

**PLANNING BOARD MEETING
SEPTEMBER 10, 2014**

PRESENT: Roxanne Pecora, Chairperson
 Fred Zimmer
 Daniel Michaud
 Darin Dekoskie
 Margaret Yost

EXCUSED: Michael Manicone
 Michael Minor

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

Chairperson Pecora called the meeting of the Town of Esopus Planning Board to order at 7:35 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: Chairperson Pecora asked if the Board read the August Meeting Minutes and if there were any changes.

**DAN MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE AUGUST 13, 2014 MINUTES
SECONDED BY MARGARET. MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 5-0.**

VOUCHERS:

Myles Putman (August, 2014).....	\$ 2,300.00
Daily Freeman (Church Communities).....	\$ 12.60
Church Communities (Public Hearing Fee).....	\$ 200.00
Clough Harbour (Church Communities).....	\$ 1,670.00
April Oneto (secretarial services).....	58 1/2 hours

**FRED MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE VOUCHERS AS READ,
SECONDED BY DAN. ALL MEMBERS WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION PASSED
WITH A VOTE OF 5-0.**

Since there was some time prior to the opening of the Public Hearing Chairperson Pecora took the opportunity to update the Board regarding the last meeting and the discussion regarding the Building Inspector and the operation of his office. She spent some time with Mr. Keefe yesterday and he will be at this meeting later tonight to explain some issues. She would like the Board to think about who would like to be a liaison from this Board to the Building Department. Dan questioned what encompassed this role. Roxanne stated that it would be to interface with him on any Planning Board issues concerning the Building Department. Dan asked about tracking of conditions placed by the Planning

Board and Roxanne stated that the Building Department does the tracking and that would not be a Planning Board function. Dan stated that he would consider doing this. Roxanne stated that the Building Inspector really has no issue with this Board but he stated that this Board has its job and he would like to be allowed to do his job. Fred stated that he would have no problem volunteering for this function as well. This discussion will continue following the rest of this meeting.

PUBLIC HEARING:

CHURCH COMMUNITIES (The Mount Expansion): Case #2013-19 – Special Use Permit/Site Plan – 825-1001 Broadway (US Rt. 9W), Ulster Park; SBL: 72.001-2-13.1

FRED MADE A MOTION TO OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING FOR CHURCH COMMUNITIES, CASE #2013-19, SPECIAL USE PERMIT/SITE PLAN, SECONDED BY MARGARET. ALL MEMBERS WERE IN FAVOR.

Chairperson Pecora read the notice placed in the Daily Freeman, copy placed in file.

Chairperson Pecora asked if there was anyone present to speak regarding this application. Chairperson Pecora stated that the applicant has requested to give a short presentation of approximately 5-10 minutes.

Those present representing Church Communities were Dennis Larios, Engineer, Brinnier & Larios; Michael Moriello, Esq., Attorney; Richard Riesley, Esq., Attorney; Hans Boller, Church Communities; Johann Huleatt; Mark Barth, Church Communities; Chris Mason, Church Communities; and Dan Shuster, Planner, Shuster Associates.

Dennis gave a brief overview of the project. The property is the former Mount Saint Alphonsus Seminary and Convent consisting of 411.8 acres. The property was acquired by Church Communities Foundation by deed dated May 8, 2012. The property presently includes the former Seminary Building (5 stories tall, 175,000 sq. ft.), former Convent Building (12,400 sq. ft.), four single family dwellings and various outbuildings. Currently 9.1 acres of the site include buildings, roads and other paved surfaces. The former Seminary Building has been completely restored including all mechanical systems, windows, interior renovations and renovation of the worship/chapel area and basically it was converted into a high school for the Church Community. This work was largely done by local contractors and trades people and the local building supply companies.

Church Communities is proposing an Education Building (2 stories, 16,900 sq. ft.), five (5) Residential Buildings (2 stories, each 4,300 sq. ft.), a Community

Dining Hall (20,700 sq. ft. plus partial basement), a Light Manufacturing Building (30,000 sq. ft.), a Central Maintenance Building (9,200 sq. ft.), an approximate ½ acre Cemetery, a parking area (180 ft. x 102 ft.) and a small addition to the Convent Building (3,000 sq. ft.). There are presently 190 students attending the school. They anticipate a 10 year build out for the project.

