

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

November 18, 2014

Present: Michael Dudick, Chairman, Denise Bagramian, Michael Bloss, Jerry Cifor, Randy Gifford, Chris Lemire, Jennifer Vucetic, Mario Fantini

Also Present: Joel Peller, ZBA Counsel
Steve Myers, Director, Building & Zoning

Absent:

Mr. Dudick called the meeting at 7:05 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Dudick informed the applicants this is a seven member board with one alternate. Tonight all members are present, including the alternate. To receive approval, an application one must receive 4 yea votes regardless of the number of members present. There are seven voting members present tonight so the applicant must receive four out of seven votes for approval.

OLD BUSINESS

None

NEW BUSINESS

The secretary read the legal notice as it appeared in the Daily Gazette on November 13, 2014

1) An application from John Hartley for a variance from Section 208-12A which requires 80' front setback. Proposed = 31', Variance required = 49' setback for hot tub. Property is located at 2 Elizabeth Court, Lussier Drive Cluster Subdivision, Clifton Park, NY 12065 (Permit #80998)

Mr. John Hartley, owner of the property on Elizabeth Court, presented the application. He informed he lives on a corner lot and there is not much space to satisfy the 80' setback requirement. He drew a picture of the lot, pointing out the L cove area of the house where they would like to place the tub. He said they would place a fence around it so that it would not be seen from the road or the neighbors. He summarized it is the best location on the lot.

Mr. Dudick announced the public hearing asking for comments. There were none.

Mr. Myer commented this is in a cluster subdivision where the setbacks are less than normal and the lot is barely 80' deep itself. He added he has no issue with the application although the hot tub will be close to the side and front of the house. He stated he has to provide either an enclosure wall or a lockable cover.

Mr. Dudick asked Mr. Hartley if he understood he needs to do that, and Mr. Hartley confirmed he does.

Mr. Dudick made the motion to close the public hearing, seconded by Mrs. Vucetic. All approved. Public hearing closed.

Mr. Lemire asked Mr. Harley why he did not move it back further from the road. Mr. Hartley responded that it would block the door to the basement and also the tub would be within sight of the neighbor if they move it behind the house.

Mr. Lemire asked the depth of the lot and Mr. Myers said it is 90-95 ft. from Elizabeth Court. Mr. Lemire questioned whether topography in back of the lot that would prevent placing it somewhere else and Mr. Mr. Hartley answered "not really". He explained the layout.

Mr. Gifford asked if it was on the street side and Mr. Hartley answered it is on the Lussier Court side. He explained the location they picked is for privacy, pointing out where the other home is and showing how the location would be out of their line of sight.

Mr. Peller inquired as to whether the home has been completed. Mr. Hartley answered it is partly complete and is supposed to be finished by December 17.

Mr. Gifford made the motion to approve the application as submitted. Seconded by Mr. Bloss

Ayes: Lemire, Bagramian, Cifor, Dudick, Gifford, Vucetic, Bloss Noes: none
Application approved as submitted.

Mr. Peller inquired if Mr. Hartley has closed on the property and he answered that he has not and is not yet the record owner of the property. Mr. Peller asked Mr. Myers to acquire the signature of the builder on the paperwork.

Mr. Lemire recused himself from the next two applications (AJ Sign) explaining he has business dealings with the applicant. Mr. Fantini sat in for Mr. Lemire.

The secretary read the legal notice as it appeared in the Daily Gazette on November 13, 2014

2) An application from AJ Signs for variances from Chapter 171, Table I 1) 3 wall sign requested, 2 maximum allowed 2) 25 sq.ft. directional signs allowed., 85 sq ft. requested 3) canopy/roof sign at 44 sq.ft. requested, not allowed use, variance required Property is located at 3 Crossing Boulevard, Clifton Park, NY 12065 (Permit #80999)

The application was presented by Tom Wheeler of AJ Sign Company, representing the owner of the property. He submitted written owner authorization to represent the owner, and also presented certification of mailing to neighbors.

Mr. Myers corrected an error in the application, saying the square footage for #2 is 2 sq. ft. and 8 sq. ft. for the directional sign, not 25 sq. ft. and 85 sq. ft., speculating it was a mistake in reading the writing on the application.

