

Meeting of the Planning Board of the Town of Lewisboro held via the videoconferencing application Zoom (Meeting ID: 914 0464 9102) on Tuesday, September 15, 2020 at 7:30 p.m. The audio recording of this meeting is 200818\_001 and the YouTube link is [https://youtu.be/\\_neLEv0YeCY](https://youtu.be/_neLEv0YeCY)

Present: Janet Andersen, Chair  
Jerome Kerner  
Richard Sklarin  
Greg La Sorsa  
Judson Siebert, Esq., Keane & Beane P.C., Planning Board Counsel  
Jan Johannessen, AICP, Kellard Sessions Consulting, Town  
Planner/Wetland Consultant  
Ciorsdan Conran, Planning Board Administrator  
John Wolff, Conservation Advisory Council

Absent: Maureen Maguire

Approximately 22 participants were logged into the Zoom meeting and 1 viewer on YouTube.

Ms. Andersen called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

Janet Andersen: So, I'm Janet Andersen and I hereby call to order the Town of Lewisboro Planning Board meeting for Tuesday, September 15, 2020 at 7:30 pm. Before I go any further, I'm going to confirm that Ciorsdan has started recording this meeting, which I see and this meeting is happening via Zoom with live streaming to YouTube, which is available on the Lewisboro TV channel. The public can view the meeting there and we have confirmed that the feed is active and working. Note that in accordance with the Governor's Executive Orders, no one is at our usual meeting location at 79 Bouton. I've also confirmed with Ciorsdan, the Planning Board administrator, that the meeting has been duly noticed and legal notice requirements have been fulfilled. Notice has been placed on the Town of Lewisboro website and included in the email distributions from the Town and the [Lewisboro] Library and it has been posted on Facebook.

Joining me on this Zoom conference, from the Town of Lewisboro are the members of the Planning Board. I know Greg La Sorsa is here, Rich Sklarin and myself. I don't know. Oh, and Jerome [Kerner] has joined us. I did not see Maureen [Maguire] come in, but with four members we do have a quorum and thus we can vote on any matters that do come before the Board. Also, with us is the planning/wetland consultant Jan Johannessen and our counsel Judson Siebert and planning board administrator Ciorsdan Conran and the CAC chair, John Wolff.

The Governor's Executive Order 202.1, which has been renewed, enables the Planning Board to meet remotely and electronically to function on behalf of the Town. In accordance with the Executive Order we intend to post both the recording and later a transcript of this meeting to the Town website and it will also be available on the Town's YouTube channel and of course actions will be documented in meeting minutes. We have a public hearing scheduled for tonight. That is the only time we expect to take public comments and I will describe the process in a minute.

The public, any members of the public have joined muted and without video. Until that point, we ask any applicants that are not currently engaging in dialogue to mute their lines. This will help everyone hear over the inevitable background noises. And I think with practice we've all gotten a lot better at managing this. To those whose lines are open, I remind you that we should do our best to avoid cross talk and, if possible, to mute ourselves until it's necessary to talk. To ease the recording of our votes I will poll Board members individually.

Okay, so let's get started. We will start with a public hearing. Let me talk about the process. The purpose of the public hearing is for members of public to understand the proposal, in order to express to the Board concerns and

comments. These comments should be addressed to the Planning Board. A public hearing is not meant to be a dialogue and in general the Board will not respond to comments during the public hearing. The Board will take public input into consideration as we continue to review the application. Again, let me just put on the record that because of Executive Order 202.10, we are not meeting at a common location. We are holding the meeting via video and telephone in accordance with Executive Order 202.15. We have invited public comments by email before the meeting and I just confirmed with Ciorsdan that we do not yet have any email comments. The public can comment during the hearing by sending an email to our normal planning email. It's [planning@lewisborogov.com](mailto:planning@lewisborogov.com) and, in addition, the public can speak at the meeting. So, if the public wishes to speak at the meeting, please raise your Zoom hand. To do that if you are on Zoom if you put your cursor at the bottom of the window, you should see an image of people labeled participants. Click on that to get a panel on the right-hand side with icons at the bottom. You can then click raise hand. Participants who have raised a hand will show up on the hosts' screen in order that you raise your hand and we will then unmute you and tell you, you have the floor. And depending upon whether your microphone is active, you may have to unmute yourself as well. And I do see there is one person in a waiting room that's on a phone can should we...

Ciorsdan Conran: I've been trying to chat with them to state their name and they haven't responded yet.

Janet Andersen: On a phone number they might not be seeing that. But I was going to say if you have dialed in on a phone like this one person. You can raise your hand to indicate you want to talk by pressing \*9 and we ask people to give their name and address upon entering and to keep their comments to three minutes and while, I certainly don't expect this to happen, someone who is disrespectful at this meeting will be asked to leave the virtual meeting, just as they would be asked to leave a physical meeting.

And again, I want to mention, I believe we now have one person on the phone. If you want to raise your hand to indicate that you want to talk during the public hearing you press \*9.

## I. PUBLIC HEARING, CONTINUATION

**Cal# 91-19WP, Cal# 10-19SW**

(5:50 – 18:10)

**McArthur and Salazar Residence, 40 Old Pond Road, South Salem, NY 10590 Sheet 33C, Block 11155, Lots 16, 17 & 44 (William McArthur, owner of record) - Application for Wetland Activity Permit Approval and Stormwater Permit Approval in connection with the reconstruction of a lakeside residence and cottage.**

William McArthur, owner; Michael Sirignano, Esq.; Teo Sigüenza, AIA and Alan Pilch, PE; were present.]

Janet Andersen: So, the first item on the meeting agenda is the continuation of the public hearing on MacArthur and Salazar residence at 40 Old Pond Road, South Salem, New York. This is an application for wetland activity and stormwater permits in connection with the construction of a lakeside residence and cottage. We opened the public hearing on August 18 and adjourned it to today. So, we have received no new submissions, but I believe we may have some new reports here. So, should we start with the anything the applicant wants to tell us.

Billy McArthur: Hey Janet, it's Bill here. Well we we conducted a site visit and I would let Jan and Alan comment. I would say it was quite positive. I think we have a good understanding of next steps. And we're working hard to submit our projects that we can be in front of this Planning Board in October.

Janet Andersen: Great. Okay. Um Jan, would you like to give us a summary of the report of your site visit?