Chairperson Pecora read a letter received from Joseph Guido, ZBA, 708 Old Post Road, New Paltz. He stated that the property is zoned RF1 which does not allow manufacturing. He personally feels that a variance is necessary but he is aware that Planning Board Legal Counsel does not agree. He hopes that the Planning Board does its due diligence in permitting this use by providing safeguards pertaining to specifics ie. what is being manufactured, size of the manufacturing and controls over expansion as well as area used to be specified. He also recommends that there be provisions if the property is sold or subdivided. Copy of letter placed in the file.

The Public Hearing was open to comments from the public.

Harold Elder – 852 Broadway, Ulster Park – He is concerned about the manufacturing building being so close to the road. What is the size of the community now and what will be the size of the community when the project is completed. He feels that it needs a much broader study done by the Town. He is concerned about the increase in traffic even if they are using shared transportation. He is really concerned about the closeness of the manufacturing building to the road and the visibility of this building. The letter that was sent to surrounding property owners did not say much and they were told to contact the Town Hall which he did but he never got the opportunity to come back and review the files.

Jean Linderman – Peters Lane, Ulster Park – She is concerned about the manufacturing building and the traffic with tractor trailers coming in and out of the building. Is this zoned industrial? Is there a tax base for the Town on the manufacturing building?

Matthew Loughlin – 1053 Broadway, Ulster Park - He is concerned about the wastewater disposal from the manufacturing site. There are streams and a series of ponds on the site that travel to the Hudson River and would like to know if they will be affected. Will there be any change to the view from the Hudson River? Is there a process for notification of public stakeholders i.e. Scenic Hudson, Dutchess County Land Trust, etc. to comment on this project? He does not really understand some of the language used regarding this project and was wondering if they have some kind of plain language discussion. He would like to know what is being approved and what the timeline is.

Anthony Verano – 854 Broadway, Ulster Park – The view area is a big concern for him. He purchased his house a couple of years ago and the view was an

important part of his decision to purchase his home. He is concerned about the factory being so close to the road, how this factory will affect traffic and the noise level. He would encourage a traffic study be done.

Frank Lancer – Across from Pell Lane, Ulster Park – Shares the concerns of those who have already spoken. He thinks it would be a good idea for the Church Communities to consider another location for the factory. They have a lot of property and a different location may not have as much impact on the neighborhood along Route 9W. This location is close to a lot of houses that exist and have existed for a long time.

Harold Elder – 852 Broadway, Ulster Park – Just wanted to say that his wife shares his concerns that were voiced earlier. The fact that the place was bought by Church Communities and is now shut down to the community is rather saddening and now the community is going to see massive development

Councilperson Gloria VanVliet – 217 Doris St., Port Ewen – She stated that she believes that this is only a SEQR Public Hearing and there will be another Public Hearing for additional comments. She feels that the Church Community has proposed a beautiful project. They looked into every avenue to make sure everything was correct including the view shed. They examined everything and she is in favor of this project.

Jean Linderman – Peters Lane, Ulster Park – She stated that it was a blow to the local community when the Church Communities purchased the property and would not allow individuals to walk on the property and go down to the river or use the property. She stated that they have an enormous amount of property and the factory could be located somewhere else not so close to the road. She is concerned about the property values.

FRED MADE A MOTION TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING FOR CHURCH COMMUNITIES, CASE #2013-19, SPECIAL USE PERMIT/SITE PLAN, SECONDED BY MARGARET. ALL MEMBERS WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 5-0. VOTE AS WAS AS FOLLOWS:

Fred.....yes
Margaret.....yes
Darin.....yes
Dan.....yes
Roxanne.....yes

OLD BUSINESS:

CHURCH COMMUNITIES (The Mount Expansion): Case #2013-19 – Special Use Permit/Site Plan – 825-1001 Broadway (US Rt. 9W), Ulster Park; SBL: 72.001-2-13.1

Roxanne stated that we did not receive a response from the Town of Hyde Park Planning Board. We do have a response from Waterfront Advisory Board dated 8/27/14. Letter read by Chairperson, copy placed in file and copy given to applicant.

Chairperson Pecora stated that we received a response from the Ulster County Planning Board dated 9/3/14. Their recommendations include:

1. Trail Access – Required Modification
2. Visual Impacts – Required Modifications
3. Pell Lane Access – Required Modification
4. Fire Safety – Required Modifications
5. Architecture – Advisory Comments

Copy of the Ulster County Planning Board response placed in the file and copy given to applicant.

