

PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES – FINAL

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 2, 2014

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Joan Wyant, Chairman
Jeffrey Anagnos
Nathaniel Charny
Kim Godfrey
James Jeffreys
Radford West

MEMBERS ABSENT:

John Mautone

ALSO PRESENT:

Jack Campisi, Town Board Liaison

Chairman Wyant opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

Applications:

1. **Beam Lot Line Adjustment** – Philip Masaro, L.S., was present as the authorized representative on behalf of Wilfred Beam regarding Mr. Beam’s proposed lot line adjustment between two properties on Hicks Hill Road, tax grid number 6670-00-754614 owned by Beam Realty Corp. and tax grid number 6670-00-665585 owned by Wilfred and Cheryl Beam. Both properties are located in the A3A zoning district. Mr. Beam is proposing to take 3.215 acres off of 754614 leaving a remainder of 3.245 acres and adding it to 665585 bringing that parcel to 96.71 acres. Both lots are improved with a single family residence, well, and sanitary disposal system. The map label needs to be changed to state “Lot Line Alteration – Beam Realty Corp.”, the owners’ consent to file block needs to be added to the map, and a before and after acreage chart needs to be added to the map. The Board agreed all the information has been received to set the date for the public hearing, that this is an unlisted action under SEQRA and that this application meets the objectives of the subdivision regulations.

Chairman Wyant motioned to set the date of the public hearing for the Beam Lot Line Adjustment to be held at the May 7th Planning Board meeting. Mr. Jeffreys seconded.

Joan Wyant, Chairman	Aye	James Jeffreys	Aye
Jeffrey Anagnos	Aye	John Mautone	Absent
Nathaniel Charny	Aye	Radford West	Aye
Kim Godfrey	Aye	Motion carried	6-0.

Public Hearings:

1. **Orange County Poughkeepsie Limited Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless – Site Plan-Special Use Permit** – Scott Olson, Attorney, was present for the continuation of the public hearing to install and operate a communications facility on property located on Academy Hill Road, tax grid number 6572-00-862990. Mr. Olson said the Board

decided at the last meeting that they preferred a monopine tower which will be a monopole tower camouflaged with pine tree branches. It was decided that this design would mitigate to the extent feasible any significant adverse visual impact. Mr. Olson said the record speaks for itself regarding need. The Board's professional consultants have confirmed the need. Letters have been received from residents stating there is no need for this tower. Mr. Olson said while he appreciates where they are coming from, there is no support for any of those comments. The technology has been reviewed by our engineers and the Board's independent RF consultant and the need has been confirmed. Mr. Gordon, an attorney representing several residents, had his own consultant review the materials and he even confirmed our analysis. We are consistent with industry standard. Members of the public have made need an issue and they are entitled to raise those issues but we have conclusively addressed this facility is needed. It has been said that this facility will only cover a small tiny gap. However, we are talking about 4 miles. This is not a small gap; as a matter of fact, Mr. Olson said it is one of the most significant gaps he has ever seen. Chairman Wyant asked if it isn't true that it is actually more than a 4 mile gap in circumference. Mr. Olson said he was referring to the Taconic but if one were to draw a circle, the gap is much greater than 4 miles. Mr. Jeffreys addressed the 1996 Telecommunications Act, section 704, which says that Towns and Planning Boards and Zoning Boards have the right to review the siting of the tower, suggest buffering, stealth design, etc. and all of those issues have been brought up and discussed. In clarification, per the Telecommunications Act, it seems that we, as a Board, cannot discriminate in favor of one carrier over. In other words, just because we have great AT&T coverage in an area, that in itself does not give us the ability to preclude Sprint or Verizon from putting up a facility in that same area. Our code does require an applicant demonstrate that co-location on existing towers is not feasible. The Mariner Tower on Near Road in Gallatin has been referred to in resident's letters as a co-location alternative. The Board asked the applicant to do additional plots and computer models using the Mariner Tower and while coverage improved, it did not complete the four mile stretch. Mr. Olson agreed with that. Mr. Jeffreys said per the Telecommunications Act, it is not in the purview of the Planning Board to dictate to carriers where they can build out their coverage and we can't dictate to the carrier where to put the tower. Mr. Olson agreed and said the Planning Board can suggest sites for co-location, which this Board has done, and we have looked at all surrounding towers, JNS, Woody Row Road, Near Road, and looked at the two site solution which does not work. Mr. Olson said we would rather co-locate as opposed to building a new tower for obvious reasons. We would not have the community sentiment and it would be much cheaper. It is much more expensive to build a tower. It would be a poor business model to propose a new tower if co-location were a possibility. Mr. Jeffreys said the Telecommunications Act does allow the Board to control the visual aspect and this tower's proximity to the parkway has required a submission to SHPPO and the applicant has stated they have received a letter from them. Mr. Olson said he believes he has that and will double check that. Mr. Charny asked about the tower height as several different heights have been referred to. Mr. Olson said this is a proposed 150 foot tower. We had in the beginning talked about 160 feet for co-location purposes but that height created a lot of issues. We do believe that at 150 feet the tower is co-locatable. Structurally it will support three or four carriers total. Jay Paggi, Town Engineer, said he has reviewed the SEQRA documents and concurs with

