



PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

April 21, 2026

C. Howard Post, Chair, opened the meeting at 7:35 p.m. Pledge

Present: C. Howard Post (Chair), Carole Furman (Vice Chair), Mike Tiano, Bob Hlavaty, Kevin Brady, Al Riozzi, Gina Kiniry and Brigdy Walsh (Alternate).

Also Present: Dylan Tuttle (Town Planner, NPV).

The draft minutes of the March 17, 2026 Planning Board meeting were reviewed. A motion was made by Furman, seconded by Kiniry, to approve as with the one change. Board vote: Post-Aye, Furman-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Brady-Aye, Riozzi-Aye, Kiniry-Aye. Motion carried.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Major Subdivision (9-Lots), Solo Holiday, LLC, Cottontail Lane & Route 212. Presented by Khattar Elmassalemah, Praetorius & Conrad, P.C. The applicant is back before the board to re-open an adjourned public hearing from November 18, 2025. Certified mail receipts and return receipts were handed into the PB secretary.

Post opened the public hearing at 7:37 pm. Elmassalemah-the applicant is proposing a 9-lot subdivision on the 71-acre project site which includes two parcels. The subdivision will be accessed via a private road with cul de sac at the end. The primary access will be via Route 212. There will be emergency access only via Cottontail Road. The site contains a good amount of wetlands and topographical restrictions. The entrance from Route 212 will cross over approximately .5 acres of wetlands. Solo Holidays LLC has officially purchased the property and is the sole owner. A site plan for 185 campsites was proposed by the previous owner which included numerous studies. Since the studies were done within the last few years we will be using several of them for the proposed subdivision as they are still accurate. We sent the traffic study to NYSDOT along with the new proposed subdivision plan. Have unofficially received comment that they do not have any issues with the entrance/exit on Route 212 as long as the applicant follows the NYSDOT curb cut requirements. Awaiting an official letter from NYSDOT with those comments. There are few existing wells on site. The applicant has had the water of those wells tested and an official report has been received (a copy was given for the record). The results demonstrate that the water tested falls within the required drinking limits. The applicant is proposing a green belt around the lots to ensure that extensive clearing is prohibited. Currently working on the SWPPP and road profiles. The concept remains the same and the entrance remains the same as the last submission.

Public comments:

- Mark Pisani, 11 Osnas Lane-the SWPPP has not been submitted to date. The water analysis has not been officially filed, until it was submitted tonight at the meeting. Concerned about water and how the deed restrictions will be maintained for the proposed green belt on each parcel. If this is a private road will there be a Homeowner's Association (HOA)? What rights will the Town have to check. Still awaiting a traffic study for this particular proposed use. The Army Corps report has not been filed. I am an immediate neighbor and have concerns with the wells. Please keep the public hearing open until more information is received.
- Peter Wortmann, 28 Raybrook Drive-concerns with the well water and the effect the additional services required will put on existing surrounding wells. There have been issues in the past with wells running dry in the area and contamination from the Superfund Site of the old dump. How will the aquifer

perform over time and what was the scope of the testing. Contamination over time, residents have had to use bottled water. The NYSDEC has reports of contamination. Some of the proposed parcels are located within the Superfund site. Should fully address these concerns and urge the Planning Board to keep the public hearing open.

- Doug Haeberer, 1676 Route 212-wells of concern. I have a pond on my property that goes dry during droughts. There have been issues with the surrounding wells in the area in the past. My parcel is located downward from the proposed development and my parcel will receive seepage as there is a lot of rock and shale between. The water runs down and sits in the neighbors wells.

Elmassalemah-septics will be installed as per the Health Department requirements. We are aware that one well can not be used. The density of the proposed subdivision is minimum compared to the development that is allowed within the zoning. The SWPPP is in progress and will be reviewed by the Town Engineer to ensure it meets the Town's requirements. They will perform an analysis of values and the proposed development, pre and post. NYSDOT has accepted the previously done traffic study from the proposed campground. The Campground was proposing 185 sites and we are proposing 9 houses. No requesting anything out of the normal requirements. The Route 212 entrance is the only feasible entrance/exit as Cottontail Lane is narrow and is not practical the way it is developed for the additional development. The Army Corps. of Engineers application is being taken care of and mitigation is in progress. The proposed entrance/exit will disturb .5 acres of wetlands and the applicant is proposing to create 1.3 acres of wetlands on-site in its place.