Dan Shuster stated that the manufacturing building is 270 feet from Rt. 9W and there will be extensive landscaping to provide visual protection. Fred stated that there is a berme being built plus the building sits down 25 feet. It will not be invisible but it will be screened by existing and proposed vegetation. Other than that building there will be no visibility of any other structures. Dan stated that the site plan handed out to the public this evening is a very small site plan for a very large piece of property. If you look at the scale, you will see that the factory sits back 270 feet.

Dan stated that regarding the Waterfront Advisory Board comments there is a rather detailed description regarding the manufacturing process. Page 23 of the application describes each process. In terms of traffic, all of the workers will walk to the facility. There will be no commuting vehicles to the manufacturing facility. The only traffic generated by this facility will be 3-4 UPS type trucks a day at the most going to the factory. Pell Lane will be widened at its entrance to allow for better turning radiuses. Dennis stated that there will be no wastewater discharged to the small stream on the property that runs to the south and eventually to the Black Creek. There is an existing treatment system and the discharge is treated before flowing to the Hudson River. The manufacturing is a dry assembly process and it has no liquid waste treatment. The residential buildings will have waste that will go to the existing system which is under permit. It discharges to the Hudson River. Hans stated that they will have a dumpster behind the building for any recyclables. Hans stated that they are planning paying fully assessed taxes on the manufacturing building. Hans stated that this will increase their standing as the fourth largest taxpayer and they are happy to do that. Hans stated that generally speaking all of the concerns raised tonight are answered. He stated that they try to be good neighbors. They have challenges but they are not closed minded. He thanked everyone present for their concerns and stated that they take them seriously.

Mr. Riesley is concerned about whether they should answer the comments from the Waterfront Advisory Board or the Ulster County Planning Board. They were not asked

to be present at the Waterfront Advisory Board Meeting. They were present at the Ulster County Planning Board and he wants to know how procedurally they should deal with this. Waterfront Advisory Board is an advisory board to the Planning Board. Darin stated that they could send a letter referencing the book that provides this information. Chairperson Pecora told him that it was not necessary to respond to the Waterfront Advisory Board since it is an advisory board to this board and they have satisfied the Planning Board. Ultimately it is his decision if he chooses to respond to them. He then asked if the Planning Board would like them to respond in any way to the recommendations of the Ulster County Planning Board. Roxanne stated that this Board does not need them to respond but again if they want to respond that is their decision. Roxanne stated that it is up to this Board to vote on the required modifications and this Board can override them with a majority plus one vote if it wishes to do so. We are not in a position to vote on this tonight since there will be a second Public Hearing.

Fred asked what color they were going to have the manufacturing building. Hans stated that it will be earth tone (tan/gray) so that it will blend in. The roof is very slightly pitched and you will not see the roof.

Darin stated that he does kind of agree with the conservation easement for the front of the manufacturing building so that they will maintain the vegetation.

Dan questioned the water supply. Dennis stated that the water system that serves the current facility was upgraded with the renovation of the seminary and in doing that they drilled a second well. All of these components have been approved by the Ulster County Health Department. As part of this plan, once you get past Phase I there will be an extension of their water distribution network and a new water storage tank and that will be subject to review and approval by the Health Department. Dennis stated that this is probably down the road a few years but the supply is there. Right now the site utilizes 6-7,000 gallons a day and this would go up to about 18-19,000 gallons a day at full build-out. They believe it will actually be 11-12,000 gallons a day.

Phase I will be the educational building, Phase II will be the central maintenance building and light manufacturing building, Phase III will be the dining hall and Phase IV will be the residential units along with the addition to the convent. Each phase of construction will be less than 5 acres of land disturbance during construction.

Roxanne asked about whether they contacted the fire department. Dennis stated that they are scheduling a meeting. There was a discussion during the master planning prior to submission about what they wanted. They want 14 feet with shoulders for the residential area. Pell Lane is generally 16 feet. They will sit down and review with them what they need for water storage, fire fighting, etc. Dennis stated that the dining hall and the manufacturing building will have sprinklers.