Ms. Axelson's recommendations with respect to the engineering portions of the application that he has reviewed. If a negative declaration is approved tonight, the applicant will still be required to get site plan approval and special use permit approval. Mr. Paggi said he still has an active comment letter which required some additional closing up of some loose ends with regard to the SWPPP. SEQRA comments have been addressed. Mr. West asked if a final Fire Department letter has been received. Mr. Andros said we did reach out to them but did not get a response. Mr. Paggi said the applicant included all of the Fire Department's initial recommendations in the changes they made.

Chairman Wyant read the rules of conduct for a public hearing and said that several items of correspondence have been received for this application and are on file in the Planning Office – copies can be requested by anyone who would like to read them.

Public Comment: Frank Plant, 526 Academy Hill Road, said he is against the tower and said at 150 feet, it will protrude way above the horizon. He added that according to the FAA, the tower needs a strobe light and people won't like the light blinking all night long. Sian Zelbo, 735 Academy Hill Road, said the tower is right next to her property and is clearly visible from her property. She said we moved to this house with three kids and were brought to this area because of the bucolic character. Having a tower looming over our house will change the character of the neighborhood and of our house. George Steckler, 11 Old Jackson Corners Road, said his family has been in this area for 55 years. He said he has a 20 acre piece of property across from the firehouse with 200 feet of road frontage on Academy Hill Road. He said he has been approached by developers over the years but feels that would be a wrong way to treat his neighbors. Mr. Steckler said Parkway communication is important and suggested this 20 acre site may or may not be suitable to Verizon and possibly more preferable to the tower naysayers. Perhaps these 20 acres could be an advantage to Verizon plus remain forever wild. Delmar Hendrickson, 388 Fitzsimmons Road, said Fitzsimmons is a charming road and he is very happy there but one thing makes him unhappy – he has no cell service. He needs to go away from the house to use his cell phone, although sometimes it works on the second floor of the house. He has never been able to give anyone his cell number to use. He said it is a frustrating situation for those of us who needs phones. Mr. Hendrickson said another concern is there are more and more problem with land phones. By far, the majority of people I know don't even have land phones anymore. What will we do if we don't have any cell reception? He said he has a couple of friends in real estate who have said that no one would ever buy his property without cell phone reception. Doug Raelson, 255 Willow Glen Road, addressed the height of the tower and the zoning ordinance which caps the height at 100 feet. He said as he reads it, the applicant can apply for a variance up to 150 feet if they show two things, (1) if an independent radio frequency consultant determines that adequate coverage would not be provided by a tower of lesser height and (2) if the applicant can demonstrate that, based upon topography of the site and surrounding area, siting of the antenna, antenna design, surrounding tree cover and structures and/or through the use of screening, that off-site views of the facility will be de minimis..... He said the definition of de minimis is lacking significance or importance, pertaining to trivial things, small, minor,

