

TOWN OF MILAN ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING MINUTES – FINAL
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 22, 2011

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jack Grumet, Chairman
Rocky Mancini
Guy Russell
John Schneider
Phillip Zemke

MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

ALSO PRESENT:

William Gallagher, Supervisor
Jack Campisi, Town Board Liaison

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

Public Hearings:

1. **Misti Nolan Area Variance:** Ms. Nolan was not present for the public hearing for her area variance application to permit the placement of a fence to be 23 feet off the front property line where 85 feet are required on property located at 924 Salisbury Turnpike, tax grid number 6571-00-117158 in the A3A zoning district. Ms. Nolan had another commitment tonight so Chairman Grumet agreed to hold the public hearing with the understanding that if anyone from the public was present with questions, the Board would hold the hearing over until next month. Chairman Grumet read the legal notice that was posted in the paper and sent to neighboring landowners. He explained that Ms. Nolan wants to put a fence in front of her house to prevent people from parking there and throwing litter and for some additional privacy. In the current zoning law, a fence is considered a structure so requires a variance to be within the front setback area. Ms. Nolan did submit, as requested at the last meeting, a more detailed drawing of the fence showing the placement and the length which is 90 feet. There were no members of the public present.

Hearing no public comment, Mr. Russell motioned to close the public hearing. Mr. Mancini seconded. All aye. Motion carried 5-0.

Board discussion: Chairman Grumet said there have been no negative comments from the public and he thinks the fence would have a positive reflection on the property, providing Ms. Nolan with more privacy and preventing people from parking on her property and throwing their garbage on her property. Glenn Butler, Highway Superintendent, said where she has proposed the fence would not impact sight distance.

Chairman Grumet read the proposed Area Variance Findings and Decision stating this is a Type II action, the Dutchess County Department of Planning stated this is a matter of local concern, an undesirable change would not be produced in the character of the neighborhood, there is no feasible alternative to the variance as the code defines a fence as a structure, the variance is not substantial, the variance will not have an adverse impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood, and the alleged

difficulty was not self-created. The ZBA members agreed that the benefit to the applicant does outweigh the detriment to the neighborhood or community.

Mr. Russell motioned that the ZBA accept the Area Variance Findings and Decision as presented. Mr. Mancini seconded. All aye. Motion carried 5-0. The variance was granted without conditions.

2. **Donald Johnson Request for Interpretation and Area Variance:** Mr. Johnson was present for the public hearing for his area variance request and request for interpretation for his property located at 26 North Road, tax grid number 6571-00-957459 in the Hamlet zoning district. Mr. Johnson said he wants to start an auction retail business in what is an existing mower shop business. The only structure on the property is the garage. He is proposing to hold the auctions every other Saturday during the summer months. Mr. Johnson said he has adequate parking for 30 to 40 people and according to the building inspector, he can have up to 49 people without changing the classification of the building. He said the items for sale will be basically household items such as nick nacks, furniture, etc. There will be no cars or anything big that would need to be outside. Everything would be in enclosed in the building. Chairman Grumet said there used to be an auction house on the adjacent property years before so it is a traditional use for the area. Mr. Zemke said Mr. Johnson is just here for the interpretation regarding the use and the area variance regarding the garage. He will then go back to the Planning Board for site plan approval. The Planning Board will look at the details of the entire operation. We are just here to interpret the use. Chairman Grumet agreed and said today the ZBA will see if the business can be categorized under the zoning code. If so, the process will then start with the Planning Board who will look at the site plan and community input. The scope of the ZBA is relatively limited here. Mr. Johnson needs an area variance because he has a .47 acre lot and there is a one acre minimum requirement in the hamlet zone. When asked, Mr. Johnson said the auctions will last probably about 2 hours. He will try to schedule them between 7 p.m. and 9 p.m. to get everyone cleared out by about 9:30. Mr. Johnson said he is planning to be the auctioneer. He said he is trying to get the business built up and if he does, he will look elsewhere to hold the auctions.