Mr. Wheeler presented a drawing showing overview of the property and the sign locations. He explained that they want to make signs visible and easy to read for ill patients. He described the sign on the canopy which would give visibility from the intersection and the small logo for Albany Med on the wall. He explained they want a small directional sign over the door where people enter for radiation and PET scan. He said the directional sign need to be larger.

Mr. Peller asked if Albany Med is a tenant in the building. Mr. Wheeler answered Columbia Med actually owns the building and NY Oncology and Hematology and Albany Med are tenants. He explained Albany Med has a small area/practice there.

Mr. Peller further questioned if the practice/tenant could change at some time and Mr. Wheeler agreed it could.

Mr. Bloss commented there are two wall signs asking about the second tenant should get a wall sign. Mr. Myers said if they were two separate tenants they would, but this is all one.

Mr. Myers responded they are both occupants, New York Oncology and Hematology and Albany Med and that they work together. Mr. Wheeler explained Albany Med has a small area in the front of the building and there are two different tenants.

Mr. Peller asked if they have their own entrance and was told it does not.

Mr. Bloss questioned if Albany Med has a separate lease for that specific area of the building. Mr. Wheeler said it is their own practice, not part of New York Oncology and Hematology.

Mr. Peller asked Mr. Myers if he wanted to change the application. Mr. Myers stated he was not aware of different tenants in the building and he thought it was different services for one tenant to his knowledge.

Mr. Dudick asked the size of Albany Med's sign and Mr. Wheeler speculated it was 9 sq. ft. Mr. Dudick pointed out that if it is a separate tenant they would be allowed a sign and if it was one tenant there would be a variance needed for multiple wall signs.

Mr. Peller advised the Board to adjourn the application to allow Mr. Myers time to determine if there are two tenants.

Mr. Dudick added that they could have exterior wall signage if there are two different tenants. Mr. Wheeler said the building is fully occupied.

Mr. Peller reminded they need to check with the client to find out if it is one tenant or two separate tenants. Mr. Myers commented that Albany Med is not on the canopy sign and it was never considered to be a separate tenant. Mr. Peller said the issue is, if Albany Med vacates, the new tenant might not be happy with a small sign.

Discussion ensued. Mr. Peller informed that the application might have to be re-noticed. Mr. Fantini asked why. Mr. Peller explained that if there are two tenants, one part of the application will be taken off and it will be less of a variance required and the purpose of the notice would change. He stated both tenants might want something different, and they would not know that based on the current notice.

Mr. Dudick commented that, being it is a commercial, it is understood a commercial building has tenants and questioned if the need to notice is necessary. Mr. Peller assured that it is because Mr. Myers initial analysis would be different and it would be a substantial enough change that it should be re-noticed.

Mr. Myers stated he will go to his office and check the plans to determine if there are two tenants.

The Board temporarily suspended the application while the research was being done, stating they will go back to it later in the evening.

The secretary read the legal notice as it appeared in the Daily Gazette on November 13, 2014

3) An application from AJ Signs for variance from Chapter 171, Table I, sign law. 32 sq.ft. allowed for each tenant based on area of each space, none of the tenants would be allowed over 32 sq.ft. by law. Requested = 60 sq.ft. for main tenant, variance= 28 sq.ft; and 40 sq.ft. or 8 sq.ft variance each for other tenants.

Property is located at 1750 Route 9, Clifton Park, NY 12065 (Permit #81000)

Mr. Peller suggested the Board note the way this application is noticed, explaining there is a main tenant and other tenants with a different sign request. He pointed out this is very different than the previous application with regard to the way it is now written.

Mr. Wheeler presented the application, representing the owner of the mall, Hannoush Jewelers. He explained they have re-written the application since the last meeting and are back with a sign package. He said they are asking for a 60 sq. ft. sign for the anchor tenant with the larger façade (down from 90 sq. ft.) and 40 sq. ft. signage for each of the other tenants. He alleged the 40 sq. ft. is allowed for stores in Clifton Park Center Mall and the stores facing Hannaford are about the same distance from the road. He informed that Mr. Hannoush will put this in the tenants lease.

Mr. Bloss asked the number of tenants and Mr. Wheeler responded there are four maximum. Mr. Fantini questioned whether the 40 square feet would apply if two spaces were combined. Mr. Wheeler said it would be, because it would be in the lease.

Mr. Peller asked if the spaces are dividable, meaning one space could be made into two. Mr. Wheeler supposed it would be possible, adding they would be small.