insignificant. His question is, how has it been determined that the visual impact will be de minimis. Mr. Raelson thinks he will see it so he is confused as to how this determination was made. He said when he looked at old minutes, back in April of last year there was a tethered balloon raised in the morning during the week with no announcement made to the public. This is going to be much more than a de minimis impact on the Town. Maybe it would be a de minimis impact in NYS or Poughkeepsie. In our town, we have come to love it due to its beauty and bucolic and pastoral nature. He said he does not think this effect is going to be de minimis. How is it de minimis? Peter Goss, 285 Willow Glen Road, said he is concerned about the visual impact and would like to make sure other avenues will be explored as to the necessity of having this tower where it is. Paul Doherty, property owner, said he has spoken before. He has a tower on another property that has been there for 16 years. There have been many questions over the last eight or so months about the visual siting and height. If the tower is not at this height to allow for co-location, there will be other companies coming in wanting towers instead of being able to co-locate. People at meetings have also complained about the effect on property values. He said we have 400 acres surrounding this tower. For \$1,000 a month, we would not sign on if we thought it would diminish our property value. He said with his other tower, someone asked him when he was going to put it up and Mr. Doherty said it has been up for six months – the person never saw it. Tom Foote, 211 Academy Hill Road, said he thinks the residents deserve an explanation of the de minimis clause and how this specific tower fits into the current Town law. He said he would like to see that issue addressed formally by the Planning Board. Tom Whyte, 1262 Turkey Hill Road, said he was not present to address aesthetics but would like to address need. He said he got a letter in his mailbox which states most people in town have cell service. Mr. Whyte does not think that is true. People tell us we can rely on network extenders. He said where he lives, our service on a good day is bad. He has Frontier on speed dial. The phone is out all the time. The internet signal is very poor. Sometimes his cell works, sometimes not. Mr. Whyte is concerned about the safety factor. What if you have to call the Fire Department in the middle of the night and there is a storm and the internet and phone are out. Or if there is a family whose car goes off the road in the middle of the night. Mr. Whyte said we definitely need cell service in this area. Bobbi Egan, 205 Milan Hill Road, said her comments were addressed. Al LoBrutto, 394 Academy Hill Road, said it has been previously addressed that we have service in Town with AT&T throughout the whole parkway and Academy Hill Road. The gap that Verizon identifies is for their equipment. There is a 4 mile gap on the Parkway. That gap could be significantly reduced to a ¾ mile spot by Wilbur Flats Road and North Road and a mile gap on Jackson Corners Road which is a point made by Rick Andras, a Verizon consultant. The gap could be reduced if they co-locate on the Near Road tower. This tower is not necessary to reduce a 4 mile gap or ¾ mile in one spot or 1 mile gap in another spot if they co-locate on the Woody Row Road tower which is 195 feet tall. That covers a substantial area. These areas would be substantially covered. Mr. LoBrutto said as far as the law is concerned, we are concerned about adequate coverage. The question is, do you want a new tower to provide most of the service or can you co-locate? Mr. LoBrutto said for a ¾ mile and one mile gap, let's go with co-location. Gordon Oliosi, 695 Academy Hill Road, said Verizon keeps saying they are going to co-locate on two existing towers but they have not done anything they have told us. They have not