Chairman Grumet read the legal notice and opened the public hearing. Judy Aguiar, Hamlet Lane, said she is confused with the purpose of this meeting and said maybe she should make her points at the Planning Board meeting. She said she is worried that if there is an illegal building there and it's been illegal for awhile and rules haven't been followed for the building, she is not confident the rules will be followed as we go forward. She said she is very concerned about the safety on the road. There is a blind hill right there and it is very dangerous for all of us coming out of Hamlet Lane and all the driveways. Everyone who attends the auction will want to park as close as they can and will have little regard for people's lawns and blockage of roads. It will be even worse when everyone is jockeying to get out when the auction is over. There will be lines of traffic idling with little regard to the safety of the road; it will be like at

Battenfelds during Christmas tree season. You need traffic control people. She said it is really, really not safe on North Road. What will happen to the quality of life for those not running businesses out of their houses with cars idling, food papers thrown on the ground and refuse left behind. She said she is very concerned about traffic and safety issues. Chairman Grumet said these comments will be given to the Planning Board. Arthur Michaels, 44 North Road, has had the property adjacent to the Johnson property for over 40 years. He is asking the ZBA to deny Mr. Johnson's request. He said approving a building that has already been built with disregard to zoning sets a bad example for everyone in Milan. It diminishes the strength of the Town zoning regulations. Allowing this variance will let others think it is okay to illegally build on a parcel that is too small. He said Mr. Johnson is also asking for a variance to hold auctions on this small site. Auctions are not an appropriate use of land on residential North Road. It will create disturbances and increase traffic on evenings when people are entitled to stay home, relax and quietly enjoy their property and the site is not physically appropriate for auctions. North Road is not wide and cannot support a lot of traffic. The rescue squad and fire engines depend on using an open North Road as do families pushing strollers and kids biking. People might park along North Road. There will be noise and there could be hazardous congestion leading to accidents. The stretch of North Road near Mr. Johnson's driveway is a dangerous blind hill. The intersection of Hamlet Lane and North Road is a blind intersection. The intersection of North Road and Route 199 is a notoriously deadly intersection and has seen horrendous accidents and countless close calls. Increased noise and traffic related to auctions will lower value to nearby residents. Mr. Johnson's auction will present a severe blow to existing residents. Chairman Grumet said these comments will be forwarded to the Planning Board. Don Johnson said both people keep saying this is an illegal building on the property; it's not an illegal building on the property. He said he has a Certificate of Occupancy. The building was constructed in 2001 as a steel garage. Janet Langdale, 56 North Road, said if zoning is an acre and he only has 0.47 acres, why is there an issue? He will be making money and this is a residential area, not a business community. If he's going to make money, let him rent somewhere and do the auction somewhere else. I don't want to try to get down my road on Saturday night and not be able to get to my house with cars being parked on my property. If he doesn't have adequate acreage, why is this even being considered? Chairman Grumet said these comments will be forwarded to the Planning Board for their consideration during the site plan review process.

Hearing no further comments, Mr. Russell motioned to close the public hearing. Mr. Mancini seconded. Motion carried 5-0.

Chairman Grumet said he thinks this business will fit under the Schedule of Use Regulations. These are legitimate concerns that have been raised which will be addressed by the Planning Board. The concern of this Board is whether the business will fit in with the zoning code. The proposed location is in the Hamlet district and the specific purpose of that district is to provide a mixed residential and business community. The lot is under

the required acreage but the purpose of that district is to have that vital mix of residential and business. The Hamlet district is suitable for a business. Chairman Grumet said his opinion is an auction will fit under the use Miscellaneous retail store which is defined as a traditional small scale retail establishment providing services as well as selling goods or merchandise to the general public for personal or household consumption. Mr. Johnson is proposing to sell small scale items to the general public; he is not wholesaling. This definition seems to fit well. Chairman Grumet said this area of North Road has held auctions traditionally in the past so this is not new for this area. This business seems to fit the definition of small scale also. Mr. Zemke said he thinks the interpretation is right, this is a retail operation. This business seems to fit into the usage of the hamlet. Chairman Grumet read a definition of an auction from the dictionary, which is a publicly held sale at which property or goods are sold to the highest bidder and said he thinks it fits into the retail establishment. Retailing is defined in the dictionary as the activities involved in the selling of goods to ultimate consumers for personal or household consumption. Mr. Mancini said as far as people leaving garbage around after they leave, Mr. Johnson can take care of that by policing the property after every auction and Mr. Johnson did say that if this is successful, he will move to a larger building. Mr. Russell agreed with the previous comments and Mr. Schneider said he thinks this is a good location to get something started on a small scale.