Jan Johannessen: Sure, I conducted a site walk along with Alan Pilch; the owner, Billy MacArthur, and representative of the Westchester Land Trust. I don't know, maybe two weeks ago, two, three weeks ago. We

walked the property. We've also walked the adjacent land trust property. I had an opportunity to speak to the representative from the land trust about some of the protocol for the for the invasive species removal and I had a concern originally, that they were proposing to remove the Japanese barberry and other invasives by means of burning them, you know, which is, you know, widely accepted practice by the DEC and others, and you know in locations where it kind of makes sense but myself and the rep from the land trust had a similar kind of reaction to that and because of the remote nature of the parcel and the steep slope and the surrounding woodlands and the dry season that we've had. We didn't think that was maybe the best approach to remove the invasives. So, we talked about maybe having them cut flush to the ground surface and then treated with an herbicide removing them by the roots on the steep slope will probably cause erosion adjacent to the lake, which wasn't something that we're interested in. So, I think the best method for the removal is going to be cutting cutting them flush to the ground and then treating them.

Janet Andersen: When you say treating there you would, that would be just painting the stems, or would that be broadcast spray?

Jan Johannessen: I would imagine to be painting the stems. I think Steve Coleman is going to be working on a program a written narrative of how the invasives will be mitigated and monitored and I'd expect them to be painted, but that that's a document that we're waiting to receive I think for the October submission.

Janet Andersen: Right.

Jan Johannessen: So, I felt real comfortable about what was taking place on the land trust parcel. We walked that swale, the drainage swale down and they pointed out to me, where they wanted to put the gabion baskets and I thought that made a lot of sense. So I was, I was kind of on board with their program. We also talked about one of the comments from the CAC which was that that the tank that they have down below to collect the storm water and detain the storm water the detention tank is currently being proposed to outlet at a single location. And I think there was a desire to have that split so so it wasn't all going to one particular area and the applicant indicated that they would make the best effort to comply with the request and try to split the discharge.

We also talked about the comments that came back from the [South Salem] Fire Department and how they may be handled and I don't want to speak out of turn so I'll ask Billy or someone for the project team to kind of reiterate what was discussed or what they had indicated to me and how they planned on responding to those but and I think that I think that a lot of the comments are in process, you know that they're going to be responding to them in an appropriate manner and expect that the October submission will be complete and I think we're with some additional information that's been requested I think we will be in a good place. I feel comfortable with the mitigation. We also talked about some additional plantings along the lake edge to try to maximize the onsite mitigation, to the extent possible, they were on board with that. So as Billy mentioned very positive meeting and I think they're headed in the right direction.

Janet Andersen: Okay, um, any comments or questions from, I know we don't have any new submission materials, but from the Board. Anyone have a more comments, questions or thoughts on this?

Jerome Kerner: Well, I hope. Well, we'll have some comments on the Building Inspector's comments regarding this road frontage issue and whether or not it will be some remediation or a variance request.

Jan Johannessen: The Building Inspector has come out and indicated that it is a private road as suspected. That they require two different variances: one is a 280-a variance under the New York State Town Law, the second variance is of frontage variance under our local zoning. I do not believe that those applications have been made but they will be required. And I'd like if the applicant is willing, just to discuss some of the mitigation items that we discussed at the field.

Alan Pilch: Maybe I'll, it's Alan Pilch, maybe I can just indicate that with, so with regard to the South Salem Fire Department request for a dry hydrant. When we were out there, we concurred that due to the elevation change from the lake up to Old Pond Road and the distance that it is, yeah, that really made it was not practical to have a dry hydrant in that location. But as an alternative what we said we would do is we'd have sprinklers in both the the lakeside cottage and the studio cabana buildings. Just want to make sure that that goes it's noted.

Janet Andersen: Okay, that'll be on any new plan submitted?

Alan Pilch: That will be on the new plans.

Billy McArthur: Actually, and thanks for bringing that up Janet. One of the one of the comments from Teo, who's, who's on and tell may if you want to comment on this, but I think those have to be designed by by an expert. And so the question for us is, this is going to be noted in Teo's plans, but we would ask that this would become you know, an item for us to complete once it's been approved by the Planning Board.

Jan Johannessen: And I would completely agree with that. I don't think the Board needs to be reviewing the sprinkler plans, but just a commitment from the applicant that both buildings would be sprinklered. That would be carried over and any future resolution and then can be dealt with, with the Building Inspector. I think like with your resubmission in October, you'd be expecting some sort of written confirmation that that's your that's what you're planning to do.

Billy McArthur: Okay.

Janet Andersen: And any I honestly have no idea whether that means that you need to have a reservoir somewhere or how it would work. So, and I'm sure that's part of what you're going to be asking so, you know, I think just having it indicated that that will be part of the final residence would would be is something that we need to see.

Billy McArthur: Yep.

Janet Andersen: Okay. Um, I have gotten through through Ciorsdan a message from Maureen that she is, at the last minute, she's unable to join us tonight so that's where we stand on that. So I again if anyone member of the public I don't see anyone on wishes to make a comment or someone on the phone wishes to make a comment you can do it by raising your hand by putting your, your cursor on the window and clicking on participants and then clicking on raise hand or if you're on the phone, you can do it by \*9, but I do not see any anyone commenting. I think we; we know that we're going to have more information. So, I think the wise thing for us to do is to adjourn this again until the next our next meeting, which is October 20 if that's agreeable to everyone. Looking for nods. Okay, yes, the Greg okay so and so I think with that, when we look forward. I'm going to remind you that the resubmission date is, I believe, September 29 and we look forward to getting more information from you then.

Billy McArthur: Thank you.

Janet Andersen: Okay, great job. Yes, somebody's calling me. Jud, you have to...

Jud Siebert: Yeah. And just a reminder. Can you hear me I the audio is...?

Janet Andersen: Yes.

Jud Siebert: Okay. And just a reminder that you know the October meeting it's a likelihood that it will be conducted remotely by Zoom again. But that will be dependent on an extension of the current Executive Executive Order so anyone who is viewing or listening that public hearing may continue either over Zoom as we

are tonight or it could potentially be an in person meeting at a location selected by the Town. So please, just keep an eye on the agenda when published as to those specifics.

Jan Johannessen: I just wanted to point out that I don't think there's anything preventing the applicant for making applications to the ZBA if it hasn't already for the additional two variances.

Janet Andersen: Great, thank you Jan. Anything else?

