



Minutes of a Regular Meeting held by the Planning Board of the Town of Shawangunk, County of Ulster, State of New York, at the Town Office Building, 14 Central Avenue, Wallkill, New York, on Tuesday, 7th day of May 2024.

Those present were: Sal Patella
Rich Barnhart
Todd Widmark
John Szarowski
Ryan Reid
John Leonette
Mark Watkins, Chair

Also Present: Ken Ronk, Town Supervisor; Dennis Arluck, Zoning Board Chairman; Kathy Ebbrell, Court Clerk Rich Hoyt, Esq., Town Attorney; Bonnie Franson, AICP CEP, Town Planning Board Consultant. Please see sign-in sheet for rest of attendees.

Meeting location: Town Hall, 14 Central Avenue, Wallkill, NY 12589

Open Regular Meeting: 7:00 pm

Emergency Exits Announcement

Pledge of Allegiance

Approval of Minutes of April 2, 2024

A first motion was made by Todd Widmark and seconded by John Szarowski to approve the Meeting Minutes of April 2, 2024. Vote: All Ayes: 7, Abstain: 0, Absent: 0, Vacancy: 0

Introduction of New Board Member:

The Planning Board Chairperson, Mr. Mark Watkins introduced our newest member to the Planning Board, Mr. John Leonette. Mr. Leonette is the owner of Whispering Pines Development Company and specializes in commercial and government contract work. Mr. Leonette is happy to be part of the Planning Board Team and wants to provide positive feedback to the Town and make a difference. Mr. Leonette is looking forward to being on the Planning Board.

CONTINUATION OF PUBLIC HEARING:

PUBLIC HEARING:

E&L Garvey – Two Lot Subdivision (Applicant No. 2024-04)

SBL: 105.1-1-26.122, 152.64 acres, Address: 3014 State Route 52, Pine Bush, NY 12566. Lot Line Adjustment to create two parcels, approximately 102.5 acres and 50 acres. Property Class: Rural Residential, Pine Bush School and Pine Bush Fire District.

Entered into Record:

- Letter Dated April 11, 2024 from Margaret Hillriegel, Licensed Land Surveyor regarding 2-Lot Subdivision and updated site-plan.
- Memo Dated May 2, 2024 regarding feedback to E&L Farms Subdivision from Nelson Pope Voorhis, Ms. Bonnie Franson, AICP CEP, Danielle Dreyer, Planning Analyst.

Mrs. Margaret Hillriegel is representing E&L Garvey who own 152 acres at 3014 Route 52 and New Prospect Road. The Garvey's are proposing a 2-Lot Subdivision and are not proposing any improvements at this time. As per the Planning Board request and policy, there is a proposed septic system and a well for a house on proposed Lot 1 where a portion of the gravel mine is located. Soil has been submitted for testing to the Ulster County Health Department and there are no problems. Each lot has an existing trailer that is used for farm help and Lot 2 has an existing house which Ed and Lynn Garvey live in and it has the solar facility site. It has a net lot of 26 acres and Lot 1 will be approximately 96 acres net.

Additional Net Lotting Areas:

Mrs. Hillriegel reviewed Ms. Franson's memo with comments handed to her and believes more items will need to be netted out. The farmland does not need to be netted out. Only when there are horses and livestock and not just crops. The net area for the solar is noted on the map and is well within the net area. The net area for Lot 2 solar easement distance that is noted in the Solar 1000 file site plan shows it comes about 9.5 acres. The net area of the wetlands will be included on the map/chart to make it clear by Mrs. Hillriegel.

Mining Permit Use:

Ms. Franson questioned if there is any current mining or reclamation? Mr. Garvey stated very little mining and the permit expires in August of this year. The permit will be reopened for Lot 1 only (less than an acre) while Lot 2 will be completely shut down by July and covered. The Engineer will do the reclamation maps and the DEC to approve. The permit is being reopened to remove material from the property. Even though the mining will only continue for one more year, they can only renew the permit for four years.

Mr. Ryan Reid questioned if a Special Use permit is required for the mining? This is non-conforming pre-existing and present since the early 1980's. There is a Mined Land Reclamation permit under the New York State DEC Law. Mr. Reid questioned its existence to be shown on the current map subdivision being provided even though the mine is going to be closing shortly. Majority of the Board felt that the mining has been going on for so long, it was not a benefit to do anything. Mr. Watkins recommended the maps to be signed after they close the mine. Mr. and Mrs. Garvey agreed. Mrs. Hillriegel stated she can show a small mining area on the map for the existing mining (permit reopening for this area).