Health Department approvals will be required. The SWPPP approval from the Town Engineer is required. NYSDOT approval is required and the Army Corps. approval is required. The applicant does not want to get the same comment over and over if the public hearing is kept open for another month. We are addressing most of the concerns.

Would request that referral be sent to UCPB at this time.

The idea of cluster housing would be ideal but due to the topography of the site and the significant wetlands it would not be feasible. Tuttle-cluster housing is not required but suggested if feasible.

A motion was made by Hlavaty, seconded by Brady, to refer the 9-lot subdivision to the Ulster County Planning Board (UCPB). Board vote: Post-Aye, Furman-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Brady-Aye, Riozzi-Aye, Kiniry-Aye. Motion carried.

Tuttle-the limits of disturbance are close to the 10-acre threshold for Full Environmental Assessment Form under SEQR. Elmassalemah-will submit a FEAF Part I for the next meeting submission. Tuttle-does the applicant want to create parkland or pay the fee in lieu of parkland? Elmassalemah-the applicant will pay the \$1,200.00 per lot for recreation fees. Tuttle-how will ownership of the PRR be demonstrated? Elmassalemah-Lot #1 will own the road. There will be a road maintenance agreement and right-of-way for each additional lot. Tuttle-the code does require an HOA but the Planning Board has the power to override.

Post-we will be keeping the public hearing open until next month, all members of the Board agree.

OLD BUSINESS

1. Site Plan/SUP, KCE NY 34 LLC/Key Capture Energy, 7 Tomsons Road. Presented by Paul Williamson (*Key Capture Energy*). Also present was Hyde Clarke, Esq. Williamson-received the comment mem from NPV and would like to address comments:

#3 on page 2 of the memorandum the applicant has spoken to the adjacent site applicant, Nexamp, about their design for interconnection with Central Hudson (CH). Awaiting a reply from CH regarding the route of connection. There is a powerline that crosses and once the final design of the road is determined and the CH

response will be able to finalize. Can see if there is more coordination required beside the connection line going under their proposed access road. Tuttle-concerns with the wetlands that were mapped for both projects, NPV ecological specialists had their site visit on the KCE site.

#4 on page 2. During the site visit on April 17, 2026 with the ecological specialist from NPV and our wetland scientist it seemed as though the NPV scientist understood the rationale based on wetland delineation. There were small variations from the KCE NY 34 wetland scientist delineation and the Nexamp scientist delineation. They are similar but did have slight differences.

#2a on page 3. The applicant has hired a sound engineer and a noise analysis has been performed. Expect the results to be received for the May meeting. Epsilon is the name of the company.

#2 on page 4. Separate the survey from the site plan for clarity. Tuttle-that is satisfactory.

#6 on page 4. The application has been submitted with Central Hudson for the crossing agreement.

#7 on page 4. The updated site plan did show the area of disturbance. Does the applicant have to mark all individual trees with 6" diameter and larger? Post-a couple of Planning Board members can do a site visit to look at the area and flag those trees required to be shown.

#11 on page 5. Light color of light model ranges between 4,000k-3,000k. The lights will only be on during working hours. The light poles will not be visible within the village. Post-the Planning Board requests 3,000k or lower as a general practice. The Board was in agreement.

#19 on page 6. Will remove the label as requested.

