the Town and you should not reach out to variance rules to apply them to a Special Use Permit. He would urge them to review 123-46 and make sure that your concerns really fit a Special Use Permit and not Use or Area Variance short of review. Michael Minor asked if he was saying that if this was a permanent use we should look at different principals than we look at for a Special Use Permit in terms of quality of life and property values. Mark stated that they are different animals and he wants the Board to pay attention to that in their review. A Use Variance or an Area Variance is more permanent in its nature and requires a different list than what your Code points you to in doing site plan approval and special use permits you are specifically directed to Section 123-13 and Section 123-47 not directly to the sections that you quoted. Michael stated that the section that he quoted is the preamble to 123-13. Mark stated that he understands this but he wants to urge them to remember that this is covering not specifically a Special Use Permit and he asks that they keep this in mind in undergoing their review.

Margaret stated that under Conditional Use Permits (123-46-C.1C) it states that “the proposed use is of such a location size and character that in general it will be in harmony with the appropriate and orderly development of the district in which it is proposed to be situated. It will not be a detriment to the orderly development of adjacent properties in accordance with the zoning classification of such properties.” She asked Michael Minor if that was what he was referring to. Michael Minor stated that he was looking at the overview, the purposes that he thinks we are here to support. He stated that there may be different standards for a Special Use Permit that are not the same as the restrictions that would be incurred. Michael Minor stated that there may be different standards but the underlying principals are the same and again under 123.3 the effect on other provisions it says very clearly that if there is a discrepancy then those provisions which are most restrictive or pose higher standards are to be imposed if there is an issue. Michael Minor further stated that he is not a lawyer but this is what the code says to him. He stated that he is a member of a Town Board who was appointed and to him this is a very difficult situation. He feels that he has a responsibility to the Town and to the residents. He has a tendency to pay more attention to people who live in residential areas of the Town or people who have businesses in the Town as listed in the general purposes of the Zoning Board

than he does to those who want to bring new business to the Town. He feels that this is his responsibility.

Mike Manicone stated that he was reading the same code. He is referring back to Section 123 because he feels the same way as far as residents in the Town. He feels responsible to maintain the nature of those properties. Mike Manicone questioned the issue of shuttling guests and the parking restrictions and asked if this was something new. He was told that this was something new. Michael Minor stated that from the time of the pre-submission there was an initial statement made that they would look at the parking on a 3:1 ratio and it later changed to 4:1 and this would have to include all of the people who provide services. Even at 4:1 there are 75 parking spaces there so this would come to 300. You have to remember that you have to take away spaces for the people who are providing services and this could be potentially a fairly large number. Michael Minor stated that he thinks from the very beginning that the Planning Board recommended a smaller number of maximum guests. He has not heard before this evening that they will be shuttled from another site. Michael Minor also stated that the sound was stated by this Board as 8:00 PM and they came in with 9:00 PM and they have decided to stay with the 9:00 PM. This is something that we need to look at.

Fred stated that the Board could make a motion for approval with conditions: 1. 8:00 PM ; 2. Special Use Permit be valid for 2 year period of time and subject to review again; 3. limit the number of occurrences during the year, etc. or the Board could table this and vote on it next month. Fred stated if somebody wants to make a motion tonight we could vote on it tonight or someone can make a motion to table it until next month.

Myles stated that 123.3 is written to benefit the Zoning Law in contrast to any other chapter in Town Code. It is not meant to address possible inconsistencies within the Code. He thinks that Margaret is on the right track in looking at the general criteria of Special Permits and citing that section as well as other applicable sections. Myles stated that the 62 day time period after the closing of a Public Hearing is there for the Board's benefit to be able to develop a rational resolution of action whether you are going to approve this or disapprove this. This is the time for you to get all the information coming in from the public and any additional information you may have received like the shuttling of guests and the reference of the Assessment Records which may be of interest to the Board to review. Myles stated that if the Board wants to rush and make a decision without covering every possible base he will try to work with the Board as best as he can. He was not prepared for the Board to act on this tonight. He thought they would just get through the hearing.

Fred stated that he will entertain a motion to approve with restrictions or whether the Board would like to table it and come back within a month.

Michael Minor stated that he defers to Myles on this. He does not think that membership on the Planning Board is conditioned about legal knowledge or Zoning Law knowledge and this is why we have Myles. It is not conditioned upon engineering concerns and this is why we have outside consultants. Our purpose is to vote as members of the community. He will not make a motion but he will vote on a motion.

Rich questioned the shuttling of guests where would that staging area be? Mark stated presumably at their hotel. Karen stated that where the guests are staying they would arrange for the shuttle bus to pick them up. A lot of hotels have shuttle buses and they would drop them off at Aberdeen and they would leave and they would come back to pick them up. Rich questioned if there would be any plans to stage people at an existing lot. Karen stated no. Karen stated a lot of times guests know each other and stay at the same hotel and the shuttle would be arranged to have them picked up at that location. For those guests that would be driving themselves they would rely on the parking that is on site to house those vehicles.

Michael Minor stated that he would much rather they have a limit on cars rather than on the number of people since guests and staff would be using the parking spaces. Michael Minor stated that one issue is the length of time of the Special Use Permit and he would like to see it no longer than one year or a certain number of events. We would also need to change the sound hours and a decibel level would have to be set. We would need to limit the total number of vehicles not to exceed the number of available parking spaces; not just guest vehicles but total vehicles. Michael Minor stated that he is willing to defer it to next month but he is not sure that given the extensive length of time that this has been before us that there is much to be gained by taking that extra time.