approached Gallatin to co-locate. Let's do a co-location first and see what the gap is then. If its 4 miles now and is less than a mile after co-location, then let's re-convene and see if we need a third tower. Secondly, Mr. Oliosi said he was reading the Town Supervisor's statement that is posted on the Town's website which states "Today, Milan has neither a village center nor a post office.....Residents are fortunate to enjoy a somewhat rural lifestyle and we are committed to maintaining it so. Individuality, privacy and diversity are highly valued here and we prefer to avoid suburban development concepts and a way of life. We welcome to our community those who enjoy a bucolic lifestyle and share a willingness to sustain it." In light of that, why are we talking about this? A cell tower is totally inconsistent with that statement. Jack Grumet, 575 Academy Hill Road, agrees with both sides stated by the speakers. He agrees we need good cell phone service at home and on the Parkway for safety reasons. However, he said he drove the entire length of the Parkway from North Road to Jackson Corners Road to Academy Hill Road with an AT&T phone and maintained three bars and was able to hold a conversation. Mr. Grumet said he can't imagine that AT&T has a technology that Verizon doesn't. We have seen graphs and charts where that is not possible but he said he had good cell service on the Parkway and Academy Hill Road. Mr. Grumet said the Board should look at co-location. Why can't Verizon co-locate with the same type of technology? The Board needs to know the importance of this decision. Several residents whose property abut this property will take a hit on their property value. Everyone wants cell service and it is important but if you don't allow them to co-locate, it will have serious ramifications for some neighbors. No stone should be left unturned before you allow people to lose value on property. Secondly, a neighbor, Steve Kahn, wrote a letter in opposition to cell tower which Mr. Grumet submitted to the Board. Charles Terhune, 235 Pond Road, said he has only been here a couple of years. He said he understands property values but more importantly, they don't have cell phone service or if they do, it is scant. His AT&T phone did not work at all today. It works sometimes. This seems to be appropriate if it can be done. It is very important that everyone where we live has cell phone service which we can rely on in case of an emergency where the Fire Department or 911 needs to be contacted and then find a place for the tower that is as least intrusive as possible. He questioned how our service will be improved, will it just improve service on the parkway. He received the letter that said this tower was just to service a small span on the Parkway. He said he can't see why we have to build something here for that. He is more concerned for our own citizens having coverage. That needs to be addressed. John DiCarlo, 372 Willow Glen Road, said he and his wife bought their three acre parcel last summer and they bought it for its beauty and privacy. We are directly affected by this. We are not for it or against it. We bought the property knowing we have no cell service. He said they called both Verizon and AT&T. They ended up purchasing a GPS box for a one time fee of \$200. Their concern is the access road which runs alongside their property. They have two small children and three dogs that run free. We have already seen strangers on our property surveying the road. He does not know what the offsets are for a driveway, is it 20 feet from the property line? What kind of guarantee will we have that people won't be on our property? There will be a gate but it's easy to walk around a gate. As far as aesthetics, he does not think they will see the tower since we have a lot of woods around our house. Our biggest concern is the access road. Kate DiCarlo said the last she heard, the surveyors were out on the

property to control run off. She just wants to make sure our property won't be affected due to the access road. She also asked how they bring the tower in – do they take down trees? We bought the property because it is so wooded. David Gordon, an attorney representing property owners on Academy Hill Road, requested the Board keep the public hearing open. He said as a matter of law, the public hearing also applies to the special use permit and site plan approval. The Board should be commended for opening the public hearing for SEQRA. However, you need a public hearing for site plan approval and special use permit approval. Mr. Gordon urged the Board to keep the public hearing open through those reviews. He said in their submittal in December, the applicant went to some length to demonstrate with a drive test verification of the existing gap. There were multiple colors on the map and they explained what each represented. This is what we are asking for, to look at alternatives. Mr. Gordon said the Board must also demonstrate as to the de minimis, and needs to consider the special use permit. When this application gets to the ZBA, the fact that this is the minimum variance is necessary. It is important to know what that 130 foot tower would do. Mr. Gordon urged the Board to ask the applicant to show what it means to be slightly below -85dBm with a 130 foot tower. Suzanne Curatolo, 201 Torre Rock Road, said she has terrible Verizon cell phone service and that is with using the frontier internet connection. There is a need for cell phone service for some of us. She said she does not want to diminish the beauty of the Town, but cell service is a need and said she hopes we can find a solution.

Board discussion: Mr. Charny said based on the comments made, the consensus is that cell phone coverage is important. The concerns are really about are we allowing more than is necessary to solve the problem everyone in the community agrees exists. Mr. Charny acknowledged he missed most of the review of this application, but had a few questions for the Board. Does this need a strobe light and, other than the balloon test, is there any other visual of what the tower will look like, and if AT&T has the technology, why can't Verizon do it? Verizon has said they use different technology, inferior technology – that is what the Verizon people said. They can't match what AT&T did. Mr. Charny said he has his own significant concerns about the choice of a fake pine tree or not – it is an impossible decision to make but this Board has the authority to make that decision. He would like to see a good, clear visual of the monopine. Mr. Charny agrees with the notion that the Board should leave the public hearing open while the ZBA deals with the height variance. He said he is satisfied that co-location is not technically feasible but he is not quite satisfied on the need for a 150 foot tower. How bad would the gap be at 130 feet? Mr. Jeffreys said as far as the strobe, the FAA requires structures above 190 feet to be lit and they can request the structure be lit if it is in a glide path. This tower will not be lit. As far as the balloon test, it was done over a two day period which is the typical method used and the only real way of getting a visual up to 150 feet. They actually flew the balloon at 160 feet. The test was noticed in the newspaper. As far as visuals, in October, the applicant provided visuals of a lattice tower, a fake tree, and a monopole in the form of photo simulations. Mr. Jeffreys said as far as coverage, the applicant provided propagation maps showing propagation based on their frequency usage. They can't just show AT&T coverage and say that will be the Verizon coverage. Mr. Jeffreys said he was not sold on the stealth tower but acquiesced to the rest of the Board. He said when he looks at towers, he looks at the overall landscape. The fewer