#20 on page 7. Augmentation will include additional units installed. The site plan being proposed is for the entire project. After approximately 7 years will bring in additional units, timing depends on how the batteries perform. Tiano-lifespan 7 years? Williamson-the batteries deteriorate approximately about 2% per year. The plan is to ensure that the site has the ability to supply 100MW at all times. The initial number of batteries installed will provide supply of over 100MW. The applicant will add batteries to the project as the original units deteriorate. Furman-how do the battery units get installed? Williamson-built off site and a crane is used to set them on the concrete pads. They will take approximately 2 weeks from start to finish when one has to be installed. The batteries are in a fully contained unit. Walsh-to ensure that you keep the 100mw supply at all times will you be adding units or replacing them? Williamson-the augmentation area demonstrated on the site plan is for future use and will ensure to maintain the batteries to operate at full capacity at all times. Hlavaty-what is the total life of the project? Williamson-20 years is based on the current warranties and the land agreement is for 20 years plus two five year extensions. Any changes in the footprint of capacity would require additional permitting. Kiniry-the proposed life of the project is a long period. What happens if you do not stay with the project? Williamson-the applicant will be providing a decommissioning bond/plan that will give the Town the ability to return the land to the pre-development state. The bond will be revised as required with market conditions. IF the applicant goes bankrupt it will most likely be bought by another company to continue the use. Tuttle-updated title report for decommissioning bond, which will be reviewed by the Town Attorney and Town Engineer will review the report for the full cost. Brady-with the augmentation area what if the units still fall below the 100MW, will you swap the units out? Williamson-full confidence with the augmentation that will not happen. If the units do not operate properly they will be under warranty. Walsh-what is the proximity to Cantine Sports Complex? Williamson-the site is located approximately 2,500' away with no impact visually or with noise. Tuttle-actually located 2,300' from Cantine. Will you be augmenting as batteries degrade or will degraded batteries be swapped out? Williamson-could be swapped out if under performance. Engineered life expectancy is conservative but most likely they will last longer.

Tiano-no replanting of trees is proposed during decommissioning. The site is currently forested. Williamson-the cleared area would be the pathway for the overhead powerline and the owner would want to maintain that area as cleared. The maintenance of that area would be important so that trees do not threaten the overhead lines.
Tiano-road grades? Williamson-we will be using the same road as the current CH substation.

Furman-with the sound study was another battery energy storage system used? What kind of mitigation will be used if necessary? Williamson-the engineer looks at ambient noise from a variety of other sources in the area to create a baseline. Then taking lab tested sound results from manufacture for those units that are proposed to be used at the facility. If the levels at the boundaries of the site exceed the Town requirements mitigation will be presented, such as vegetation.

Walsh-coordination of impacts of Esopus Ridge Solar and this project on the Town. Williamson-there is a cell phone tower located between the two project sites. The two projects are visually and physically different. Two separate as far as impact. Connections are also different. Tuttle-there is a test that will be performed by the Planning Board for determining Segmentation for SEQR. The process is ongoing.

Tiano-is KCE 24 in Texas located on an old airforce base? Williamson-not familiar with that project. Tiano-who oversees the requirement of a fire watch to ensure the temperature remains at 145 degrees hourly.
Williamson-there are new fire standards requiring a safety subject matter expert that can be reached within 15 minutes of an emergency and onsite within 3 hours of an incident. The responding Fire Chief will be the authority over the incident and will be the one who will release the firefighters when they feel it is safe to do so. The applicant's expert will remain onsite for as long as necessary. Tiano-still looking for clarity on OSHA training requirements. Kiniry-emergency response plan. Williamson-there will be a site specific emergency response plan and will have to follow the NYS Law/Fire Code.

Tuttle-the application is in the very early SEQR review. The Part I EAF describes the project. NPV will create a draft Part II for the Planning Board with potential impacts for review and adoption. The Planning Board can not assume lead agency yet, another interested agency was identified and the NOI was circulated. The applicant will be responsible for completing Part III once the Part II has been adopted. A negative declaration will have to be reviewed and adopted as the next step. The Public Hearing can be opened but can not be closed until a negative declaration is adopted. At that time the public hearing can be closed. If the Planning Board determines that a positive declaration is warranted the public hearing can be closed but another public hearing will be required during the EIS process. The application is still in the early stages of review.

2. Site Plan/SUP, Esopus Ridge, LLC/Nexamp Solar, Tomsons Road. Presented by Ryan McCune (Nexamp). McCune-we have submitted the revised design, steep slopes and the glare study for the submission deadline. We are submitting part of the visual simulations tonight. The visual impacts will need to be reviewed by the consultant. Have addressed access design changes. 15% slopes are proposed on site. There is existing vegetation which is being left there seems to be no glare. If the vegetation is removed there is a small glare impact. Tuttle-during the months of April-September the glare is minimal. Run glare study through NYSDOT. The Town Engineer has submitted a review memo, received this morning. A site visit still needs to be set up with an NPV environmental consultant. The applicant has submitted a truck turning plan, to be circulated to the Fire Department. Tiano-steep grade? McCune-the steepest slope is located on the northern side of the site which is around 6%. The vast majority of the grade will be 3%-4%. The road profile has been included in the latest submission. Tuttle-close to a draft Part II for the Planning Board to review.

