

TOWN OF PLATTEKILL  
PLANNING BOARD  
P.O. BOX 45  
MODENA, N.Y. 12548

July 28, 2015

THE MEETING OPENED WITH A SALUTE TO THE FLAG BY CHAIRPERSON, CINDY HILBERT AT 7:30 P.M.

ROLL CALL: Chairperson, Cindy Hilbert, Richard Gorres (arrived at 7:40 P.M.) Thomas Wilkin, Nathaniel Baum, Darryl Matthews Judith Mayle (arrived at 7:35 p.m.)

PLANNING BOARD ENGINEER: David Clouser

Absent: Kathie Beinkafner

***MINUTES***

June 9, 2015

**MOTION**: Mr. Matthews made a motion to approve the minutes as written with Mr. Baum seconding the motion. All ayes on the vote.

***OLD BUSINESS***

**The Greater Hudson Valley Family Health Center Inc. (24 Old Firehouse Rd.)  
SBL#107.8-8-6**

Ms. Mayle recused herself from the discussion on the project.

Mr. Anthony Mariani, Director of New Projects & Initiatives was present to represent the Greater Hudson Valley Family Health Center. Mr. Jason Lichwick of Minuta Architecture was also present. Mr. Lichwick presented the following plans to the Planning Board members:

- Site plan on the trees that would be removed and which one's would remain
- Update to one entry coming in, with Doctor parking, patient parking and employee parking and separating them with a directional sign
- A dedicated spot will be provided for a Loading zone
- Building size would remain the same
- Parking and site details were shown
- Sign and handicapped details were shown
- Dumpster pick-up would be every two or three weeks

*Mr. Wilkin asked if medical waste would be put in the dumpster. Mr. Mariani stated no medical waste would be placed in the dumpsters.*

- Landscaping plan; deciduous trees and evergreens to be planted. Perennials to be planted around the building

*Mr. Wilkin noted that there was a hedge row on top of the retaining wall. Mr. Lichwick stated they would be between two and four feet tall.*

- Lighting detail to be provided. Three LED post lights at a height of 16' to light the parking lots.

*Mr. Clouser stated the lighting was too bright and the foot candles should be between 1 ½ to 2 in the parking lot.*

Mr. Wilkin stated that the Ulster County Planning Board sometimes hosts a gateway meeting to get the involved agencies together along with the County staff. Mr. Wilkin stated one of the issues that could be discussed was how they would be handling the sidewalk issue, and the pedestrian walkway with UCAT. Mr. Mariani asked if this project would have to go to the Ulster County Planning Board for comments. Mr. Wilkin stated yes, this would be referred to the County about the same time as the public hearing. Ms. Hilbert asked Mr. Clouser if he had any comments. Mr. Clouser stated that he looked at the plans that he received last week and he expected to see a Drainage Analysis and limits of disturbance, an environmental review on the project and a Habitat Assessment Report. Mr. Clouser stated he is curious about the parking operation and why twenty nine spaces would be needed when twelve are required. Mr. Mariani stated at a medical facility you typically have a three to one ratio; one provider would have three patients. Mr. Clouser stated that the Board would need to see floor plans and written justification as to why that many additional parking spaces are needed. There was discussion regarding making the necessary corrections to the Short Form EAF, and that the only SEQRA form in the file was dated May 1, 2015. Mr. Wilkin stated that the address should be corrected, it should be Walkkill New York instead of Plattekill New York. Mr. Lichwick stated he would find out the correct address. Mr. Lichwick added that he would supply an updated SEQRA form. Mr. Wilkin asked Mr. Lichwick if they were planning on putting in any signage. Mr. Lichwick responded that the code was very confusing and he wanted to confirm that forty square feet would be permitted. Mr. Mariani stated they would have a directional sign that would direct employees, patients and a decal on the glass of the building, and a sign where Old Firehouse Road meets State Route 32. Mr. Wilkin stated that one thirty two square foot identification sign is allowed for every two-hundred fifty feet of road frontage. Mr. Mariani inquired about the planning process timeline. Mr. Mariani asked if next months' meeting would be a public hearing. Mr. Gorres stated that the drainage analysis has to be supplied to

Mr. Clouser for his review and comment. Ms. Hilbert stated if Mr. Mariani would like a gateway meeting to be scheduled, he should contact the Planning Board Clerk.