Stand Pipe Location for the Fire Company:

Mr. Sal Patella questioned if the setback was previously approved for the solar new proposed property line? Mr. Watkins went to the site and spoke to Mr. Garvey and where the stand pipe is and if the 50 ft. was added, it would be in the pond. A recommendation was made to move the stand pipe to the other pond, so the fire companies still have a place to draw water and fire company drills.

Mr. Hoyt stated if Mrs. Hillriegel can show the rack of panels closest to the line because the 50 ft. is from the panels and not the exterior fence. Mr. Hoyt stated on the north side of the property you have more than 50 ft. The panels were not put on the last site plan and an aerial which shows the as-built condition was compared to the approved plan and they differ. The Applicant should show that rack of panels to prove you are more than 50 ft. from the new line where it is created. The question regarding on the east side of the solar project where there was a lot line change approved, it came about the same time the solar was approved and resulted in a 12.7 ft. setback. If it was a mistake, it was made four years ago, we are not changing it but to make sure the new line being asked to approve meets the solar regulations. The current approval now must meet zoning, we cannot go backwards for the 12.7 ft.

Zoning Code Regarding 50 Feet Setback:

The setback standards can be located under the following Zoning Code §177.23.1 Solar Energy Systems, Section E (bottom of Page 79).

- (a) Height and Setback. The height of the Large-Scale Energy Systems shall not exceed fifteen (15) feet above natural grade when oriented at maximum tilt. Setback requirements shall be fifty (50) feet from

a side lot line, fifty (50) feet from a rear lot line and fifty (50) feet from a front lot line for all components of the facility except the fencing and the perimeter vegetative buffer per Section 3(d).

Zoning Code – Vegetative Buffer:

The vegetative buffer was to screen New Prospect Road, Route 52. Mrs. Hillriegel is going to verify the vegetative buffer. The Code Enforcement Officer requested a mesh for screening. Mr. Reid is requesting vegetative buffer be according to the below current code and shown on the map.

Zoning Code §177.23.1 Solar Energy Systems, Section E - (Page 80).

(d) A minimum fifty (50) foot perimeter vegetative buffer; except for the area of roadway access; which buffer may be partially or totally within the perimeter lot line setback, consisting of natural and undisturbed vegetation, supplemental with evergreen plantings, as may be required by the Planning Board, shall be provided around all mechanical equipment and solar panel arrays to provide screening from adjacent properties and Town, County and State highways.

Ms. Franson believes Zoning Code (i) (Page 81) would also be of reference regarding vegetation buffer.

(i) All Large-Scale Solar Energy Systems shall be enclosed by fencing to prevent unauthorized access. The fencing may be installed within the required setback. The type of fencing shall be determined by the Planning Board. The fencing and the system may be further screened by any landscaping and/or berming needed to avoid adverse aesthetic impacts. Other limitations on fence height elsewhere cited in this Zoning Law shall not be applicable here.

Mr. Patella questioned the type of vegetation buffer and any trees along the property line. Mr. Watkins stated that the portion of the proposed lot line that measures 338.05 ft. has pine trees and the lot line that measures 157.92 feet does not.

Mr. Reid questioned if these issues could be resolved upon renewal of the permit?

Mr. Hoyt questioned is it the Special Use permit that is renewed or the Town registration from the solar company? Special Use permits are not renewable and are good for the life of the permit.

Zoning Code §177.23.1 Solar Energy Systems, under E(q) (Page 82):

- (q) All recipients of Special Use permits issued by the Planning Board for Large Scale Solar Systems shall register with the Town Building Department. Registration shall be effective for a five-year period, with renewal required prior to expiration date. Recertification shall be required for years two through five as described in this chapter. The Town of Shawangunk desires to develop a registration system to ensure all large scale solar energy production facilities are properly maintained and to ensure all owners properly maintain and inspect their facilities. All owners of large scale solar energy production facilities located in the Town of Shawangunk shall be required to register the facility upon the granting of a Certificate of Compliance. The local large-scale solar energy production facility registration system shall be administered by the Building Department of the Town. The Town Board may establish a fee structure for the registration which may be amended by resolution from time to time. The owner and any and all lessees, renters, and/or licensees of large scale solar energy production facilities shall agree in writing to allow the Code Enforcement Officer/Building Inspector access to inspect all facets of said permit holder's, renter's, lessee's or licensee's placement, construction, modification, and maintenance of such facilities, including, but not limited to, solar panels, support structures, and buildings or other structures constructed or located on the permitted site to verify compliance with the conditions of the Special Use Permit and any applicable technical, safety, fire, building, and zoning codes, laws, regulations, and other applicable requirements. Registrations shall be required to be renewed beginning with a period of time ninety (90) days prior to expiration and not less than thirty days prior to expiration. The owner shall provide notice to the Town of Shawangunk of any changes in registration information within thirty (30) days of such change.