## II. SKETCH PLAN REVIEW

[Cal #03-20PB, Cal #37-20WP

(18:11 - 38:54)

**Gossett Brothers Nursery, 1202 Route 35, South Salem, NY 10590 Sheet 31 Block 10805 Lot 46 (Thomas Gossett for T. Gossett Revocable Trust – owner of record)** - Application for Site Development Plan Approval and Wetland Activity Permit Approval for an existing nursery.

Thomas and William Gossett, owners, John Vuolo, South Salem Winery; Tim Cronin, Cronin Engineering; and Michael Sirignano, Esq.; were present.]

Janet Andersen: Okay, so, um, thank you all and we will move on to the second item on the agenda which is a sketch plan review, Cal #03-20PB and Cal #37-20WP Gossett Brothers Nursery at 1202 Route 35, South Salem, an application for site development plan approval and a Wetland Activity Permit approval for an existing nursery and this is in conjunction with a Special Permit for a winery on the same site. Gossett Brothers appeared before us on October, oh sorry August 18[, 2020] and are back again. Tonight, we still have some lead agency still open. We're waiting for some responses so that that is still going on. We have referred this to the County and I thought that perhaps it would be helpful even though we're still waiting on some of the procedural items to have to continue our discussions and to talk about where, where we might see some might want some more information and to reference that we did get a letter from the Building Inspector. So, I want to make sure that the applicant does have that. So, I guess I see the Gossetts and Tim, are on.

Okay, so the first thing I did want to mention I appreciate receiving the the business plan I and I didn't want to wait two months, especially to tell you that I think I would like to see this fleshed out a little bit more, um, I, I looked at some of the things on the website and they don't match some of the items that are on the business plan and so I'm sure there's some way to sort of expand it. The website talks about a farmer's market on both Saturdays and Wednesdays and that it's year-round. The the business plan that we got sort of talks about it being in business, April through December.

I think it would also help if part of the business plan when you get to the winery part talks about some of the items that are in the special permit so that we just have sort of a way to say they're in accord. So, for example, you know, there's some if the the special permit language has things that say at least 80% of the grapes have to be grown in the state. Well, you know, if you just say that you know that we have it or I think a little bit more of a definition of how many seats there might be at wine tastings versus wine by the glass versus, you know, events or just a little bit more description of what all these would be I think would help me.

And I also would like to know a little bit more about as we as we encountered at a prior nursery that we talked about, we talked about delivery times when the trucks came, where do they go, you know, how is that managed, is there a loading zone for some of the products you send off that are larger than a retail customer might buy, you know. So, I think just a little bit more would be very helpful to me on that.

Thomas Gossett: I'll take that. I'll take that as a list. I will certainly write those down and then we can address those. That would be good.

Janet Andersen: Yeah, I think it will also, it just helps document, some of the things that we're trying to deal with here so...

Thomas Gossett: Great. Okay.

Jan Johannessen: I know the business plan came in a little late. We need to review it, but probably be helpful to have a business plan if it wasn't presented this way for both the nursery and the winery. So, we can understand the different hours of operation and how the two kind of are consistent or inconsistent with each other, especially with regards to hours of operation and parking demand and that sort of thing, the deliveries of the plant material. You have a couple uses on the same property; it probably makes sense to have separate business plans. So, we can understand.

Jerome Kerner: They do cover hours of operation, Jan, you know.

Jan Johannessen: Okay, very good. Yeah.

Janet Andersen: And I also thought you talked about, for example, the the vendors for the farmer's market park around in the back. Well, maybe that's, I don't actually know whether that will count as additional. I mean, some of the parking spaces that you might have that or whether they don't. I honestly don't know, but I think a little bit more information on that. The other thing is that parking I think this special permit actually says, you know, there should be X number of off-street parking spaces in addition to those required in this chapter for the business to which the accessory uses granted, so I think I know we have the ability to vary that but it would help to know how many that are supposed to be there to start with so that we could then say we're, we're granting a change to that. So, and I think that's basically based on square footage and I know the Building Inspector did ask for more details about the the square footage of the various buildings that are on site.

Thomas Gossett: I think that's very helpful, we kind of went into it a little bit vague, but now that we have more direct questions to answer we'll be happy to do that. I think that's, that's very helpful.

Janet Andersen: Great. Well, I again that's I wanted I think it's, it's important to try to you know move this, keep the process moving so I that's part of the reason that we wanted you here.

Thomas Gossett: We appreciate that.

Janet Andersen: Any comments from anyone else on the Board?

Richard Sklarin: I'm just looking at the August 24 [2020 applicant] memo. I'm just a little bit confused on the hours, it talks about nursery hours, April through December, 9 am to 5 pm that's every day.

Thomas Gossett: Yes.

Richard Sklarin: All right, so then it says business hours for the winery 3 to 8 pm so and that's same days and then it goes on to say private events will be offered after nursery hours only I'm just trying to mesh together.

William Gossett: I'm sorry, can you repeat that you broke up for one...

Richard Sklarin: I'm sorry my signal's bad here. Okay, I'm sorry, I'm the business hours for the winery talks about 3 to 8 pm.

Thomas Gossett: Right.

Richard Sklarin: So that's this potentially the same seven days that little overlap for the regular hours.

John Vuolo: No. I'm sorry. Can you. Am I, am I on?

William Gossett: Yeah, John, you're good.

John Vuolo: I'm sorry. Yeah, that's my mistake. I'm reading that now, no, the winery is only going to be open Fridays, Saturdays and Sundays for tastings.

Richard Sklarin: OK, and then it says...

John Vuolo: That needs to be changed. Yeah.

Richard Sklarin: Okay. So, and that's so it's 3 to 8 pm overlap to the regular nursery hours of 9 am to 5 pm.

John Vuolo: Yes.

Richard Sklarin: Okay, and then it says private events offered after nursery hours. So that means is that the same 3 to 8 pm or is it. I don't know what the...

John Vuolo: Well no, after the nursery closes at 5 pm. So, we're going to have a private event, it would start after you know six o'clock or after 5 pm.

Richard Sklarin: Okay, so it's the whole, the total range is like until eight o'clock or later potentially? I don't know.

John Vuolo: On a private event, you know, it could go later I'm assuming 10 o'clock or something like that.

Richard Sklarin: Okay.

John Vuolo: But 3 to 8 pm is going to be a Friday, Saturday, Sunday, just, you know, get getting people to do tastings. We're not in Napa Valley and, you know, people aren't coming around, Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday to do tastings in this area.