McCune-we have reservations about the tree preservation section of the code. The level of disturbance has been adequately addressed with the most recent submission. It would be relatively binary if specific preservation of trees. We will be preserving trees to the extent practical given the proposed use of the site. The use will require the removal of trees to ensure proper sun exposure. Dylan-the Planning Board will need the request to waive that requirement in writing. Post-we can also do a site visit to see what trees can be preserved without being a

detriment to the proposed use. Walsh-the trees taken down, will they be repurposed on-site? McCune-working with a general contractor to remove the hardwood. Some Towns have requested the wood chippings be done on-site. Ecological site assessment-need guidance. Two concerns with the Special Use Permit requirements are discharge of water and endangered species. The Northern Long Eared Bat and the Red-Headed Woodpecker may be present. An on-site visit should be done with the biologist. More information is needed.

3. Site Plan/SUP, Black Walnut Farm, 1032 Kings Highway. Presented by Bob Hagopian, engineer and the co-owner of Black Walnut Farm, Jim Glaub. The applicant is looking to use the 34-acre site for an event venue. Currently access to the site is via an existing roadway over the railroad tracks from Kings Highway. Proposing an even max of 150 guests. Current access is not ideal and looking to develop a new entrance via an extension of Tissall Road. The purpose would be safety concerns. The Town of Saugerties owns part of Tissall Road and the applicant will present the extension of that road to the Town Board. The applicant is asking the Planning Board, if they are willing, to write a letter of support for the proposed extension to the Town Board. Using the existing features. Will propose a new septic to Ulster County Health Department for review and approval. Comments from the Town Planner were received. In reference to parking, the lot is existing. The creek travels through the parcel. Wetlands have been delineated and validated by NYSDEC. Is it better to separate the proposed event venue from the road buildout and new access? Tuttle-if the two are proposed the Planning Board can not separate them in their SEQR review because of segmentation. The applicant may want to decide how to proceed. It would be appropriate for the Planning Board to draft a letter of support if they feel inclined to do so. Post-if you use Tissall Road as access what will happen to the current access across the railroad tracks from Kings Highway? Hagopian-will be used for emergency access. Tuttle-a traffic study may be necessary for future access vs. existing access.

Tuttle-will need to review this as a minor event venue vs. a major, which was initially proposed.

Hlavaty-are trees with 6" diameter or greater shown on the site plan? Glaub-no clearing is proposed except for the area for the new access roadway when built. The clearing at that point will be kept to a minimum only removing what is reasonably necessary for the installation of the private rural road (PRR) to Tissall Road. Tiano-the PRR requires pull offs every 500'. Hagopian-the proposed width is 28' which will include two 12' lanes and 2' shoulder on each side. Walsh-the proposed PRR intersects with the creek, is there an existing culvert? Hagopian-yes, may widen. Will be working with the engineer and the NYSDEC to determine. Glaub-the creek is very important and sort of comes to an end on site.

Hagopian-currently proposes lighting at 3,000mw and is shielded from Kings Highway. Any lighting proposed is located at least 1,000' from Kings Highway. Post-as previously discussed 3,000mw is preferred. Tuttle-due to the location near wetlands it is more about creating even lighting not so much about the intensity of the lighting. Hagopian-will have shielded lighting and only on during events. Tuttle-always recommend lower levels within rural areas.

Hagopian-proposing one weekend and one weekday event a week. Tuttle-that can be quantified in the SUP. Post-the Planning Board will review the SUP after 1-year to ensure the applicant is in compliance with all conditions.

Hagopian-school buses will be used for shuttling guests to and from local hotels to the events on-site. Shuttles will be required for every event as described in the initial submission. Tuttle-all required parking shown on site with adequate turnaround.

Glaub-in our initial submission we provided safety documents regarding access via the railroad crossing. There will be a crossing attendant stationed at the crossing for all events. The procedure is outlined within the event management plan.