Mr. Reid stated if vegetation becomes an issue, it can be addressed upon registration. Mr. Hoyt stated there has not been a solar around long enough to be renewed. Mr. Watkins stated this is a 2-Lot subdivision and is currently staying as is. The flag lot could have a road built and to add a note on the map stating "at the time of further development on this site, the trees would have to be planted along the two sides of the array for screening based on the solar law". At this point, there is no requirement. Mr. Garvey stated some folks do not care if they are looking at it.

Mr. Hoyt questioned in addition to the one new house that is shown conceptual, what would that trigger? Mr. Watkins stated it would have to be figured out but they are allowed to have a house there. I do not believe it would trigger anything but change of ownership. At that time, the new owner will be fully aware of the array and can screen it themselves if need be. Mr. Garvey stated if the house is going to be built at a higher elevation the screening would be of no benefit if above the solar facility. From New Prospect Road, the solar array is lower than the road and you do not see it.

Mr. Reid stated it can be addressed upon a new registration if sold to someone who does not like seeing those panels. I believe that will take care of itself through the registration process if someone challenges the law for the vegetative buffer upon renewal with the Building Department and addressed at that point.

Easement:

Mr. Reid questioned if they can show the setback within 50 ft. and the easement area. Mrs. Hillriegel pointed out Mr. Garvey was very kind to put in stand pipe and hydrant, there is no written easement and no metes and bounds. This was agreed between property owners being good neighbors and helping each other out. Mr. Garvey is still in compliance with the law.

Ingress and Egress:

Mr. Reid stated he would like to make sure that there was approval for emergency ingress and egress per the Fire Department. We should look to see if there is anything officially signing of a prior map showing this. Mrs. Hillriegel stated there is none and Mr. Garvey plows this for the Fire Department. Mr. Watkins stated there is

nothing official and the Pine Bush Fire Department can use the hydrant. Mr. Garvey stated also Walker Valley and Town of Shawangunk Fire Department use for fire drills. Mr. Reid agreed as long as it was part of the approval.

Ms. Franson's Memo Review:

Requested a clean-up on the Short EAF regarding the net lot area that was in question. Ms. Franson questioned if there was a recreation fee required for a subdivision? Mr. Watkins stated yes. A subdivision requires a \$2,000 recreational fee.

There were no comments from the Public for the E&L Farms Subdivision. Confirmed the Public Notice was sent out certified mail on April 23, 2024 and posted in the newspaper and on the Town of Shawangunk website. Mr. Watkins stated the Public Hearing will remain open to next month's meeting, June 4, 2024, and the Planning Board to receive an updated site plan.

A first motion was made by Sal Patella and seconded by Ryan Reid to continue the Public Hearing and leave open until next Planning Board Meeting on Tuesday, June 4, 2024 at 7:00 PM. Vote: All Ayes: 7, Abstain: 0, Absent: 0, Vacancy: 0

APPEARANCES:

US Light Energy – Wallkill Solar Array:

SBL: 99.2-6-10, Address: 2319 Brunswick Road, Wallkill, NY 12589, and Wallkill Central School District, R-Ag4.

Entered into Record:

- Letter Dated April 12, 2024 NY USLE Bruynswick Rd I LLC – 17 Pages related to Planning Consultant's comments and Planning Board Follow-ups. Noise Report, Notice Regarding Solar Energy Project Pursuant to Real Property Tax, and CESIR Redacted documents from C.T. Male Associates, Mr. Chris Koenig, Project Manager and US Light Energy, Applicant.
- Memo Dated May 2, 2024 regarding feedback to U.S. Light Energy Solar Site Plan and Special Use Permit – Preliminary Review from Nelson Pope Voorhis, Ms. Bonnie Franson, AICP CEP, Danielle Dreyer, Planning Analyst.