Mrs. Vucetic inquired the size of the whole building and Mr. Wheeler said it is about 12,000 sq. ft. with Hannoush having about 4,000 sq. ft.

Mrs. Vucetic expressed concern, explaining this happens all the time that, after they approve something, the applicant comes back and says they have a national tenant and need something larger. She suggested they talk about this.

Mr. Gifford asked if there is a lease agreement could the tenant come back and ask for larger sign. Mr. Dudick confirmed they have a legal right to ask for a variance, although it hasn't happened yet with the mall.

Mr. Cifor mentioned Redwing has a larger sign. Mr. Dudick agreed, saying this was a unique situation, but admitted Mr. Cifor made a good point. He suggested it is possible that the other three tenants could possibly become four or five tenants if they subdivide. Mr. Wheeler said anything is possible because he doesn't have tenants yet.

Mr. Dudick informed all the stores along that road have the allowable 32 sq. ft. and asked why Hannoush should have additional signage.

Mr. Wheeler argued the building is built in a way to accommodate the 90 sq.ft. sign they proposed the last time, suggesting that they are compromising on that. He claimed new retail spaces are built to accommodate a larger sign to give them good visibility from the road.

Mr. Dudick announced the public hearing and asked for comments.

Mr. Bloss alluded to Mr. Wheeler's comment about the signs in Clifton Country Mall and pointed out this building is considerably closer to the road than that mall. Mr. Wheeler argued the stores that face Hannaford are closer to the road than the Hannoush building.

Mr. Myers returned to the room and confirmed the limit on the size of signs in the mall is 40 sq. ft.

Mrs. Vucetic said she would like to see uniform signage no matter how many tenants are in the building.

Mr. Dudick commented that he has seen that building facades have become larger. He expressed the opinion that buildings should be able to stand on their own from an architectural standpoint and doesn't need a sign in order to complete it. Just because there is a big blank space doesn't mean a sign is required to fill the big blank space or they will see larger and bigger ones in the town. He explained this is the way he feel about the idea of "we need a sign to fit the space."

Mr. Gifford pointed out that they knew at the time what the codes were and they made the façade much bigger expecting it to be approved.

Mr. Dudick explained each Board member has their own opinion, but his opinion is that a group sign would make him more likely to approve.

Mr. Myers said Mr. Wheeler approached him with the comparison to the Mall, which he said he told him was wrong because of the sight distance. He informed that the 40 sq.ft was applied to the interior buildings that are off the parking lot and the variance doesn't apply to ones along the road and he believes they are all 32 sq.ft. He explained some of the reason for the variance was the distance from the roadways, adding the applicant's building is fairly close to the road.

Mr. Dudick asked the size of the stores in Hannaford Plaza. Mr. Myers said they are all 32 sq.ft except for the Hannaford sign, Petsmart and Toys R Us because of the size of the building.

Mr. Dudick made the motion to close the public hearing, seconded by Mr. Gifford. All approved. Public hearing closed.

Mr. Fantini commented he is concerned about granting 40 sq.ft. for the other tenants because it sets a precedent for other businesses to ask for a variance also.

Mr. Dudick discussed the other buildings on the road, and that many are freestanding and comply with the code of 32 sq. ft. He commented there is a consideration as to how big a plaza is, citing that the mall was a special arrangement because it has hundreds of stores versus four stores.

Mr. Fantini reminded the stores in the mall facing the road adhere to the 32 sq. ft. size. He suggested the stores they are discussing should be compared to the stores in the mall closer to the road.

Mr. Wheeler asked if the Board would be more comfortable if the applicant went to 32 sq.ft for all the stores except for the anchor store. He again suggested that anchors get bigger signs.

Mr. Cifor answered it would increase the probability of getting approval.

Mr. Bloss asked if there is a monument sign as well. Mr. Wheeler said there is a multi-tenant monument sign as well.

Mr. Dudick said this would be an amended application with the other tenants having 32 sq. ft signs. Mr. Wheeler agreed he was willing to go the 32 sq. ft. for the tenants but wanted to keep the 60 sq. ft. for the anchor store because it is a larger façade.

Mr. Cifor made the motion to approve the amended application for the 60 sq. ft. sign only, but not for granting the other variances. Mr. Gifford seconded the motion. Mr. Dudick informed the applicant would require 4 yes votes to have it approved.