blockages you do to the sky, the more light you see through the tower such as with a monopole or lattice style. A stealth tree blocks the light behind it. Also, the highest tree is not 150 feet in that area. However, Mr. Jeffreys said he realized that there are some pretty big trees in that area that stick way up. So, the monopine will stick out but will be less intrusive than he originally thought, perhaps less intrusive than a lattice or monopole, blending in a bit more with the fake branches and it helps that stealth technology has gotten better. Mr. West said the one style tree that sticks up are the white pine and ostensibly this would be that type of design. Mr. Olson concurred. Mr. Jeffreys said both he and Mr. West went along for the balloon test and there were three places he said he could see the tower using binoculars – at the corners of Academy Hill Road and Jackson Corners, on Ferris Lane coming down the hill, and on Academy Hill Road coming over the hill. Mr. Olson said in one submission, they provided pictures of actual tree towers we have done with an up close perspective to you could get an idea of the 3D and what it looks like. Chairman Wyant said with regard to the access road concerns, she believes all the run off issues have been dealt with by the engineers. She asked how far the access road is from the DiCarlo property line and if any trees would be taken down if the tower were to be installed. Mr. Paggi said he will review the plans to that specific property, look at the separation, and report back to the Board. He believes the direction of the run off is away from the DiCarlo property. The entry road is 12 foot wide, one side cut and one side fill. The clearing limit is wider than road. Depending on depth of cut and fill, it gets narrower and wider. He said he will report to the Board on those items. Mr. Jeffreys said all of this documentation, including maps, is available in the Town Hall. Anyone can come in and look at all this. Mr. Charny said he still thinks it is an impossible decision, to go with fake tree or not. He thinks the fake trees look silly but in the pictures, it looks good and looks like the best choice.

The Board reviewed Part 2 of the long environmental assessment form.

Chairman Wyant motioned that the Planning Board approve the following resolution: BE IT RESOLVED, the Town of Milan Planning Board has considered a Negative Declaration (Determination of Non-Significance) under NY SEQR for Orange County-Poughkeepsie Limited Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless Special Use Permit/Site Plan for a Wireless Communications Facility to be located on Academy Hill Road, tax parcel identification number 6572-00-862990;

WHEREAS, the proposed action involves the construction of a 150-foot monopine style communication tower facility and enclosed equipment shelter compound to be located at the end of a proposed approximately 3,200+/- feet long gravel access from Academy Hill Road, placing the tower, or mount, on the west side of the subject property, approximately 1,800 feet from the intersection of Academy Hill and Fishwoods Roads with its center located at a ground elevation of 597 feet; and

WHEREAS, the action as proposed requires a variance from the Town of Milan Zoning Board of Appeals for the tower's height; and special permit and site plan approvals from the Planning Board; and

WHEREAS, the materials listed at the end of this resolution were submitted in support of the proposed action, which were reviewed by the Planning Board and its consulting Radio Frequency Engineer, Planner and Engineer documented in the review correspondence provided to the Planning Board; and

WHEREAS, in the course of Planning Board review, including alternate scenarios of possible collocation on existing tower sites, the plans, which originally proposed a lattice-style tower, were revised to address comments about camouflage tower design and retention of vegetation for buffering related to the visual aspects of the tower and enclosed equipment shelter compound. The plans were also revised to include grading, drainage, erosion and sediment control measures to address the effects of land disturbance, creation of impervious surfaces and stormwater runoff; and

WHEREAS, the 123.47 ± site is located in the A5A (very low density residential) zoning district; and