Review of Goals:

Mr. Fingar reviewed project goals and discussed some the comments received from Ms. Franson and review items that can be closed out. Also to confirm the visual analysis advantage points and ensure comments that were previously addressed are satisfactory. In regards to the letter from the Planning Board received, we were hoping for guidance on what a mature tree is. Mr. Fingar is requesting more additional work on-site and willing to provide a tree survey to show what is mature and what is not mature on-site. To perform a tree survey of the entire property including the array area seems to be out of sequence and inappropriate to determine what is a mature tree.

Representation of Defining Mature Trees:

Mr. Watkins is not comfortable with the definition because different species mean different things. In the example provided in the letter, different trees have different points of maturity and many different forms. No one has a true definition of a mature tree. It is done by species and we do not know what species are there and cannot decide. Mr. Fingar is asking for the appropriate member of the Town to produce a definition of what that means in context of the code. Mr. Fingar stated he does not believe it is the Planning Board's task to provide a mature tree definition and will refer to his counsel. Mr. Hoyt spoke to the Code Official for the Town

of Shawangunk and the Code Official stated it is not his area of expertise and does not have much knowledge in trees. Mr. Watkins and Mr. Calaca, Code Official, worked on the definition together for one week and came to an agreement based on the letter. This was a Town collaboration from everyone including the Town Supervisor, Town Board, ZBA, Building Department, and Town Engineer to help figure this out for everybody to use.

Mr. Fingar stated he appreciates the letter and believes there are other elements that can be used, other than a tree survey, to be on-site to produce a definition. We can engage an arborist to get some guidance on a definition. I do not think it is appropriate at this stage to produce a complete inventory of all these points on the site and a substantial task of the applicant to inventory the entire site of trees. We are trying to determine on the site which trees are mature and not mature. Mr. Fingar stated he is willing to produce a tree survey to determine which part of the property is mature and not mature and will also reach out to the Code Enforcement Officer via a letter.

Mr. Reid agrees on the tree survey but the project could be held up if Mr. Calaca is unable to provide a definition and how long should the project be held-up and is it possible the Zoning Board be involved? One mature tree in one acre and a mature tree in another acre will be difficult when installing panels.

Mr. Hoyt stated the Code Official can forward to the ZBA if he does not know the answer and his determination asks for assistance from the ZBA. The applicant would have to appeal Mr. Calaca's ruling or Mr. Calaca can have the ZBA make a ruling if he is unable to. Mr. Arluck, ZBA Chair, stated we do not have anyone on our Board to make these determinations, same as the Building Department. The applicant should get an expert to have someone say this is a mature tree and definition.

Zoning Code for Clear Cutting Trees:

Mr. Arluck stated the bigger problem is the actual zoning itself. You want a net 20 acres on the whole piece when our zoning is 10 acres. Mr. Fingar stated his interpretation of the code on the 10 acres is limited to the mature trees. Mr. Arluck stated that is true but you have mature trees spread out on the property. Mr. Watkins stated the law states "in no case" is it to exceed more than 10 acres". This is part of the sentence "cutting mature trees."

- (e) A land grading and vegetation clearing plan shall be submitted and must include all connections to the existing grid whether on-site or off-site. Connections to the existing grid shall be via underground facilities unless the Planning Board, in its sole discretion and for good cause, waives this requirement. Clear-cutting of mature trees shall be limited to the area of the panel array, the equipment compound, the area of access roadways and the area required for solar access and in no case more than ten (10) acres per parcel. If clearing occurs within a three (3) year period before an application is filed, the Planning Board is authorized to review historical aerial views or other data to apply the ten (10) acre limitation retroactively.

Discussion on Clear Cutting 10 Acres of Trees and Variances:

Mr. Barnhart stated the applicant's major issue is the 22.5 acres of clearing to accommodate solar array and able to access (see above law highlighted in yellow). Mr. Barnhart stated the Planning Board does not have the authority to circumvent the solar law and they cannot cut more than 10 acres. Until that piece is addressed, it is not feasible to discuss mature trees at this point. Mr. Fingar stated he wants to get an interpretation of a couple of points and ask the Zoning Board for a variance. The last time we were in front of the Zoning Board we were asked to present the minimum variance possible. For this to be done, it needs to be understood how to calculate the request for the area being cleared, is it code complaint, and how much variance is being requested? Mr. Barnhart stated the law is well crafted and straight forward and is not our purview to go beyond what that law says and cannot make that decision. Mr. Reid agreed with Mr. Barnhart and stated a clear cutting of mature trees is confined in that area only; "if clearing occurs within a 3-year period before an

application is filed, the Planning Board is authorized to review historical aerial views or other data to apply the 10-acre limitation retroactively”.