Mr. Russell motioned that the Zoning Board of appeals approve the following resolution: BE IT RESOLVED, Donald Johnson has requested an interpretation of Table A, Schedule of Use Regulations, to determine if the proposed use, North Road Treasures Auctions, fits under a category listed in Table A, relative to property located at 26 North Road, tax grid number 6571-00-957459, WHEREAS:

- The proposed use of the property to hold seasonal, bi-weekly auctions involving approximately 30 to 40 people on the site would be considered, comparatively, a small-scale operation;
- The definition of auction is “a publicly held sale at which property or goods are sold to the highest bidder”;
- An auction would be considered a “retail establishment” as retailing is defined in the Webster’s Dictionary as “the activities involved in the selling of goods to ultimate consumers for personal or household consumption”.
- Auctions can be considered a “traditional” use for this area as auctions were held on North Road in the past on a near-by property;
- “Miscellaneous Retail Store”, a use listed in Table A, Schedule of Use Regulations” is defined as “Traditional small-scale retail establishments providing services, as well as selling goods or merchandise, to the general public for personal or household consumption.”

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, the Zoning Board of Appeals finds that the proposed use, North Road Treasures Auctions, fits under the category, Miscellaneous Retail Store, listed in Table A, Schedule of Uses, in the Town of Milan Zoning Code. Mr. Zemke seconded. All aye. Motion carried.

The Board discussed the area variance request. Chairman Grumet said typically, we have a lot of these types of variance applications where the structure is existing on an undersized lot. Mr. Zemke was concerned that there might not be enough information and is concerned that granting a variance to allow this building may supersede the Planning Board's review. Chairman Grumet said the building is existing so that's a given. The use is going to be addressed by the Planning Board. This is a variance to allow the Planning Board to go forward. Mr. Zemke said so granting this variance will legitimize the building to allow the Planning Board to move forward. Chairman Grumet said yes, then they can look at the whole scope, and it is typical for the ZBA to work with the Planning Board to allow them to do their job. Mr. Johnson will not be automatically given approval for the auction. Mr. Zemke said if it wasn't for the applicant's proposed activity and the Planning Board's review of that activity, this would just be a normal catching up and legitimizing of something that exists. It is not moving the proposal of the auction forward. Chairman Grumet said typically, when an applicant comes before this Board, if, for instance, they want to put a deck on, we always try to make the whole property as conforming as possible. Even if the variance request is for something minor, we look at the whole property and bring it into compliance with the zoning code.

Chairman Grumet read the proposed findings which state that an undesirable change would not be produced in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties because the garage is existing and the applicant is not enlarging the use, the benefit sought by the applicant cannot be achieved by a feasible alternative to the variance because the garage is existing, the requested variance is and isn't substantial because the property is less than half an acre in one acre zoning. The nature of the variance requested is not substantial but the difference in acreage is. The variance will not have an adverse impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood because this is an existing structure. The alleged difficulty was not self-created because the applicant followed proper procedures in obtaining a building permit and certificate of occupancy for the garage. It was an oversight by the building inspector to not require the area variance at that time.

Mr. Russell motioned to approve the Findings and Decision for the Johnson area variance application. Mr. Mancini seconded. Motion carried 5-0. Chairman Grumet said now Mr. Johnson can move forward with the Planning Board review process.

After the public hearing had been closed, Don Westermeyer addressed the Board and stated he did not think the board followed the proper procedures in approving this

variance. Mr. Michaels added that if the use of an auction is not listed under the Schedule of Use table, then it should not be allowed and should not be considered under any use.

3. **Diana Bergherr Area Variance:** Paul Hughes was present on behalf of Diana Bergherr for the public hearing to allow a private stable on 4.83 acres where 10 contiguous acres are required on property located at 371 North Road, tax grid number 6572-00-773337 in the A3A zoning district. Mr. Hughes said in response to the Board's request for a planting plan, they will be planting three to four foot high Colorado Spruce trees six feet apart starting on the west side of the property on the north end, bringing the trees to the point where the property drops off, stopping where the kid's shed is on the neighboring property, instead of going all the way to the road. He said that would screen the bulk of the neighbor's houses as far as the view up to the lot. Chairman Grumet said the first time this application was submitted, the plan was to renovate the barn – is that still the plan? Mr. Hughes said yes, they will build two additional stalls which will increase the barn to four stalls and plan to add on two more bays towards the west with a slant roof for a tack room and supply room. The building is 21 x 20 now and will be 21 x 42 once the renovation is done. The roof won't be any higher than it is now. They will use the same siding so it will all look the same.