Michael Moriello, Esq. stated that regarding the Conservation Easement the client has stated that this is not something that is on the table. Richard Riesley stated that they have worked on this project for a number of years prior to submission. They have no intention

of cutting any forest. They plan on always keeping the vegetation there and there is nothing in front of the Board that requires any forest cutting. He further stated that if the clients want to come back to the Planning Board for any changes or new development this Board has plenty of authority to protect the vegetation. They are certainly not going to start cutting it down. A Conservation Easement is giving a third party the rights to control your property. They are not cutting even ½ acre which is very conservative.

Roxanne stated that people have the right to do what they want to do with their property as long as it is within the laws of the Town. She further stated that if the applicant meets our code we cannot disapprove it. Mr. Riesley stated that some of the recommendations are not proper. Discussion took place regarding some of the comments made by the Ulster County Planning Board and the applicant was told that they have a right to address these issues at whatever level they choose to.

Margaret questioned the noise from the factory. Hans stated there will be virtually none. They have done studies on existing properties and it is all listed in the paperwork provided. He feels that it is less than the noise that comes from Route 9W. Dan stated that at the wall of the building it will be 72 decibels and by the time it gets to the property line it is down to 57 decibels which is essentially background noise. Hans stated that a major state highway is 77 decibels and they are less than that by the building.

Margaret stated that they have 190 students and asked if they are going to increase it or keep it the same. Hans stated that this community will be smaller in terms of the residential component because of the high school. They have about 100 people living there now who are on staff and they will add approximately 125 people. The people who will be working in the factory will be living on site. The individuals who live on the site will either work in the factory or will be teachers in the high school. There will be no extra traffic generated except for transportation of the students.

Dan questioned the hours of the factory. Hans stated that it will be Monday through Friday and possibly some Saturday mornings. Generally speaking the hours will be 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. with some exceptions.

Mr. Riesely stated that after this Board makes the determination of significance they need to have another Public Hearing. Michael Moriello suggested that their office submit a draft with some greater details that can be sent with the next Public Hearing letter. They can submit this for the Board's review. The Board did not have a problem with this. Roxanne stated that Myles will write the resolution for SEQR and submit the EAF.

DARIN MADE A MOTION FOR MYLES PUTMAN TO COMPLETE PART 2 AND PART 3 OF THE EAF FOR CHURCH COMMUNITIES, CASE #2013-19, SPECIAL USE PERMIT/SITE PLAN, SECONDED BY DAN. ALL MEMBERS WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 5-0. VOTE WAS AS FOLLOWS:

Fred.....yes
Margaret.....yes
Dan.....yes
Darin.....yes
Roxanne.....yes

DARIN MADE A MOTION FOR MYLES PUTMAN TO PREPARE THE RESOLUTION FOR THE SEQR DETERMINATION FOR CHURCH COMMUNITIES, CASE #2013-19, SPECIAL USE PERMIT/SITE PLAN, SECONDED BY DAN. ALL MEMBERS WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 5-0. VOTE WAS AS FOLLOWS:

Fred.....yes
Margaret.....yes
Darin.....yes
Dan.....yes
Roxanne.....yes

MISSIONARY SISTERS OF THE SACRED HEART (St. Cabrini): Case #2014-12, Lot Line Adjustment – 2055/2056 Broadway (US Rt. 9W), West Park; SBL: 79.002-1-21

Applicant represented by Michael Moriello, Esq.

Roxanne stated that we have not received anything from the Town of Hyde Park Planning Board. We did receive a letter from the Waterfront Advisory Board dated 8/27/14 stating that they had no issues. Copy of this letter placed in file and copy given to the applicant.

We received Part 2 and Part 3 of the EAF prepared by Myles Putman. Myles recommended that the Board take action on the SEQR Forms and direct him to fill out the ENB Form online so that this is processed with the State.

MARGARET MADE A MOTION TO ACCEPT PART 2 AND PART 3 EAF AND MAKE A NEGATIVE DECLARATION PURSUANT TO SEQR AND DIRECT MYLES TO COMPLETE THE ENB FORM ON LINE FOR MISSIONARY SISTERS OF THE SACRED HEART, CASE #2014-12, LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT, SECONDED BY FRED. ALL MEMBERS WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 5-0. VOTE WAS AS FOLLOWS:

Fred.....yes
Margaret.....yes
Darin.....yes
Dan.....yes
Roxanne.....yes

DARIN MADE A MOTION TO GRANT CONDITIONAL FINAL APPROVAL

FOR MISSIONARY SISTERS OF THE SACRED HEART, CASE #2014-12, LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT, CONDITIONED UPON APPROVED EASEMENT AGREEMENT REGARDING THE SEWER AND RECEIPT OF 6 PAPER MAPS AND 1 MYLAR SIGNED BY THE APPLICANT, SECONDED BY DAN. ALL MEMBERS WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 5-0. VOTE WAS AS FOLLOWS:

Fred.....yes
Margaret.....yes
Darin.....yes
Dan.....yes
Roxanne.....yes

Mr. Moriello was told that we have an Escrow Account in the amount of \$3,000 but we are still awaiting a bill from Peter C. Graham, Esq. for the Easement Agreement and M.L. Putman for completion of the EAF Part 2 and Part 3 and completion of the ENB on line. If the bills exceed the Escrow Account, Mr. Moreillo will be contacted.

ALEO (Hasbrouck Hill): Case #2014-06 – Special Use Permit for proposed Duplexes – Hasbrouck Ave., Port Ewen; SBL: Section 56.059 Block 4

Edward Aleo, applicant and Khattar Elmassalemah, Praetorius & Conrad, P.C. were present to represent this application.

Roxanne stated that we received a letter from the Port Ewen Fire Department Chief Peter Koeli stating that he has no questions regarding the placement of hydrants. Letter received from Highway Superintendent Michael Cafaldo and he stated that he reviewed the plans, made his suggestions and approves the plans. Copies of both letters placed in file.

Myles reviewed M.L. Putman Report dated 9/5/14. Copy was given to applicant and copy was placed in file. Myles mentioned that the Lot Line Adjustment that was approved last year (Case #2013-13) was never filed and this will need to be resubmitted for re-approval.

Report dated 9/4/14 received from Peter Lilholt, Clough Harbour Assoc. Fred spent a great deal of time reviewing the letter. Myles stated that Fred and he agree that Peter Lilholt will need to make a site visit. Fred stated that this Board needs to give permission for Aleo's engineer to contact Peter Lilholt directly to work out a lot of the issues in this review.

Fred brought up the cross slope on the maps and feels that both engineers need to look at this again. Fred stated that it should be 3%. Khattar will change this. Fred stated that they have a 1 foot deep ditch and a 2 foot deep driveway pipe in a real urban area. He thinks that they should look at some type of tip up gutter rather than a 12" deep swale and

driveway pipes under the driveway. Discussion took place regarding this suggestion.

Dr. Aleo felt that the maps were filed. The County does not have a record of this and there are no maps signed by applicant or Planning Board in the file. Since Khattar's office did this he will check his files. We are at the one year point so it needs to be taken care of ASAP or applicant will have to reapply. Applicant will need to submit the maps now for the Board to sign and then file them.

Khattar discussed with the Board some of the issues in Peter Lilholt's report and he was told that he needs to contact Pete and discuss the issues with him. They can probably come to agreement regarding many of the issues in the letter. The Board is in agreement that Khattar needs to contact Pete. Roxanne stated that Pete encompasses everything in his initial review so that he does not have to keep coming back with new things. Khattar stated that he has no problem discussing this with Pete but he is interested in moving the project forward. He asked if this can be sent to the County Planning Board. He was told that it can not be sent until these items are resolved.

Dr. Aleo stated that there were no drainage issues with the other project. The neighbor across the street had a drainage problem. He stated that he put sump pumps in the basement and there was never ever any water. Fred stated that we were not worried about Dr. Aleo's water we were concerned about where his water was going to go. Dr. Aleo stated his dissatisfaction with the direction that this project is going. He agreed to put it together as one project and he was told that it would save him money and it is not saving him money. At this point, he is almost willing to abandon the project. He has a problem with the statement that this project may disturb more than an acre of land when they have said that they will not. Discussion continued and applicant's engineer was told to contact Pete Lilholt to discuss the issues.

Khattar stated that all the comments about water and sewer will be taken care of since they are working with the Health Department. Roxanne stated that it is called communication. Applicant's engineer needs to communicate with the Planning Board Engineer and most of this could have been dealt with prior to this meeting. Khattar stated that he will contact Pete.

It was suggested that a meeting be scheduled with Peter Lilholt, Myles, Fred and Khattar. Planning Board secretary will try to arrange this meeting. Khattar was asked to e-mail what days would work for him.