Mr. Reid questioned how do you determine a mature tree only based off of historical aerial views? This sentence supports the fact that mature tree cutting is restricted in that area, but in no case can it be more than 10 acres. Mr. Watkins stated the original law that was in front of us, was you can cut 5 acres and come back to cut another 5 acres in the future. When the law was passed, it showed 10 acres. When writing the law, it was a devastating amount to clear 10 acres on a neighbor. This is a variance that you will have to go for with the ZBA.

Mr. Watkins questioned you have two other variances? Mr. Fingar stated no, we have decided to takes those out and I want to remind the Board in our original application we took a conservative approach and figured we may need variances and went to the Zoning Board. I do know when you are willing to act on SEQR and I know one issue that has prevented me from moving forward is the project has not been forwarded to the county or reviewed by the Board for SEQR. No determination can be made by the Zoning Board until SEQR is complete.

Mr. Hoyt stated you went to the ZBA in July, August, October, and in November you were not there. You initially presented June 6 to the Planning Board and returned for Lead Agency on September 5. You returned last month, April 2 and presented this evening, May 7. Until we can get these variances figured out, how are we going to refer to Ulster County? Also, how are we going to close SEQR and do a NegDec if variances are maybe yes and maybe no? It is within your rights to send a letter to Mr. Calaca and plead with him to make a ruling. You cannot go to the ZBA without given Mr. Calaca the opportunity to write a letter on the tree issue - the 10 acres of mature versus the 10 acres of any kind of tree. The original code draft has any trees which means any size, and it was changed to be more specific to mature trees. Counsel and I had a discussion on the phone about a week ago regarding the need for a tree inventory.

Ms. Franson commented on the variances. There is a provision in the law that states “you shall avoid” and talks about views from the mountain Scenic By-Way, ridge line, and wetlands. From our perspective and the zoning code, you have not avoided the wetlands and may need a variance for that as well. We are still waiting on some visuals and often times, the county wants to see that as part of their GML review, especially with the Scenic By-Way and ridge line. Make sure with the net lot area, other uses that might be on the site have been subtracted out.

Motor Vehicle Inspection License:

On the front of the barn there is a plaque with a license on it and when you look it up in DMV it shows being active for automotive repair and considered a separate use. Mr. Sparaco, owner, was present and stated the license is for used car purchases from wholesale dealerships and cars were never stored or worked on at the property. The license has not been used since COVID but kept active because of the licensing process and the law with the DMV states it has to be displayed. Mr. Sparaco also stated the license was used to buy wholesale and were being sold at the auction without even being on my property. Mr. Fingar will speak with the Code Enforcement Officer to clarify what the requirements are and that there is not a use or activity related to automotive repair going on at the site. It does have to be on-site where the operation is taking place on the property. Mr. Fingar stated he will seek an interpretation on that from the Code Officer.

Netting Out and Calculations:

Mr. Koenig questioned how this will affect the calculation? Ms. Franson stated, there is a zoning requirement that states for each individual use you have to meet the minimal lot area. For example, if there were four individual uses on the property; and a 2-acre zone, you have to meet 2 acres for each of those uses and that gets netted out of your available lot for your solar. Whether it is a coverage requirement, etc., is part of the netting out for some of the bulk requirements for solar development. Mr. Koenig questioned notwithstanding the automotive question, it is just the residence and the accessory agriculture use? Ms. Franson stated that is two. Mr. Koenig questioned how are we adding it all up as we previously submitted previous site plans showing

buildings, driveways, and now there are more? Ms. Franson indicated this is not new and has been raised in previous memos and not addressed. Mr. Hoyt stated you need to net out 2 acres for that home site. Not just the roof tops and the impervious surfaces. Mr. Hoyt questioned is the area devoted to the use bigger than 2-acres? Ms. Franson stated if you are considering the accessory barn area, etc., our code states "minimum lot area" regardless of the use.

Mr. Hoyt stated one of your resubmittals after the April meeting, I think it was April 10 or 12; towards the end of one of the response letters it states you have netted out 2 acres from the house. I looked for a set of plans or chart to show that but was unable to locate. Mr. Koenig stated the comment was addressed on the plan but not submitted. Mr. Hoyt stated this will change the calculation and reduce the amount available for solar and you were just under the 50% threshold. If you lose anymore of that solar area, you go back over the 50% triggering parameters. At one point we were told you do not need any variances and I am unsure that remains a true statement. Mr. Fingar stated that it does not seem to be the case any longer after this discussion and questioned what is "not" to be in a variance. I proposed something originally and that was not agreed to. You took another look at it and still not agreed to. I need to see confirmation from the Building Inspector Code Officer it sounds like so I can actively quantify the variances I am requesting.