Margaret thinks that there should be other restrictions. She stated that they said in the very beginning in their narrative they were not going to be using the school buildings for this business and that should be included. She still has an issue with the noise and visual aspect. This bothers her tremendously. She feels that the length of the Special Permit should be restricted to one year.

Michael Mior stated that he will admit that one year is a problem because it is hard to invest in building a business if you don't get enough time. He also understands that there are enough valid concerns raised by the neighbors. Information that was presented at the non-formal Public Hearing is in question and maybe somebody wants to check and see if that is correct. He is also not sure if the other business in the community has been the cause of the property values going down. Everybody's property values have gone down about 25% but the presenter at that meeting said that the property values have gone up and therefore there is a question as to who is right. If that presenter had said everybody's property values stayed the same he could have made a misstatement or if he said that everybody's property values went down it could

have gone down because everybody's property values went down. However, he said that everybody's property values went up and this is what we were told. He has concerns about this statement. Fred stated that they might have gone up in 2006/2007. Michael Minor stated that our job is to listen to the statements made and to evaluate them the best we can. We are here to make a common sense judgment and he has no doubt that should this business operate it will benefit the wedding planners, the caterers, the band and it will benefit Maria. His job is to look at the residents of the community, the existing businesses to see the impact that this will have because this is a Special Use Permit. Fred stated to look at the impact it will have and the only way you are going to do that is to reevaluate after a period of time.

RICH MADE A MOTION TO DECIDE ON A BOARD VOTE FOR FERGUSON, CASE #2012-10, SPECIAL USE PERMIT/SITE PLAN WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- 1. Limit the amplified noise to 8:00 PM which is within the Code;**
- 2. In addition, noise barriers be put in place (i.e. tent panels, vegetative, etc.);**
- 3. Limit the number of vehicles to available parking spaces;**
- 4. Limit the number of events to 12 events per calendar year;**
- 5. Limit the approval for 2 years;**
- 6. Use of one room in the cottage for the bridal party.**

MOTION SECONDED BY FRED.

Mr. Grunblatt urged the Board to consider more than 12 events per year which is 3 months. The Board is limiting brides to pretty much the center of the season. He thinks a more rational number would be closer to 20 in terms of being able to accommodate the demand.

Rich stated that the first two years would be a probationary period. Fred stated that in two years you come back and this can be increased.

VOTE ON RICH'S MOTION:

Mike Manicone.....yes
Margaret.....no
Rich.....yes
Michael Minor.....no
Fred.....yes

Myles stated that the Motion to approve failed and if the Board were to take a vote on a Motion to disapprove and it fails then this application will still be active on the agenda. Myles stated that there is no default with a Special Use Permit. The Board has to decide one way or the other. Following some discussion it was

felt that the Board may need to speak to the Planning Board attorney regarding this application.

MIKE MANICONE MADE A MOTION TO TABLE THIS APPLICATION UNTIL NEXT MONTH SECONDED BY FRED. THE VOTE WAS AS FOLLOWS:

Rich.....yes
Michae Minor.....abstained
Mike Manicone.....yes
Margaret.....abstained
Fred.....yes

Fred questioned Michael Minor what he was hung up on for approval. Michael Minor stated that he believes that as a representative of the Town that this particular project does not meet the qualifications of maintaining the quality of life in the district to be effected nor the property values in the district to be effected. Fred stated that the property values can be all over the place. Michael Minor understands this but these are his issues.

Fred questioned Margaret about what her issues are. She stated that she feels that it will not enhance the neighborhood. If she had property there, she would be highly upset. She does not think that it will be a positive thing at all. Fred stated that this is why you are putting a 2 year probationary period on it.

Rich stated that he voted for it because he was willing to give them a chance. He is willing to take the opportunity to see how it works. He says he thought about this and the noise does bother him and potentially taking business away from the other businesses that are within the same industry in the area. He thinks that maybe a little competition is a good thing and maybe they can become a feeder. He is not for or against it but he is willing to take the opportunity to see whether it does well for the area or not.

Fred stated that it will show within the first couple of years. Michael Minor disagrees with this statement because historically we have not followed up. The complaints go to our enforcement officer and we don't necessarily know about them. Fred stated that you are putting a probationary period on here and limiting the events. Fred stated that if it does not work we can always revoke the permit. Michael Minor feels that by putting a 2 year limitation on this he feels that we are saying that as the Planning Board we are going to do the enforcement. Discussion continued about the enforcement issue. Fred disagrees with Michael Minor's opinion.

Michael Minor stated that he would like to see the amendments made to the plan. He would like to see the paperwork on the shuttling of guests and the change in the amplified sound from 8:00 PM. Mark stated that they will provide this.

This application will be carried over to the February meeting.

Roxanne returned to the Board at 8:40 PM.

ZONING BOARD REFERRALS:

None

MISCELLANEOUS:

None.

RICH MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN AT 8:45 PM SECONDED BY MARGARET. ALL MEMBERS WERE IN FAVOR. MOTIONED PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 6-0.

NEXT MONTHLY MEETING: FEBRUARY 13, 2013

DEADLINE DATE: JANUARY 30, 2013

NEXT PRE-SUBMISSION: FEBRUARY 5, 2013

Respectfully submitted:

April Oneto
Planning Board Secretary