Richard Sklarin: I want to know like from the thing but on the Saturday, cut it off at eight o'clock. I don't know what your ability to go later if you're looking to go later. That's all.

John Vuolo: Yeah, um, while we were open, we realize we're not serving dinner there. So, it's kind of a, you know, after, after a certain amount of time people aren't coming to the winery. It's more of a, you know, an event you're not staying there and having ziti and osso bucco and spending the night.

Richard Sklarin: Okay, thanks.

Janet Andersen: And, and I guess the the other thing I would ask is at right now, at least, is there any conflict between, you know, you're not serving full meals and the requirement that the, you know the COVID opening has on, you have to at least have some food that's you know more than I think a bag of potato chips or something to to provide at the same time is, is there any conflict there? Are you able to handle that?

John Vuolo: Believe it or not, that is in the I'm not sure how I think COVID is almost forcing the food, but the New York State law always has been, when I opened up the winery and I think has been that way for many years.

If you're going to serve wine by the glass then food of substance must be served and food of substance could be you know charcuterie and cheese it can't be crackers and peanuts that you can that you can do with a tasting that is allowed. But once you serve somebody a glass you have to have it offered to them. But now with COVID I've heard people saying that you I heard somebody told me that if somebody ordered a beer, they got a \$2 hot dog with the beer. And that was a law now and that's a COVID thing, but I'm not going to open till April and, but this New York State law has always been, you cannot serve wine by the glass, unless you're serving food of substance.

Janet Andersen: Okay.

John Vuolo: So, we would try to serve food of substance.

Janet Andersen: And I see Jerome has a question. Yes.

Jerome Kerner: Yeah, with this evening function, I would expect that there will be some site lighting. I don't know if that's been contemplated at this point.

Thomas Gossett: Yes, we had a discussion with Jan on that. So, we'll be addressing that.

William Gossett: That lighting plan will be provided.

Janet Andersen: Okay, great. Well, I think. I like the fact that you're, you know, being responsive and and I'm going to try to keep moving this whole thing forward and we'll see if we can keep it going. I expect we will get the lead agency responses all by the next meeting and we'll be able to take some of the procedural steps as well.

Jan Johannessen: We could just get an indication from the applicant when they plan on making a submission to the ZBA for the special permit.

Tim Cronin: I believe that's been made. I think they're on the agenda for the end of this month. Billy can confirm that, and Tom, but it's one of, one of the things that I wanted to discuss tonight was the parking that we're showing and what we're going to do for the land bank, because that's going to dictate to some extent what we do with the site plan. The current proposal and what was outlined in my letter was briefly that we have, I believe it's 13 spaces on the south side of the nursery, which is between the nursery and [Route] 35 and I believe another eight spaces in the back for farmer's market employees and for Tom's employees and you know, that seems to be the general number that's there right now, although we will define it a little bit more clearly in the site plan and Tom has put down some type of low reveal curb to also define those spaces. So, we're looking at 21 active spaces and when we had our conversation with Jan Johannessen, he mentioned that those spaces will have to be active spaces and available at all times, which, which is fine, we realize that. So, with those 21 spaces we're also looking to land bank and additional 21 spaces, all of which would be located on the north side of the building and just looking...

Janet Andersen: I'm sorry. I didn't hear you, all of which would be located where?

Tim Cronin: 21 additional land bank spaces, and I believe six of those would be at the on the southwest corner where the farmer's market is now and additional I think it would then be 15 spaces on the north side or in the back of the building, but you know 40-45 years of being in business, there's never really been a need for that. So we're comfortable, we you know with with the with the numbers that I've just presented I think that you know Tom based on his history and working with John on winery and we feel is a pretty good number. We, you know, we, I think as far as parking in the front goes we're, we're pretty much limited to the 13 that would be 12 regular and one handicap and then any additional spaces, if it's required by the Board, they would all be on the north side or the back of the building.



Janet Andersen: I think I would just yes so, I understand I think I think we want to try to make sure that we don't have excess space that isn't that aren't going to be used. I'll just comment that the accessory winery special purpose code does say there should be no fewer than 10 off off-street parking spaces in addition to those required for the business, to which the accessory use is attached. So we I sort of, I feel like I can't I want to say, we don't need any more than you know is really going to be used, but I sort of feel like I'm not sure what that what the actual Code would currently require for this use. So, we haven't some idea how how close we are to that number.

Jan Johannessen: Janet, they'll have a bulk zoning table and parking calculation table on the plan so they they go through the Code.

Janet Andersen: Okay.

Jan Johannessen: For specific parking parameters for the different uses and they come up with what's required by the Code to be zoning compliant. And then they're backing off that number based on what they actually need, and the delta would be what's going to be land banked. I would just suggest that they provide something in writing that demonstrates through their history and operating what the parking need is so we have something in writing from them that establishes the required number of the spaces that were actually that physically located out there.

Tim Cronin: But would that be, I guess, that'd be appropriate for putting add that into the business plan.

Jan Johannessen: Yeah, I think so.

Tim Cronin: All right. Now just know to further on what Jan just mentioned. In the site plan that was submitted last month, we showed a total of spaces required at 26. And if you recall, the Building Inspector had a comment that we can't round down. So, if you have 10.2, it actually comes to 11 so now we actually need we need 27 spaces and we're proposing the 21 would be active and then we're land banking in additional 21 so that gets us a total of 42 spaces. When the Code actually requires only 27 and that also includes the 10 spaces that are necessary for the winery. So it's going to be a matter of mix and match and I think, you know, between Tom and John it's going to, I think we'll be able to present clearly that the operators, the primary operation of the winery is going to be at the end of the day, or into the evening, whereas the primary utilization at the nursery is going to be say from 9 in the morning till one in the afternoon so you know there's going to be although I think it was mentioned that you know there's going to be there's an overlap of when they're open say from 3 to 5 pm the use of the nursery at that point is it's not certainly not as heavy as it is in the morning. So, but that's all stuff we can go through a little bit more clearly on the business plan.

Janet Andersen: Right, and thank you Jan I had, I had forgotten or did not remember certainly that they that there was something on the plans and I'll go take a look at that. I see Jerome has his hand up.

Jerome Kerner: Yeah, the business plan has a statement says the party size of events which were mentioned by the applicant will be determined by Department of Health allowances, which is a strange statement to me. I mean, it seems to me, can you get give clarification on that, it typically would be by a number of tables or lacking tables, maybe some square footage but what what restriction or allowance, does the Department of Health have on the number of people.