Chairman Grumet read the legal notice that was posted in the paper and sent to neighboring landowners.

Public Comment: Rae D'Achille, 357 North Road, said she objects to four horses on less than 5 acres. She read a letter to the Board dated June 22, 2011 from she and Dom D'Achille stating they are asking the Board to preserve the standard of living that they have enjoyed since 1985. They purchased the property in question in 1984 and there were no animals on the property at that time; they lived at 371 North Road with no horses until around 1999 when they purchased 357 and sold 371 to Dionne Graff. The letter states Ms. Graff obtained a variance to house one horse and Ms. D'Achille said it was their understanding that when the horse was no longer housed on the property, the variance would be rescinded and the property would revert back to the 10 acre requirement. The property in question is less than 5 acres. Ms. D'Achille said Dionne's horse was housed on the property for less than one year. She drew the Board's attention to two concepts from the zoning code: (1) The quality of life for adjacent properties would be adversely affected; and (2) The property values of the adjacent properties would be decreased. She ended the letter asking that the Board honor the Milan Code and prohibit the housing of horses on the property in question. Frank Plant, 526 Academy Hill Road, said at the ZBA meeting on July 23, 2008, Ms. Graff was informed of the 10 acre requirement and was informed that when someone buys or purchases this property, the use does not transfer so they would not be able to keep horses. There is a letter to Dionne Graff from Donald Smith, Building Inspector (at the time), stating that Local Law #3 of 2001 requires 10 acres for a private stable although the property can continue to be used as a private stable since it is pre-existing, non-conforming until such time as the use is discontinued for a

period of a year or more. Mr. Plant said there was probably a three or four year period where there were no horses on that property. Mr. Smith's letter also states, per Section 200-15B, "If a non-conforming use of land or a building or a structure has been discontinued for a minimum period of one year, it shall not thereafter be reestablished and the future use of the land, building or structure shall be in conformity with the terms of this chapter." Mr. Plant said Ms. Bergherr should not be granted permission to have horses on the property. The letter of the law states there had to have been continuous occupancy of the land by a horse. Again, there was a period of at least three or four years where there were no horses on that property. That being the case, the property reverts back to the 10 acre requirement. Ms. D'Achille said Mr. Graff had her horse there for maybe a year when the horse was either farmed off or it passed away. She contends there has been no horse on the property for at least eight years. Ms. D'Achille said she is not quite sure why Ms. Bergherr wants to house four horses. If you have 4.83 acres and you have a house, a driveway, a hill and a four stall barn, where will the horses be? She said she suspects Ms. Bergherr will be renting out the stalls or will leave the horses there all summer and winter with strangers taking care of them. Mr. Plant said we didn't pass the law; someone passed the law for 10 acres. This no longer falls under the pre-existing jargon. Chairman Grumet said so you feel horses were not on that property for a period of years. He went on to say we have letters from neighbors who are unhappy with the condition of the property and are concerned with what could happen in the future to this property. Mrs. Bergherr has expressed a desire to the Board to improve the conditions of the property now. This is the process that is starting at this point. This Board has oversight and Ms. Bergherr would have the Board's input to fix up her property. She would then be able to use her property more fully to her desire and the board can protect the community by ensuring everything is done properly. If she does not come in front of the Board, she can do what she wants to in many aspects of the property. Ms. D'Achille said that sounds like a threat. Chairman Grumet said it is not a threat. Neighbors have concerns about the impact of Ms. Bergherr's property on the neighborhood and environment. Taking those concerns into consideration, this Board wants to be able to implement a plan that would protect the neighbors and community and environment. Ms. Bergherr cleared a lot of trees and we have letters complaining about that. The Board can't do anything about that but we can listen to the community and work with the applicant to mitigate problems. We have had a site visit and have met with Ms. Bergherr. We saw the condition of the property and looked at different environmental impacts from the land clearing, the fencing and building, taking the whole picture into consideration. Once the process starts, this Board has oversight. Mr. Plant said Ms. Bergherr is not conforming to the law and this Board can give her leave to break that law. Mr. Zemke said the applicant is appealing for a variance from the 10 acre requirement and he asked what is the negative impact of having these horses. Ms. D'Achille said the smell, and she can't understand why the Board can put aside the 10 contiguous acre requirement which is the law and allow four horses on under five acres. Ms. D'Achille said when she herself had that property, it was spotless. Mr. Zemke said then the adverse impacts are the smell, the impact on the water table, and the manure? Chairman Grumet said part of her