Mr. Fantini asked for clarification that is 60 sq. ft. for one and 32 sq. ft. for the rest. Mr. Cifor said 32 sq. ft. they do not need a variance, but they could come in and ask for one.

Mr. Dudick added they are looking at granting a variance beyond the 32 sq. ft. for 60 sq. ft. for a business on this section of Route 9 because they want a larger sign to look nice on the property. He said he does not know how, if this is approved, that they could look at any other businesses if they red0 their façade and ask for a 60 sq. ft. because it would look nice. He said he is not compelled by the argument he wants a 60 sq. ft. sign because he wants a 60 sq. ft. sign. Mr. Wheeler repeated it is because he is an anchor tenant.

Mr. Dudick responded to Mr. Wheeler saying you could argue that Harbor House is an anchor tenant and he cannot say why he would say yes to 60 sq. ft. for the jeweler and not to any other tenant or business. Mr. Wheeler argued it is case by case.

Mr. Dudick replied said he cannot see the uniqueness of this case that would compel him to feel it is so special it requires him to approve a sign almost twice the size of the signs of any other business within a mile of it.

Mr. Dudick explained to Mr. Fantini it is no longer a package, but voting for just the 60 sq. ft. variance for Hannoush.

Ayes: Vucetic, Gifford, Cifor Noes: Bloss, Dudick, Bagramian, Fantini
Application denied.

The Board returned to the application

**2) An application from AJ Signs for variances from Chapter 171, Table I 1) 3 wall sign requested, 2 maximum allowed 2) 25 sq. ft. directional signs allowed., 85 sq ft. requested 3) canopy/roof sign at 44 sq. ft. requested, not allowed use, variance required
Property is located at 3 Crossing Boulevard, Clifton Park, NY 12065 (Permit #80999)**

Mr. Myers stated that he found nothing in the plans to indicate the number of tenants and recommended he needs to talk to the architect.

Mr. Peller suggested the Board needs to adjourn until there is a determination.

Mr. Dudick deferred to Mr. Peller.

Mr. Wheeler asked if the Board could just look at the directional signs.

Mr. Peller advised there are too many variables and they need to discuss with Albany Med about the directional signs as well. He pointed out there are two tenants involved now, not just one.

Mr. Myers stated the directional and canopy signs might not change, but the roof sign is a use variance which is a different category.

Mr. Dudick suggested tabling until the end of the meeting to give Mr. Wheeler time to speak with the owners. Application tabled temporarily.

The secretary read the legal notice as it appeared in the Daily Gazette on November 13, 2014

4)An application from Sean E. Reilly, AIA, Kerns Group Architects for a variance from Section 208-59B which allows a maximum height of 35'. Top of cross of new sanctuary shows 81' above ground & highest actual roof as 63' above the ground. Per definition, height is measured to the mean elevation of the gable roof or 63'. Variance required = 63' - 35' = 28'.

Property is located at 569 Clifton Park Center Road, Clifton Park, NY 12065 (Permit #81001)

Mr. Bloss, Mr. Lemire, Mr. Fantini and Mrs. Bagramian disclosed they are members of St Edwards, but not members of the planning for the new sanctuary. They stated they believe they can hear the application and be unbiased. Mr. Dudick asked the applicant whether he was comfortable with having these members remain on the Board or have them step down. The applicant stated he had no objections with them hearing the application.

The application was presented by Andrew Gilchrist, project attorney for St Edwards. Also present was the pastor of the church, Father Butler and site planner, Tom Field. Mr. Peller requested that Father Butler sign an authorization for Mr. Gilchrist to represent the church.

Mr. Gilchrist stated they had appeared before the Planning Board, understanding there was an issue over the height of the structure. He informed the Planning Board gave its unanimous approval of the project.

He discussed the vibrant parish and its need for more space which would serve both the parish and also the outreach programs they offer to the community.

He pointed out the existing structure which is 40-42' high and the addition which is an octagonal addition leading to the cupola. He explained if you bring the height of the roof to the cupola to 63' you get to the top of the main roof which is 42-45' which gets to the roof on top of the cupola to 65' and top of the cross which is 81'. He stated bringing the line directly over from the main roof to the new structure shows it is consistent with the existing structure except for the cupola and the cross. He noted the code exemption for churches cupolas, spires and domes that are not used for human occupancy.