John Vuolo: Now, Jerome, can you hear me?

Jerome Kerner: I can.

John Vuolo: Okay, so right now we're waiting for the Department of Health too actually, they're going to be the ones who tell us how much seating that we'll be able to allow have in that size. Then that's going to determine

how many people we're going to be able to have that, because I think there's some sort of capacity. Like we can't have seating for 50 in there.

Jerome Kerner: Well, I would think that would be a Building Department space allocation, not a Department of Health issue. That seems like an anomaly to me.

Jan Johannessen: It's a Health Department issue because of you know septic...

Jerome Kerner: That's different story. Yeah.

Jan Johannessen: So, we just don't want to leave it open ended on our end, so you know as you go through the process and determine that number through the Health Department. We're going to have to know what that number is because we're going to have to include that in the ....

John Vuolo: Right and we're and we're hoping to be there soon so we know because that's going to mean a lot to me what I can do as well. Going forward.

Janet Andersen: Okay, great, any, any other comments? Um, I don't think I don't think we have anything else that we have to either refer or anything at this point so I think we can just say, we look forward to your submission and we will see you when when the submission is due, oh John did you raise your hand? No.

John Wolff: No, just scratching an itch.

Janet Andersen: Okay. All right. Um, so I think that's it. We'll see you then again in in October, assuming we have the submission on time.

Tim Cronin: Right. Okay. Thank you very much.

John Vuolo: Thank you all. Bye bye.

Various voices: Okay. Thank you. Bye.

**Cal #04-20PB**

(38:55 - 55:56)

**Alpert to Orlinsky Lot line change, Old Church Lane, South Salem, NY 10590, Sheet 46, Block 9825, Lot 46 (Corey Alpert, owner of record) and 92 Old Church Lane, South Salem, NY 10590, Sheet 46, Block 9825, Lot 18 (Ethan & Dana Orlinsky, owners of record) - Application for a lot line change.]**

Janet Andersen: So, the next item on the agenda is Cal #04-20PB. This is the Alpert to Orlinsky Lot Line change on Old Church Lane, South Salem, New York. This is an application for a lot lane change between a owner of record Alpert and owner of record the Orlinskys. So, I'm I'm not sure who is speaking for...

Corey Alpert: Corey Alpert here. I'm here.

Janet Andersen: Hi. So, could you tell us a little bit about why what is what is happening here and why you want the lot line change.

Corey Alpert: Okay, so, um, I used to own 92 Old Church Lane. I also owned 0 Old Church Lane and sold 92 Old Church Lane back last April [20]19 and deeded him a piece of property that was an old driveway, where they they said the drive would come off of all the Old Church Lane, crossover a stream, go through wetlands and then and then the house was going to be built in the 0 Old Church Lane lot off of Lost Nations Road. So, I assume that they

probably would never let you do that off of 0 Old Church Lane. He was, you know, wanting to buy that piece of property that I had there so he would have, you know, no worries about a driveway going through. I said, no problem. They've already built two houses up on the Lost Nations Road, the Ted Child's property and the old Giaccio property. I'm not sure who bought that recently. So, there is a road there so I was going to just get rid of deed him and change the lot line so he would have that strip off of 0 Church Lane. I would keep my 4.1 acres off of Lost Nations Road and eventually get a building permit and sell it or possibly build something and then sell it. So basically, it was just to give him that extra property on the right side of his of 92 Old Church Lane.

Janet Andersen: Okay, so if I understand the process correctly and I'll ask Jan on to talk about it. What what we have to do is make sure that the new the new lot the smaller lot that would be off of Lost Nations Road is zoning compliant.

Corey Alpert: No, the Lost Nations lot is 4.0 acres. I was deeding him 0.8 acres off of Old Church Lane.

Janet Andersen: Right but the result will be a smaller parcel.

Corey Alpert: Yes, it would be right, instead of 4.8 will be 4.01 or something at this point.

Janet Andersen: So we just have to make sure that that is when we create a new lot it has to fit within the guidelines and the determination of what a lot should be in terms of continuous building area and all that so which I'm probably getting into something that Jan was about to say. So why don't I ask Jan to comment on this.

Corey Alpert: Great. Hi Jan.

Jan Johannessen: I happen to have the plans.

Corey Alpert: Yes, you should have a new the new plan, new survey.

Jan Johannessen: Yeah, that's not a lot of line change for that.

Jerome Kerner: I have one here if you want to show it. Is that what you want to do?

Jan Johannessen: Yeah, hang on one second Jerome. I could see if I could share my screen here.

Jerome Kerner: Okay.

Jan Johannessen: Here we go. All right. I don't know if you can see the map.

Jerome Kerner: Yeah, here you go.

Jan Johannessen: I like three screens going through different maps up. Do you see that the subdivision map or the line change map with the charts over here to the left?

Jerome Kerner: Yeah.

Jan Johannessen: So, let me just orient you here this is Old Church Lane on the right-hand side. There's a parcel here that's developed with a single-family house with access off Old Church. And then there's this flag lot that has access off Old Church, I think it's being described as 0 Old Church Lane and it also has frontage on Lost Nations Road. And what's happening is they're proposing to take this rectangle here that's on the east side of the stream and fronts on Old Church and convey that to Parcel A with the house to make that parcel larger. That would protect this resident here from any future access going through this strip. The parcel in the back, the

remainder there will have access off Lost Nations Road, which I believe, is a private road and any future development or driveway would have to come off Lost Nations.

Corey Alpert: It's a private road but that that parcel also has the 4.8-acre parcel does have an easement for that road, it used to be the old Stamford watershed property. So, there is an easement in the title and deed of 0 Old Church Lane off of Lost Nations.

Jan Johannessen: Right, so this parcel here is getting smaller by deducting this piece and I guess our main couple of comments, if the applicant doesn't have the comment memo please reach out to Ciorsdan and pass it on to the surveyor. But obviously, the line change is taking away frontage on the public road on Old Church. It does sound like they have access rights to Lost Nations, but I'd ask Jud to take a look at that to confirm. The other items are, you know, since this lot's getting smaller and while it does meet the minimum gross lot area requirements for the underlying zone, the Town has buildable area requirements. So in addition to meeting the gross lot area requirement, you have to have a certain amount of land according to the zoning code that's quote unquote buildable and that's land that is not wetlands and is land that is less than 15% slope. So, the applicant's conducted a wetland delineation, the wetlands are delineated here. And then these areas that are shaded with this cross hatch are the slopes. The contiguous buildable area has to be contiguous it's it's and within an area you have to be able to build your house, the septic system. So, you know, this does look the remaining land still looks, you know, relatively steep or maybe that the area that's hatched is is this land that's not as steeply sloped that I'm not quite sure, but the bottom line is, they have to demonstrate that this lot will remain zoning compliant. The remainder lot will remain zoning compliant due to the fact that the buildable area of may be being reduced that they can get access off Lost Nations Road. Well, you know, access off Old Church would require a crossing of the stream. It's relatively flat. This is more steeply sloping they kind of have to...