Hagopian-permission to contact the Town Planning Board Consultant and the Town Engineer to follow-up on any outstanding concerns. Post-permission granted.

PRE-HEARING CONFERENCE

1. Minor Subdivision (2-Lot), Thomas Krzywonos, 82 Band Camp Road. Presented by the applicant's representative, Tom Conrad, Praetorius & Conrad, P.C. The applicant is proposing a two lot subdivision on vacant land. Lot 1 is proposed to be 11+/- acres and is vacant land. Lot 2 contains a house and is proposed to be 10.6 acres. The lot is not wide enough where it borders Band Camp Road so we have moved the setback line into the property to where it meets the 125' width requirement; no building can be constructed closer than that. A hatched area is shown on Lot 2 showing the assumed ROW.

Walsh-there is a stream in the rear, is that the Plattekill? Conrad-yes.

Tuttle-if the Board is satisfied with the site access then it satisfies the comment in our review memo. Post-yes. Tuttle-this is an Unlisted Action under SEQR, there are no other involved agencies to be notified and it does not need to be referred to the Ulster County Planning Board.

A motion was made by Riozzi, seconded by Kiniry, to set the public hearing for the May 19, 2026 monthly meeting. Board vote: Post-Aye, Furman-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Brady-Aye, Riozzi-Aye, Kiniry-Aye. Motion carried.

2. Minor Subdivision (2-Lot), Scott & Marsha Rubinstein, 6 Highwoods Road. Presented by the owner, Scott Rubinstein. The applicant is proposing to subdivide a section of the parcel that is 1.1 acres and is already bi-sected by a public right of way, Fishcreek Road. Can not maintain it any more and would like to sell. Tuttle-received an updated sketch map today indicating the septic and well locations. As per our review memo we still need the application updated to include answers to several questions that were left blank. The Board will need an updated SEAF Part I using the NYSDEC EAF mapper. This is an Unlisted Action under SEQR, there are no other involved agencies to be notified and referral to the UCPB is not required. For the next submission the sketch map should include signature blocks and a zoning table.

A motion was made by Hlavaty, seconded by Brady, to set the public hearing for the May 19, 2026 monthly meeting. Board vote: Post-Aye, Furman-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Brady-Aye, Riozzi-Aye, Kiniry-Aye. Motion carried.

3. Lot Line Revision, Craig Gardner, 124 & 125 Abbots Court. Presented by the owner, Craig Gardner. 125 Abbots is owned by Craig Gardner and 124 was owned by his parents until their passing. Proposing to transfer .404 acres from 124 Abbots Court to 125 Abbots Court before we sell parent's lot. Tuttle-there are variances that have been granted in the early 1990's, when it was subdivided, allowing the parcel(s) to be reviewed under what is now considered the High Density Residential zoning district and those bulk requirements. Even though it is located within the Industrial zoning district. The variances should be noted on the final plat along with a zoning table that reflects the HDR bulk requirements. This is a Type II Action under SEQR. The Planning Board may vote by supermajority to waive sketch plan approval and the public hearing.

A motion was made by Riozzi, seconded by Brady, to waive sketch plan approval, waive a public hearing and approve with conditions of including notes for approved variances and update of the zoning table to reflect the HDR bulk requirements. Board vote: Post-Aye, Furman-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Brady-Aye, Riozzi-Aye, Kiniry-Aye. Motion carried by supermajority.

4. Site Plan Amendment, TowerCo, 167 Mt. Airy Road. Presented by Taryn Ramey from McCullough, Goldberger & Staudt, LLP. The applicant is proposing to replace an existing 1977 telecommunications tower with a new monopole style tower that is 10' taller and will be constructed substantially in the same location. The

applicant has proposed that this is a Quasi Public use. They were before the Zoning Board of Appeals and it was the ZBA's determination that the proposed replacement which is 10' taller does fall under the definition of a Quasi Public Use and therefore a variance is not required. However the ZBA did determine that site plan approval from the Planning Board is required. Both outlined in the decision adopted at the February 2, 2026 monthly ZBA meeting.