proposal is a manure disposal system utilizing a dumpster. Ms. D'Achille said she has lived in this area since 1974, full time and now someone comes up and buys a property and wants to change the living conditions we've enjoyed for over 35 years. She does not understand this. The people who wrote the zoning law put 10 contiguous acres in place and did it in good faith. She said when a resolution is passed by the Town Board, another Board in the Town can't come and rescind it without a really good reason. How can you grant a variance like this? Why am I here if this is just a rubber stamp? Mr. Zemke said we are an appeals board; part of our role is to consider variance applications from residents seeking variances to the zoning law. Chairman Grumet said he is concerned over the fact that we heard a statement saying the horses as a use on the property were discontinued which is an important factor because the property has been represented to us as a grandfathered horse property, a property that has had horses historically and the owner who purchased the property bought it as a horse property with the knowledge she could have horses. Ms. Graff sold it as such. If that's not the case, it could raise some issues. Mr. Zemke said the basis of this is, can horses be responsibly housed on less than five acres? He said he does not hear anything for or against that. The neighbors don't want a change but this property is an ag zone. If it was 10 acres, she could have horses so can four horses be accommodated without detrimentally affecting the neighborhood? Issues have been raised regarding odors and manure. Ms. D'Achille said there is also the issue of this has never been a horse farm. If Dionne Graff sold it as such, she is liable. When we moved here in 1985, there were no horses. Mr. Zemke said there is a two stall barn there now that Ms. Graff put up. Chairman Grumet said he would like to look into the issue of whether the property was properly grandfathered in as a horse property. It's been represented to us that there have been horses there and it should continue to have horses. When we did the site visit, we looked at the extensive layout of the property. There were locations allocated for manure storage and renovations of the building, the fencing plan, and the screening plan was outlined to us. A lot of those variables were not detailed when we originally looked at this. Mr. Hughes said even though the barn has four stalls proposed, she will probably only use three. One of her horses is on the way out. Ms. Bergherr plans on bringing the horses up here one month out of the year when Hitts over in Saugerties has their show. According to Mr. Hughes, Ms. Bergherr said she will never have four horses and she won't be here in the winter time. Mr. Hughes went on to explain the fencing plan. He said they are replacing the existing old fence and instead of putting the fence on the property line where it is existing, they will bring it in 35 feet so that they can leave all the trees up. If they just replaced the fence where it is now, they would have to take down a lot of trees and we don't want to lose that screening. He also reiterated that due to concerns of the neighbors and to mitigate any impact to the community, they will be planting Colorado Spruce trees along the border to provide screening from the horses and the barn and to provide a buffer for the neighbors. Mr. Plant said it won't keep the smell out. Mr. Hughes said this is just a paddock; the horses will only be here a month or six weeks out of the year; they will not be here 12 months out of the year. There will only be three horses. Mr. Plant said he is still concerned about meeting the requirements of the 10 acre law that was passed; he said he thinks the

requirement should remain 10 acres. Chairman Grumet asked Mr. Plant if the smell bothered him when Dionne Graff had her horse on the property. Mr. Plant said it was a sickly horse and they hardly ever saw it, and she had the horse for less than one year. Once that horse died, the place was empty for a long time. Mr. Plant said Ms. Graff had the house on the market for over a year.

Board discussion: Chairman Grumet said he would like to hold the public hearing open until the July meeting so the Board can fully consider the comments that have been made by the public tonight. Mr. Mancini said he would like to have another site visit to get a better picture of the proposed screening as he thinks that is an important facet of this application. Board members agreed with that.