Corey Alpert: The Town would never let me pick a driveway from 0 Old Church Lane crossing over a stream and going through wetlands and finding I mean, look, when I bought the property there was a there was a Board of Health and a buildable lot. I mean, I've been paying taxes on a buildable lot and what I'm saying is that, you know, according to the survey, he mapped it out, he could see the 50 feet setbacks and everything else there is a pretty flat area in that back there. Yes, there are slopes and rocks, but there are there is that one area. Now you just, you know, I'll meet somebody out there that's no problem, you know, just to go over it. But I mean, they would never have let me build a house through a stream and wetlands and put a driveway through there.

Janet Andersen: So, I think what Jan you're saying that we, the Building Inspector is the person that really makes that determination. So, I think what we need to do is refer this to the Building Inspector. And ask...

Jan Johannessen: There almost needs to be some additional information provided before the Building Inspector would be able to determine whether the remaining lot of zoning compliant. They have not yet.

Corey Alpert: Okay.

Jan Johannessen: They have not yet calculated the remaining buildable area for for that lot [static] of delineating the wetlands, delineating the slopes, but if there is...

Corey Alpert: Here's the thing though is that I've already deeded him that property when we went to closing. Now, I'm not looking to build a piece of property right and you know tomorrow. You know, so it's still going to be four-acre zoning whether I keep it as a vacant lot or not. I just need him to to have a lot line change so that the tax map is different. I'm paying a little bit less taxes and he owns you know, and he's got his his, what his real property, you know, with the Town. Right now, without looking to like turn around tomorrow and build on it you know you know.

Jerome Kerner: That's not the point, the point the point is that at some point when there is a decision to build there that there it is a building a lot. And we're not creating some situation now where there is not sufficient contiguous area. So there needs to be, I think, from my point of view of a layout, whether it's a two-bedroom, three-bedroom four-bedroom house that can be shown on that plan and what about Jan, what about deep hole test to determine sufficient septic capacity. Is that something we look for now in this exercise or can that wait until later?

Jan Johannessen: That's going to really depend on the Health Department. This plat would need to be signed by the Health Department as part of, like, the process and they may very well want to see this you know the septic area proved proved out. I'm not I'm not sure. I think you're you're right on just trying to understand how this lot would be developed in the future. It's not going to be obviously, the final development plan. But, you know, make sure that you can get a driveway off Lost Nations Road. Where would the house go? Where would the septic go? And understand how the lot would be developed and we certainly can't, the Board can't make a determination on a lot line change if that lot line change is going to result in nonconformity or exacerbating an existing nonconformity. A lot needs 40,000 square feet of buildable area and it has it now, but they're lopping off a section of the property and it's going to result in a parcel that has 35,000 square feet of buildable area. Well, that's, that's, resulting in a nonconformity, I don't know if that's the case, but that's what needs to be proved out here.

Jerome Kerner: Right. The applicant that was speaking that's Mr. Alpert.

Corey Alpert: Yes, sir.

Jerome Kerner: So, you mentioned before that this was subdivided and determined to be a buildable lot. You know what, ...

Corey Alpert: No, it was never subdivided. I own I own all of 0 Old Church Lane. It was never subdivided but when I bought it it was a buildable lot in and, you know, they had there was an old plan with a house on it. But the house was on it in an area where now they're calling it wetlands, but I don't know maybe in 1988 it wasn't wetlands. I don't know. I mean, that's the whole problem also yeah, they had the driveway. I'm sorry what?

Jerome Kerner: It's clear to me that we're starting from ground zero here, you know, there's, there's been no justification if you will or proof that this new lot, as depicted is going to meet the criteria that has to be done.

Corey Alpert: Okay.

Jud Siebert: Which is Janet might my suggestion that this will have to be reviewed by the Building Department eventually maybe, maybe a productive exercise would be we make the referral, but we recognize and we encourage the applicant to engage immediately in, you know, in a dialogue with Jan and with the Building Inspector, you know, to, to move that piece along.

Corey Alpert: Okay, that's that sounds fine to me. I mean, I'll talk to Jan tomorrow if that's all right with you, Jan and then you can tell me where to get in contact with and know I'll can meet people out there. We can survey the land.

Jan Johannessen: We could have a Zoom meeting and go through it.

Corey Alpert: Okay, great.

Janet Andersen: I think I think in the your memo Jan you also said this would have to be referred to the County Planning Board, is it too early to do that?

Jan Johannessen: I think you could send it off. That's because of the proximity to the municipal boundary line with Pound Ridge. The property being within 500 feet of a municipal property line requires referral to the Planning Board so that I think that could be taken that could take place now.

Janet Andersen: Okay.

Jan Johannessen: The notification only referral. So, it's Ciorsdan knows what that means, but it, it's gonna be something that could take place now.

Janet Andersen: Great, and do we need to just get the consensus of the Board or what what for that?

Jud Siebert: Yes, yeah. Yes, that's not a motion, that's simply if the Board is in agreement if there's consensus, we can just have Ciorsdan do that.

Janet Andersen: Okay, so Um,

Jerome Kerner: Why don't you stop sharing Jan.

Jan Johannessen: What's that?

Jerome Kerner: Stop sharing.

Janet Andersen: Stop sharing so we can see the faces of people, so I can get whether or not we've got consensus. So, um, I guess, Greg. Are you okay?

Greg La Sorsa: Yes.

Janet Andersen: ...and Rich and he's nodding yes and Jerome. Yes. Thumbs up. All right, and I too. So we're going to refer it to the the County Planning Board and do we need to do anything formal to get it to the Building Inspector again or just our recommendation fine, you're muted Jud.

Corey Alpert: Jan, can I call you tomorrow?

Jan Johannessen: Absolutely.

Corey Alpert: Okay, great.

Jud Siebert: Yeah, Jan. The answer's the same, same process.