Mr. Lemire asked if they put a floor under the cupola and no one occupied it, then it would meet the code. Mr. Gilchrist said that was the way he reads it. Mr. Lemire asked if the cupola is open below, if it would be considered occupied. Mr. Gilchrist answered he doesn't believe the occupancy applies to the cupola at the top. He said he doesn't believe the human occupancy is the key, but rather the fact this is a church spire or cupola and, by the way they read the code, it is exempt.

Mr. Lemire summarized that, in that case, no variance is necessary. Mr. Gilchrist repeated that is the way they read it. He pointed out that the height to the cross is 81' and the roof is 45' high but it goes to the extent of the variance, between 35 and 63 it could be said as substantial. They think the variance is in the nature of 10', if required, which doesn't present a substantial

variance. He added that they do not believe that it creates a detriment to surrounding properties or an undesirable change to the character of the neighborhood adding the church has been there since the 1960's.

Mr. Gilchrist then presented a rendering of the current church and proposed addition and said they were pleased to get a positive recommendation from the Planning Board as to the height. He alleged it is in keeping with the area and meet the needs of the church.

Mr. Peller asked if there is a separate access point to the new structure.

Tom Field, sight designer, responded to the question and explained the layout, showing access, entry through the main plaza.

Mr. Bloss inquired about safety issues with the height of the structure. Mr. Myers responded that the Town has apparatus to reach the top of the building and a church is no different than other buildings of 2-3 stories.

Mr. Peller asked Mr. Myers if he agreed with Mr. Gilchrist about the height exception. Mr. Myers answered he had told them, there were two different ways to look at it, and he takes the harder way and lets the Board decide. He agrees with what Mr. Gilchrist is saying but he is not sure it is a spire or cupola so he brought it to the Board.

Mr. Cifor summarized it is a variance either way, just the degree of the variance that is in question. Mr. Myers agreed.

Mr. Peller read aloud the code regarding height exceptions.

Mr. Cifor commented it is pretty simple to him.

Mr. Lemire asked if the whole thing is a dome why it needs a variance.

Mr. Cifor opined that the intent is to exempt the cupola if it is not occupied, meaning people are not physically in the cupola.

Mr. Tom Field commented it is an architectural element to let light in.

Mr. Myers stated that, to him, it is open to below to let light in and is part of the roof structure whether it is a cupola or not.

Mr. Dudick commented it is not occupied.

Mr. Dudick asked for public comment. There was none, he made the motion to close the public hearing. Seconded by Mr. Gifford. All approved. Public hearing closed.

Mr. Myers reminded his job is to interpret the code and to take the hard line to protect the Town and it is the Board's job to grant relief, which is why he is harsher.

Mr. Cifor made the motion to approve the application as submitted for a 28' height variance.

Mr. Bloss seconded the motion.

Mr. Dudick summarized the question is the uniqueness of the application. He said regardless of whether the board members interpret the variance is larger or smaller, the building is well set back from the road.

Ayes: Vucetic, Gifford, Dudick, Cifor, Bagramian, Lemire Noes: none
Application approved as submitted.

The secretary read the legal notice as it appeared in the Daily Gazette on November 13, 2014

**5) An application from Tim Neet for 2 variances from Chapter 171- sign law. 1) request to install business sign on adjoining property which he also owns, originally one parcel until 2001 . Sight distance & NY DOT right of way does not allow sign to be visible from business parcel 2) Zero setback requested from property line due to amount of NYSDOT right of way. Variance requested = 15' (Permit #81002)
Property is located at 2045 Route 9, Round Lake, NY 12151**

The application was presented by Mr. Tim Neet, owner of the property 2045 Route 9.

Mr. Peller asked Mr. Neet if this was originally one parcel that was subdivided. Mr. Neet answered it is, and he owns both parcels. He explained he had subdivided it because he had intended to sell his home which is next to his business, but he has since decided not to do that. He said he wants to keep it as one lot because it will be worth more than two small lots. Mr. Peller asked if they are taxed separately, and Mr. Neet confirmed they are.

Mr. Dudick speculated that if it was one lot there would be no variance required. Mr. Myers pointed out it wouldn't be except for the setback. Mr. Peller agreed.