Khattar stated that there will not be a dumpster on the property. They will be using garbage cans. Regarding the parking over what is allowed Khattar stated that this is a two family house and they have a driveway and parking space in front so if they have a visitor they will park in the driveway. The house has a garage under it so if they have a visitor they will park in the driveway.

Dan questioned the parking. Three houses have underneath parking but one does not. What is the reason for this? Khattar stated that three of them will be on higher ground so

they can limit the disturbance. Dr. Aleo stated regarding the disturbance they had initial drawings and they suggested that they have driveways that were shared by both properties. He does not understand why they cannot have shared driveways since he owns the properties. He stated that the Board is thinking about when he sells the property and if that should happen people will know that they have a right-of-way. Khattar stated that if they have it they will need to comply with the Town Code for roads. You will have to build a 24 foot wide roadway.

Roxanne asked Myles to prepare a letter to State Historic Parks and Preservation Office because it is within a mile of a mapped resource. Regarding the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation Darin suggested that applicant's consultant write a letter stating that they looked at it and it does not exist on site.

ZBA REFERRALS:

MELAMUD: 15-17 Rifton Terrace – Special Use Permit/Site Plan - Following some discussion the Board stated that they concur with the Building Inspector's decision and respectfully request that applicant be referred back to the Planning Board for consideration.

MISCELLANEOUS:

Roxanne met with Tim Keefe, Building Inspector, yesterday and they spent some time regarding Mr. Minor's accusations about the Town not having zoning and therefore why have a Planning Board if we are not enforcing zoning. She has seen the book of the Zoning Enforcement complaints received. Everything is tracked and everything has been responded to. The stuff from the Planning Board where we put conditions he puts on the computer. Basically the Planning Board does its job to get applications approved and then the Planning Board needs to let the Building Department do their job. He needs to have some flexibility in his job. Sometimes changes come up in the field and if needed he will require an as-built. If something is major, he will bring it back to this Board for a decision. The constant attacks that continue to happen from an individual on this Board is not good and it is not healthy. We have to work together as a team.

One of the things that we talked about was creating a liaison from this Board to his department. In other Towns, there is a monthly department head meeting which is a wonderful thing but we do not do that in this Town. It was suggested that we have a liaison from this Board to the Building Department.

Tim stated that there has been some miscommunication or misconceptions. Once a project is out of the hands of the Planning Board it is in his hands and he deals with it to get it to the final stage. Sometimes this process takes 2-3 years. Sometimes there are changes but if those changes are minor the Planning Board does not see it again. In the instance of Tucker Pond, he issued TCO's (Temporary Certificates of Occupancy) for four specific units and informed them of what needed to be done to get other units approved. He felt that if there was someone living in the units it would force them to

maintain the property. He wanted specific information regarding the HOA (Home Owners Association) and he told them that there is no where that is says that this project has changed from condos to apartments. Tucker Pond has now come back to the Planning Board for pre-submission to discuss going back to apartments. Until this decision is made and they give him what he wants they will not get any additional TCO's.

Dan and Fred both are willing to act as liaisons to the Planning Board. It was agreed that Fred would act as the liaison and will discuss decisions made by the Planning Board with Tim for follow up in the future and Tim will discuss issues with Fred such as Tucker Pond so that he can share this with the Board.

Tim stated that all commercial entities are looked at every two years. Roxanne asked Tim if he was okay with the approvals being done by Motions. Tim was fine with this since he receives copies of the Planning Board Minutes. Margaret stated that by having someone being a liaison with the Building Department at least we will all be on the same page and work together and we will not have these issues.

Roxanne stated that in her discussion with Tim he acknowledged the individual on this Board that has been making statements about the Building Department and enforcement has not had any discussion with him and how he runs his department and what specific concerns/issues they are looking to see him address.

Gloria asked what will happen with the individual who is not present tonight. Will he continue to raise issues and questions? How will this be resolved? Roxanne stated that it will be in the minutes and she is sure that he will read it. The tape will be available for him to listen to and he is welcome to visit Tim or more importantly work through our liaison to the Building Department.

DAN MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN SECONDED BY DARIN. ALL MEMBERS WERE IN FAVOR. MEETING ADJOURNED AT 9:53 PM

NEXT MONTHLY MEEETING: OCTOBER 8, 2014

DEADLINE DATE: SEPTEMBER 24, 2014

NEXT PRE-SUBMISSION: OCTOBER 1, 2014

Respectfully submitted:

April Oneto
Planning Board Secretary