Janet Andersen: So, everyone. Let's see. I guess by thumbs up if you're okay, sending it to the or nods that you're okay, sending it to the referring this to the Building Inspector. Okay 2, 3, 4 okay 4 thumbs up so off it goes. So, I think I think we've moved a little bit more forward here and and the resubmission date I think you've already heard for to be on the October meeting would be September 29<sup>th</sup>. Great, thank you. So, the next item.

Corey Alpert: Thank you.

[The Board reached consensus to refer the Alpert to Orlinsky Lot line change application to the Building Inspector and the Westchester County Planning Board.]

### III. WETLAND PERMIT REVIEW

**Cal #46-20WP**

(55:57 - 08:17)

**MacEachron Residence, 38 Gilbert Street, South Salem, NY 10590, Sheet 36D, Block 10806, Lots 11 & 12 (Daniel and Devon MacEachron, owners of record) – Application for the reconstruction of a sunroom and deck.]**

Janet Andersen: The next item. The next item on the agenda is the wetland permit review, Cal #46-20WP. I apologize in advance if I don't get this right, the MacEachron Residence, 38 Gilbert Street, South Salem an application for reconstruction of a sunroom and deck. And Michael, I think, are you or...

Michael Sirignano: Yes, I am. Good evening. Good evening. Dan and Devon are on with us. First time I've seen Dan without a mask, he's a good-looking guy. They purchased this property at 38 Gilbert Street back in May of this year. The house, as you may know, was built in probably 1925. A sunroom was added, probably in the 1970s, some 40-50 years ago. It was a moderate or poor quality when it was built, and certainly not energy efficient and Dan and Devon want to take that down and replace it with another sunroom of exactly the same dimensions. The real problem with it is that the foundation, two thirds of the foundation sits on a slab-on-grade and then the remaining one third of the foundation, the one closest to the lake sits is supported only by lolly columns. So, they want to put in a real modern foundation around the entire base of the of the replacement sunroom; it's a single-story sunroom now, and it'll be a single-story sunroom when we're done.

The other project that triggers a wetland permit is the deck that's off the sunroom it again it's reached its, its probably its maximum age and usefulness and they want to take it down and build a new deck almost exactly the same depth or width extending to the lake it currently is 11'8" and their, their architect has designed a replacement deck of 12'6". So, it's just under a foot longer or wider depending on how you define it. Dan tells me he can split screen and give you a quick view of the drawings of the existing conditions and the proposed conditions. So, I'll turn it over to him.

Dan MacEachron: Thank you, Michael. Can you hear me?

Various voices: Yes.

Dan MacEachron: Okay, well thanks everyone for giving us this time. Just quickly, here's a few photos of the of the house and the area that we are talking about that Michael just described this is the existing what we call the sunroom. The deck is out here east of the sunroom the house faces toward the east. So, in this really is very poor-quality construction, plus the finished ceiling height inside is only seven and a half feet tall, which is I'm told doesn't actually comply with building code. So our plan is as Michael said is to demolish this part and we want to change and actually increase the slope of the roof and the effect that will have on the wetlands is an area of land disturbance of approximately 800' to demolish that slab and put in a proper foundation. The the footprint of the sunroom itself is only about 400'. So when it's finished, it will it will just be covering 400' and then these are here is to support the, the new deck that we'd like to build and just to give you a bit of a sense, having seen the photos. By making the roof less steep, it will actually give the house, a bit more of a face in this direction. We're planning a metal roof for this portion that is over the living room with three skylights here and one in the kitchen area and then the roof over the sunroom is essentially a flat roof, and we would like to do a green roof with either moss or sedum, which actually would have soil on it so are our consultant on that advises that in a 1" rainstorm, the roof itself would capture about 125 gallons of water, so it's it's a partial mitigation for the disturbance, but we're happy to do a good deal more in the way of mitigation to extent that Jan thinks that is appropriate. That's it in a nutshell, if anyone has any questions.

Janet Andersen: Great, thank you. I just, I wanted to make, make sure I understood correctly, when I think Michael talked about putting a proper foundation underneath it is not going to be a full basement. This is just going to be a more, you know, not on slab of a sort of a crawl space area.

Dan MacEachron: That will will definitely get crawl space area will have, it will have footings, which you need structurally, and then we'll have a concrete wall. We plan to face the exposed walls on the north and south with stone, which is consistent with the style of the rest of the house but the space under the sunroom itself will have a crawl space it's only about 36" tall. So, it's not usable basement it is just there so you can get to the plumbing, electrical to repair them if you need to.

Janet Andersen: Great. Okay. Thanks for that clarification. And I think we have a comment letter from Jan on this. That's correct, Jan?

Jan Johannessen: I didn't really have any real substantive comments. As indicated the footprint of the sunroom is remaining the same. The roof area is remaining the same. There's a slight increase in in the deck but that's impervious and really not significant, some comments about, you know, providing the zoning table on the plan and having the plan signed and sealed and additional information about the neighboring properties and where structures are but really nothing really see any issue with what's being proposed at the end of the day, it's going to be very similar to what they are now just built better. There's indication of where the roof downspouts are located on on the building. I question where they actually discharge are they foundation side flash blocks or are they piped in any manner across the property. Other than that, I really don't have any significant comments on it. I didn't know about the green roof. That sounds great.

Janet Andersen: Yeah, I didn't. I wasn't clear on that either and I think that is good. Typically, I'd like to see around lakes some shore side or shoreline plantings, if possible, or or anything to keep the lawn from running right into the lake so perhaps some kind of mitigation. I am not sure what your front lawn or front lawn, the lakeside area looks like now but, you know, perhaps a little mitigation, there would be good. I'd like to also ask the Board, if you would maybe stop screen sharing so we can see each other a little bit better.

Dan MacEachron: Oh, sorry.

Janet Andersen: No problem. That we have often asked for sort of regular septic inspections, if we've done something lakeside but this isn't even, this isn't adding bedrooms, or reconfiguring anything. I would like to see whether you feel that is something that we should request in this case. No? So, Greg says no. Jerome, yes?

Jerome Kerner: Well yeah, I say no too and I'm wondering if this outta be referred for administrative approval, since it is a replacement and as Jan said, there's nothing substantial of substance in a way of environmental issues, except for a temporary protection during construction. I am thinking that this certainly could go in administrative.

Janet Andersen: So, ...

Michael Sirignano: That would be our preference, certainly, we'd like to get construction started before winter.