Mr. Neet explained the DOT line goes across the front part of his driveway and does not allow him to put a sign where it would be visible. He said he has been there for 20 years and customers still drive past the business because the road has a high rate of speed and you cannot see the business or the sign.

Mr. Peller asked Mr. Myers if he thought Mr. Neet should reverse the subdivision and make it one parcel. Mr. Myers answered that would be the easy way, but it is not the way he approached him. Mr. Peller asked Mr. Neet what would happen if he wants to sell one of the parcels.

Mr. Neet said he didn't think the sign would stay if he sold the other part of the land. Mr. Peller explained that it would stay because the variance runs with the land.

Mr. Myers suggested part of the problem in combining the parcels is that Mr. Neet is probably being taxed differently on the two parcels. He said it might create a financial tax burden if he combines them.

Mr. Myers suggested three options: 1) re-draw the line and keeping two separate parcels but creating a line that will allow him to put the sign on the parcel where the business is 2) combine the parcels which will allow him to put the sign on the parcel 3) he asked if the problem has to do with height of the sign.

Mr. Neet said the Mackey sign is high and he would have to go above the auto sales sign. Mr. Myers added that there are power lines along the road. Mr. Neet stated NIMO had put poles at

an angle near Mackey who has cars sitting close to the road, and the second NIMO pole goes to his lawn.

Mr. Peller asked if he had an objection to asking the town to put it back to one parcel. Mr. Neet answered he would rather not as he would have to incur expense to have it re-surveyed and being a small businessman that is a burden. Mr. Peller asked if he is the record owner of both properties and Mr. Neet said he is.

Discussion ensued about the map and location of power lines and other obstacles.

Mrs. Vucetic suggested they put a sunset on the sign if the property is sold.

Mr. Dudick announced the public hearing and asked for comments.

Mr. Fantini, board alternate, commented he believes this is similar to the sign situation at Wit's End. Mr. Peller replied this is "cleaner" as both properties are owned by Mr. Neet.

Mr. Cifor made the motion to close the public hearing, seconded by Mrs. Vucetic. All approved. Public hearing closed.

Mr. Myers opined that this is a unique problem and he has been dealing with it for years. He said this is the only logical thing to do because the DOT has done some unique things with their right of way. He suggested that since Mr. Neet owns both properties and if there is a stipulation that the sign is removed if he sells, he has no problem with it.

Mr. Lemire asked for clarification.

Mr. Dudick explained that if this is approved the variance would sunset if there were different owners for each parcel. He continued: if he were to sell both lots to the same person, the sign could remain but if the two parcels were ever to have different owners the sign would be removed.

Mr. Lemire stated the record should show that this is a unique situation because of the expense that would be incurred for the owner to undo the subdivision. He agreed with the stipulation that the variance would sunset if the parcels were to be owned by different people.

Mr. Dudick made the motion to approve the application with the stipulation that, if the two lots in discussion were to ever change hands so that there are different owners of both lots, the sign would need to be removed. Mr. Neet agreed.

Mr. Peller advised Mr. Neet that if he were ever to become an LLC, he should make sure that both lots are incorporated. Mr. Neet agreed.

Mr. Gifford seconded the motion.

Ayes: Lemire, Bagramian, Cifor, Dudick, Gifford, Vucetic, Bloss Noes: none
Amended application approved

Mr. Wheeler returned (Permit #80999). He informed he had made inquiries and learned that Albany Med has its own lease.

Mr. Peller concluded there are now two tenants.

Mr. Myers stated he needs to re-evaluate the application. Mr. Wheeler asked if there are two tenants, can each one have two signs. Mr. Myers agreed that if it is determined there are two tenants, they can.

Mr. Peller advised Mr. Wheeler that he needs to come back so the Board can look at everything at once.

Mr. Wheeler agreed and waived the 61 days and will return to the December 2, 2014 meeting.

Mr. Dudick made the motion to approve the minutes for the October 21, 2014 meeting, seconded by Mrs. Vucetic. All approved with Mrs. Bagramian and Mr. Lemire abstaining as they had not been present at that meeting.

The next meeting is December 2, 2014.

Mr. Dudick made the motion to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Mr. Vucetic. The meeting was adjourned at 8:42 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Susan White
Secretary

cc: Town Clerk, Town Board, Town Attorney, Zoning Board Members, Joel Peller, Counsel, Steve Myers, Department of Building and Development, ____, ECC, Assessor, Highway