WHEREAS, at the Planning Board meeting on August 7, 2013, the Board identified the proposal to be a Type 1 Action; declared their intent to act as Lead Agency in a coordinated review; and authorized circulation of a notice of their intent and project information to involved agencies; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing on the special permit and site plan applications was opened on July 3, 2013; held open for additional public commentary at several meetings; continued on April 2, 2014; and closed on April 2, 2014; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board reviewed and discussed the numerous submittals of applications, plans, reports, Part 1 of the Full Environmental Assessment Form as initially submitted and subsequently revised at the following meetings and workshop sessions; and considered the commentary by its consultants and the public: - June 5, 2013; - August 7, 2013; - September 4, 2013; - October 2, 2013; - November 6, 2013; - January 8, 2014; - March 27, 2014; and – April 2, 2014; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant submitted an application to the Town of Milan Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) as a result of the review of the Planning Board applications, and for which the ZBA opened a public hearing on July 24, 2013 and similarly continued their hearing and review pending the conclusion of SEQR review by the Planning Board;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that having received no objection to their notice of intent to serve as lead agency, the Planning Board of the Town of Milan hereby declares their status as Lead Agency in the SEQR review of the proposed action; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that Planning Board, in accordance with the requirements of Part 617 of 6 NYCRR of the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA), hereby adopts a Negative Declaration (Determination of Non-significance) indicating that an Environmental Impact Statement will not be required

based on the review of the materials listed at the end of this resolution; and the supportive reasoning set forth in the attached SEQR Negative Declaration Notice; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that since this is a Type 1 Action, the Planning Board authorizes circulation of the Negative Declaration Notice to Involved Agencies; and filing of a notice with the Environmental Notice Bulletin. Seconded by Mr. West.

Chairman Wyant	Aye	James Jeffreys	Aye
Jeffrey Anagnos	Aye	John Mautone	Absent
Nathaniel Charny	Aye	Radford West	Aye
Kim Godfrey	Aye	Motion carried 6-0.	

A copy of the Negative Declaration is attached.

Mr. Charny said he feels the Board is a public body and the public should be kept fully engaged. If we are procedurally allowed to keep the hearing open, I think we should. Mr. Jeffreys said the public hearing has been open for at least eight months which has given the public plenty of opportunity to attend the meetings and voice their concerns and comments which the Board is grateful to receive and consider. Mr. West agreed.

Chairman Wyant motioned that the Planning Board close the public hearing for the Orange County-Poughkeepsie Limited partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless Special Use Permit/Site Plan application. Mr. Jeffreys seconded.

Chairman Wyant	Aye	James Jeffreys	Aye
Jeffrey Anagnos	Aye	John Mautone	Absent
Nathaniel Charny	Nay	Radford West	Aye
Kim Godfrey	Nay	Motion carried 4-2.	

2. **Munsch Two Lot Subdivision** – Chairman Wyant motioned that the Planning Board adjourn the continuation of the public hearing for the Munsch proposed two lot subdivision of property located on Round Lake Road, tax grid number 6370-00-954632 to the May 7, 2014 Planning Board meeting as per an email from Mark Graminski. Mr. Anagnos seconded.

Chairman Wyant	Aye	James Jeffreys	Aye
Jeffrey Anagnos	Aye	John Mautone	Absent
Nathaniel Charny	Aye	Radford West	Aye
Kim Godfrey	Aye	Motion carried 6-0.	

Administrative Items:

- Approval of Minutes – Mr. Jeffreys motioned that the Planning Board accept the minutes of March 5, 2014 as submitted. Mr. Anagnos seconded.

Chairman Wyant	Aye	James Jeffreys	Aye
Jeffrey Anagnos	Aye	John Mautone	Absent
Nathaniel Charny	Aye	Radford West	Aye
Kim Godfrey	Aye	Motion carried 6-0.	

- Correspondence – There was no correspondence.

Discussion Items: None

Mr. Anagnos motioned to adjourn the meeting at 8:25 p.m. Ms. Godfrey seconded.

Chairman Wyant	Aye	James Jeffreys	Aye
Jeffrey Anagnos	Aye	John Mautone	Absent
Nathaniel Charny	Aye	Radford West	Aye
Kim Godfrey	Aye	Motion carried 6-0.	

The next workshop will be held on Thursday, May 1st at 7:00 p.m. (if needed) and the next regular meeting will be held on Wednesday, May 7th at 7:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Karen Buechele, Clerk
Planning and Zoning

cc: Catherine Gill, Town Clerk
Town Board