Janet Andersen: So, Jerome. Did you put that in form of a motion?

Jerome Kerner: I would make a motion that we move to turn this into an administrative review process. Given the the replacement aspect and insignificant environmental issues.

Janet Andersen: And would you want to add that with with mitigation as deemed appropriate by our consultant.

Jerome Kerner: By our consultant, yes.



Janet Andersen: So, okay. Thank you. Do we have a second?

Richard Sklarin: I'll second.

Janet Andersen: Okay Rich. Any further discussion? Seeing none, and I should ask the CAC, do you have any comments? No? Yes?

John Wolff: Um, no. I mean, I just don't know if there's any runoff and storm water issues that have to be looked at in addition to the regular mitigation. You know, usually with lakeside stuff we always at least take a look at that. Given the you know how old it is and everything and so I raised that is something that should be looked at by Jan as well.

Janet Andersen: Okay, um, I think is already part of the I mean he's talked about it with the the leads. I guess I would ask when you when the new owners bought this, not realizing it was just purchased earlier this year. Did you have the septic system inspected and was it, you know, were there any comments about needing to upgrade it?

Dan MacEachron: I'm glad you asked. I had a delightful conversation with the man who put in the new leaching field in 2015, including photographs and his map of exactly where that was and then I was here and witness when they it appears they put in a new tank septic tank at that time as well and I was here when Folger [Vogler] Brothers came and cleaned it out and they said it's in it's in great shape and we plan to have it cleaned once a year.

Janet Andersen: Okay, so I think that also helps me agree with the recommendations of Greg and Jerome, so any, any other questions? Or comments? Since this is a motion, I'm going to poll the board.

Janet Andersen: Greg?

Gregory La Sorsa: Aye.

Janet Andersen: Rich?

Richard Sklarin: Aye.

Janet Andersen: Jerome?

Jerome Kerner: Aye.

Janet Andersen: And I also say yes, as well, or aye as well so that's the motion is approved to make this administrative. Thank you very much and welcome to town.

Dan and Devon MacEachron: We're thrilled to be here. Thanks so much.

Michael Sirignano: Thank you.

[On a motion made by Mr. Kerner, seconded by Mr. Sklarin, the Board determined that the review of the MacEachron Residence, 38 Gilbert Street, South Salem for the reconstruction of a sunroom and deck will be handled administratively a permit issued by Wetlands Inspector. In favor: Ms. Andersen, Mr. Kerner, Mr. La Sorsa and Mr. Sklarin. Absent: Ms. Maguire.]

**IV. MINUTES OF July 21, 2020 and August 18, 2020.**

(1:08:18 – 1:11:37)

Janet Andersen: Okay, and the next item on the agenda are the minutes of July 21[, 2020] and August 18[, 2020]. So, ...

Gregory La Sorsa: I read them both and they were ably and properly given to us. I would without any further ado, we'll make a motion to approve both of both, do you need a separate motion for each or are we doing them together?

Janet Andersen: I think we can do them together since the four of us were on both of them.

Jerome Kerner: I have one one correction. I don't think I came in late. You have any every 7:31 p.m., I was there on time.

Janet Andersen: Oh, ...

Jerome Kerner: Correct it please.

Richard Sklarin: Do you want to amend to correct the record to reflect Jerome's promptness to the meeting.

Jerome Kerner: 7:30 promptness, yes, thank you. I second Greg's motion with that correction.

Gregory La Sorsa: You should get a one-minute grace period.

Janet Andersen: We recognize it's always five o'clock somewhere right, so...

Jerome Kerner: Oh, wait a minute. Wait a minute. That's reference to another subject.

Janet Andersen: Yeah, no, so I'm okay. I'm sorry. We do. We have a motion and it's been seconded to for the minutes, as amended. Any further discussion?

Richard Sklarin: Thank you for being on time Jerome at that meeting.

Jerome Kerner: You're welcome.

Janet Andersen: So, Greg?

Gregory La Sorsa: Yes. Aye.

Janet Andersen: Rich?

Richard Sklarin: Yes.

Janet Andersen: Jerome?

Jerome Kerner: Yes.

Janet Andersen: And I also approve the the also vote in favor, so that's four of us who have approved the minutes of July 21[, 2020] and August 18[, 2020]; our next meeting is October 20[, 2020].

[On a motion made by Mr. La Sorsa, seconded by Mr. Kerner, the Board approved the amended meeting minutes from July 21, 2020 and August 18, 2020.]

In favor: Ms. Andersen, Mr. Kerner, Mr. La Sorsa and Mr. Sklarin. Absent: Ms. Maguire.]

## **V. ADJOURNMENT**

(1:10:11 – 1:11:37)

Janet Andersen: And I don't have anything else. So, I guess I would look for. Yes, Jerome?

Jerome Kerner: Well, I just came back from California, where I visited with my eighth grandchild Ida Belen.

Gregory La Sorsa: Congratulations.

Janet Andersen: Congratulations.

Jerome Kerner: My daughter's first.

Gregory La Sorsa: I'm very happy to hear that. I'm going to be joining you with number two, maybe tonight.

Jerome Kerner: Well, good luck with that.

Gregory La Sorsa: But you can't really do anything. You can't go to the hospital. So, I may as well come to this meeting, right?

Janet Andersen: Right and you know, we kept it short, just for you.

Gregory La Sorsa: Yeah, thanks. Possibly tonight but you know might be tomorrow.

Janet Andersen: Yeah.

Jerome Kerner: Yeah, yeah. Congratulations.

Gregory La Sorsa: Thank you, and to you.

Jerome Kerner: Okay, I move we adjourn the meeting.

Gregory La Sorsa: Second.

Jerome Kerner: 8:41 p.m.

Janet Andersen: Okay. And so again on go through, Greg?

Gregory La Sorsa: Yes.

Janet Andersen: Rich?

Richard Sklarin: Aye and best of luck to the grandpas.

Janet Andersen: Jerome?

Jerome Kerner: Aye.

Janet Andersen: And I also say yes to adjourning the meeting and wish everybody, you know, great, great futures, fortunes and safety in this time. Thank you all.

[On a motion made by Mr. Kerner, seconded by Mr. La Sorsa, the meeting was adjourned at 8:41 p.m.]

In favor: Ms. Andersen, Mr. Kerner, Mr. La Sorsa and Mr. Sklarin. Absent: Ms. Maguire.]

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Ciorsdan Conran". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Ciorsdan Conran  
Planning Board Administrator