The applicant is proposing a limited scope of work and requesting the Planning Board waive the public hearing since the applicant is simply replacing a telecommunications tower that was already onsite. The extra 10' in height is to allow for additional carriers to use the tower. FirstNet, which provides service to first responders, is one of the carriers that uses the tower. Construction may take a couple of weeks.

Tuttle-it is up to the Planning Board if they would like additional visual assessments from what has been submitted, request colors and require camouflage. The proposed barely needs to be referred to the Ulster County Planning Board but the Board should and let the County decide if it does not require their review.. This is an Unlisted Action under SEQR or it can be considered a Type II Action if the Board feels that it is a replacement in kind. No coordination is warranted. NYSDEC considers a replacement in kind to be a structure that is substantially similar in material, size, and purpose, on the same site.

Ramey-the location of the tower is 1,000' from the road. The limit in height is due to lighting requirements over 200' in height. The nearest residential structure is over 300' from the site of the proposed tower. There is an existing deed access easement that has been serving the site for over 50 years.

A motion was made by Furman, seconded by Tiano, to refer to UCPB. Board vote: Post-Aye, Furman-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Brady-Aye, Riozzi-Aye, Kiniry-Aye. Motion carried.

A motion was made by Hlavaty, seconded by Kiniry to waive the public hearing. Board vote: Post-Aye, Furman-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Brady-Aye, Riozzi-Aye, Kiniry-Aye. Motion carried.

A motion was made by Riozzi, seconded by Brady, to declare this a Type II Action under SEQR. Board vote: Post-Nay, Furman-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Brady-Aye, Riozzi-Aye, Kiniry-Aye. Motion carried.

5. Site Plan, River Tide Builders/Katie Gastley & Ian Smith, Eagle View Terrace. Presented by the owners Contractor, George Harrar of River Tide Builders. The applicant is proposing to build a single family residence on a vacant parcel that is located within the Waterfront Overlay which requires site plan approval. All windows on the river side will be non-reflective, either with a film or the glass itself.

Tuttle-a couple of items will need to be addressed. The site plan provided does not include the entire parcel with the access drive. That will be necessary. From the aerial view on the Ulster County Parcel Viewer it looks like there may be an existing single family residence on the parcel already, this will have to be addressed. There should be a road maintenance agreement and easement for the access via Eagle View Terrace. The Planning Board attorney should review that. Eagle View Terrace is a private rural road that serves that lot, the Planning Board should determine if improvements are required. Post-we can request that the Malden Fire Chief look at it to ensure that emergency access is adequate. Tuttle-the applicant will have to go through the comment memo and provide answers to the Board.

More information is required from the applicant before the Planning Board can proceed.

ADDITIONAL ITEMS

1. Extension Request, Pond View Apartments, Site Plan, 14 Stevens Court. The applicant has requested an extension to submit the final site plan to allow time to complete conditions of the resolution. A motion was

made by Furman, seconded by Brady, to approve a 1-year final site plan submission extension. Board vote: Post-Aye, Furman-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Brady-Aye, Riozzi-Aye, Kiniry-Aye. Motion carried.

2. Extension Request, Stone Creek Commons, Site Plan, 3190 Route 9W. The applicant has requested a final site plan submission extension in order to secure funding required to move forward with the project.. A motion was made by Furman, seconded by Tiano, to approve a 1-year extension to submit the final site plan. Board vote: Post-Aye, Furman-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Brady-Aye, Riozzi-Aye, Kiniry-Aye. Motion carried.

3. Extension Request, 595 Glasco Tpke., Site Plan, 595 Glasco Turnpike. The applicant has requested a final site plan submission extension to complete conditions of the resolution. A motion was made by Riozzi, seconded by Brady, to approve a 1-year extension to submit the final site plan. Board vote: Post-Aye, Furman-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Brady-Aye, Riozzi-Aye, Kiniry-Aye. Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

Since there was no further business to discuss, a motion was made by Tiano, seconded by Kiniry, to adjourn the meeting. Board vote: Post-Aye, Furman-Aye, Tiano-Aye, Hlavaty-Aye, Brady-Aye, Riozzi-Aye, Kiniry-Aye. Motion carried.

The meeting was closed at 10:49 pm.

Respectfully Submitted by,

Becky Bertorelli
Planning Board Secretary