Vantage Points:

We received a couple of comments from the Planning Board that were forwarded to US Light Energy via email as the final feedback. Mr. Watkins stated we will send a letter verifying the vantage points. Vantage points include: Intersection of Low Road, Mohonk Mountain, Minnewaska State Park Preserve on the Shawangunk Mountains Ridge, Sam's Point, and Gertrude's Nose. Ms. Franson stated it is likely you cannot see it from the Shawangunk Scenic Mountains highway. No further vantage points were provided and a letter will be drafted.

Ulster County Review:

Mr. Fingar stated he questioned about the Ulster County GML review and would like to get the interpretation to be able to continue. Mr. Watkins stated once we have a project, we will be able to submit to the county. At this time, it is still incomplete. Once we do send to the county and they review it, they send it back to us. Mr. Fingar questioned what is needed to be seen to deem this application as complete? Letter to Code Officer regarding variances, other renderings, and below mentioned topics.

Noise Analysis:

Mr. Fingar questioned if they needed to do anything further on the noise analysis? Mr. Barnhart stated a noise analysis is not necessary. He visited the Route 52 solar array and stood by the fence and did not hear anything of any significance. Mr. Watkins stated for the record, the solar arrays on Route 52 are stationary. Mr. Szarowski stated the noise analysis submitted demonstrates it is not an issue and is sufficient. Mr. Watkins, Mr. Patella, Mr. Widmark, Mr. Reid, and Mr. Leonette all agreed not an issue. All Ayes.

Fire Correspondence:

Mr. Fingar stated will continue to try to obtain Fire Department correspondence. He has spoken to them verbally but has not received any report. Mr. Watkins stated he can assist.

Wildlife Assessment:

Wildlife Assessment Report was submitted and Ms. Franson requested the wetlands be added, due to during the on-site visit on Friday, May 10th, eastern box turtles were seen and is a species of special concern. This must be addressed in the Wildlife Assessment Report. Mr. Koenig stated the report will be updated.

Soil – Wetland Delineation:

US Light Energy wetland delineation was completed. Ms. Franson stated the Board sometimes has a peer consultant review the wetland delineation on behalf of the Town, who will go out to the field, and verify the boundary and make sure everything is being captured. Due to the clayey wetness of soil and environment, Ms.

Franson recommends it, and it is up to the Board whether it be checked out. The Board agreed on the wetland delineation. Ms. Franson stated she will work with Mr. Watkins to coordinate.

Tree Survey Clarification:

For tree survey clarification, understanding what is intended by the code, the interpretations, and accurate variances, Mr. Fingar is going to send a letter to Mr. Calaca, Code Officer, from the Building Department, to get the clarifications and understanding of what you need. Mr. Fingar made it clear he will send a letter.

Resubmittal of Application:

Mr. Fingar stated his goal is to get the application back to the Planning Board as soon as possible but is unsure how long it will take to get an interpretation from the Code Officer's office. Mr. Fingar would like to be on the agenda temporarily.

Stamping Progress Submissions:

Mr. Koenig stated progress submissions are stamped by a PE when it is final and not through the extra step. Mr. Watkins stated a proposed copy is stamped when it goes to the ZBA even though it is not officially final. Mr. Hoyt is not concerned with the final submission only being stamped unless the Board feels differently. Board agreed not having extra stamped plans floating around. All Ayes.

DISCUSSIONS:

CORRESPONDENCE:

Mr. Watkins spoke to the board about his concerns involving general procedural matters and cautioned the line of questioning made by some board members. Mr. Watkins also informed the board that a meeting is planned to be held among the Town Board, Zoning Board of Appeals, and Planning Board, along with our Attorney, Engineer, and Planner. An official date for the meeting has not been set yet, but it will take place sometime in June.

ADJOURNMENT:

A first motion was made by Sal Patella seconded by Rich Barnhart to Adjourn Meeting. Vote: All Ayes: 7, Vacancy: 0, Abstain: 0, Absent: 0

Next Regular Meeting to be held on **June 4, 2024 at 7:00 PM.**
Deadline for submission is **Friday, May 17, 2024** at noon.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Ann Longano, Secretary