Mr. Russell motioned that the Zoning Board of Appeals hold the Bergherr Area Variance public hearing open until the July 27th meeting to allow the Board a chance to consider comments made tonight. Mr. Mancini seconded. All aye. Motion carried.

Mr. Plant said he was never notified when all those trees on this property were mowed down, and he said the loss of those trees will cause an erosion problem in his back yard which was completely ignored. Chairman Grumet said he understands Mr. Plants concerns but there are no laws controlling the amount of trees one person can take down on their own property. Also, Ms. Bergherr now has a planting plan to put in new trees. Mr. Mancini said that is why the Board will do another site visit. Chairman Grumet said this Board will look into the points raised at this meeting and will re-convene this public hearing at the July 27th ZBA meeting.

Mr. Michaels asked to address the Board regarding the Johnson interpretation and variance. He said the zoning code does not enumerate auctions as a permissible use of the property in question but does allow retail. He pointed out that a field mouse and an elephant are both animals but with more differences than similarities. Lumping small scale retail business, i.e. the Milan Country Store, together with an auction does not hold water and he said he thinks it is erroneous. If the zoning code allowed auctions, it would be spelled out. Mr. Michaels feels the Board has to reconsider this. Chairman Grumet said Mr. Johnson will be starting the process with the Planning Board for site plan approval now. Traffic, garbage, and parking will be addressed with the Planning Board. The Hamlet district is designed to have a mix of residential and commercial. If this property were not in the Hamlet district, we would not be able to consider it. A retail establishment is allowed in the Hamlet district. He could be open 24 hours selling goods constantly with site plan approval from the Planning Board. An auction is on a seasonable basis with a lesser impact. The HB zone takes into account the impact of those uses. Ms. Aguiar said even a store that is open 24/7 would not have the impact as everyone coming and leaving at the same time will have. She thinks it is very hard to say that an auction is a small retail establishment and that a Hamlet is supposed to have that unless there are

other defining factors. Chairman Grumet said your comments will be sent over to the Planning Board for their consideration.

Administrative Items:

- Approval of Minutes: Mr. Russell motioned to approve the minutes of the June 8, 2011 ZBA meeting as amended. Mr. Mancini seconded. All aye. Motion carried 5-0

Discussion Items:

- Chairman Grumet said Karen Hagstrom indicated to Karen Buechele, Clerk, that Mr. Eiffert would like to continue on with his use variance application and they would like the list of information the Board will be requiring. Chairman Grumet put together a draft list and would like to get some input from the Board members. Mr. Zemke said he would like an interpretation in terms of SEQRA as to what type of action this is. He thinks the applicants should be required to submit a long environmental assessment form. Also, Mr. Eiffert is asking for this storage building as an accessory but it is the primary building on the lot. What is the hazardous nature of the material being stored? Chairman Grumet said the key aspect of a use variance is to prove there is no other use for the land. This lot is 100 plus acres. Mr. Zemke said the applicant must prove that this lot is uniquely unsuitable for any other use. Chairman Grumet said that will be one of the biggest hurdles. Mr. Zemke also questioned Mr. Eiffert's link to the property as he is not the property owner and does not appear to have a connection to the property. How can he be financially harmed if he is not the property owner? Chairman Grumet said they would have to prove a link between the applicant and the property title such as a lease. Mr. Zemke asked how Mr. Eiffert was able to obtain a building permit as he is not the property owner. Chairman Grumet said the alleged expenses will also need substantiation. Mr. Eiffert's contention is that he was issued a building permit and then incurred these expenses but it is in the Town code that if a building permit is issued in error, it is allowed to be rescinded. Mr. Zemke said he has a long list of questions he would like answered but they all relate to the long environmental assessment form. Chairman Grumet said he will contact the Town Attorney. Mr. Zemke suggested he ask Mr. Greco when the SEQRA process begins for a use variance.

Mr. Russell motioned to adjourn the meeting at 8:45 p.m. Mr. Schneider seconded. All aye. Motion carried 5-0.

The next Zoning Board of Appeals meeting will be held on Wednesday, July 27th at 7:00 p.m. at the Town Hall.

Respectfully submitted,

Karen Buechele, Clerk
Planning and Zoning

cc: Catherine Gill, Town Clerk
Town Board