The applicant will provide the following;

1. Habitat Assessment Report
2. Drainage Analysis Report
3. Corrected Short form EAF
4. Lighting catalogue
5. Floor plan
6. Written justification as to why 29 parking spaces are necessary

*The applicant will make the necessary submissions*

### **NEW BUSINESS**

#### **Tony's Orchard LLC-farm activities in the AG1.5 (Route 32) SBL#94.3-1-11**

Charles Hurd was present to represent Tony's Orchard LLC a/k/a Hurd's Family Farm. Mr. Clouser stated that he wanted to let the Board know that the owners of the Hurd Family Farm are friends of his. Ms. Mayle stated they seem to be missing some information. Ms. Mayle asked if a site plan was submitted. The clerk indicated that what was presented was all there was. Mr. Hurd informed the Board that the site plan was hastily submitted in reaction to a letter that was sent to him by the Town. Mr. Hurd stated that the Town required that he submit a map, application and fee to the Planning Board for immediate review and without continuing the application before the Plattekill Planning Board he would be in violation of the code, further action would be taken, and he would not be able to open in July. Mr. Hurd stated it was sent out July 18<sup>th</sup>. and he didn't receive it until after the 23<sup>rd</sup>. and that gave him seven days to put the application together during a very busy time. Ms. Mayle asked what the violation was for. Mr. Hurd stated the violation was that it was a current site plan in regards to outdoor recreation and amusement within Agricultural zoning district which follows under 110-61 Special Use. Ms. Mayle asked if the Planning Board received notice of the violation. There was discussion that the Planning Board did not have a copy of any violation. Mr. Hurd stated they did have a meeting on March 10, 2015. Ms. Hilbert asked if that was with the Building Department. Mr. Hurd stated that was with the Town Supervisor and the Building Inspector. Mr. Hurd stated the letter stated that *this Department would like to set up a meeting with you on March 10, 2015 at 11:00 a.m. to discuss the operations of your farm, at the meeting will be myself, Joseph LoCicero, and Supervisor Joe Croce. Please contact our office and confirm that you will be able to come to this meeting. Thank you for your time in this matter.* Ms. Mayle asked if there was any reason given as to why they were having this meeting? Mr. Hurd indicated that they were having some complaints that were directed at them, they were re-occurring and Joe thought it would be a good idea to come in and have a discussion to try to figure out what the issues were, and then going forward they expanded the conversation to start discussing

the future of the farm and what direction they were going in. Mr. Hurd stated at that time they both thought that it made sense to have a conversation with what will be happening on the farm in the future, the direction, and keep that conversation going. Ms. Mayle asked Mr. Hurd how it came about that he received violations. Mr. Hurd stated that there was a determination made by the Building Inspector, he was the one that sent him the letter. Mr. Hurd stated he was sure the Building Inspector had reasons as to why he sent the letter. Mr. Hurd stated he had a slightly different point of view to the activities that took place, and in his opinion these activities did not violate the code of the Town. Mr. Hurd stated that this section of agri-tourism is in a gray area, but it is also what he has done and what the family has done at this site, and so have other operations in many other towns in this State. Mr. Hurd stated there were other, even very close by with very similar, if not grander, operations. Mr. Hurd stated, looking at that, and also being part of committees that review agriculture in the State and within the industry, it seemed to be a pretty common practice to install the inflatable jumpy pillow and car track which stands at slightly over 20 feet. Mr. Hurd stated those sites that he was referring to, the jumpy pillow and the construction of sand mountain, and there should be some pictures in your packet, those sites, they felt, in starting the construction, that they certainly were not the first farm in New York State or the Country and most farms have gone through without a site plan to install these attractions. Looking at the code for New York State Agri-tourism, and what's written into that, at the State level it didn't seem that with disturbing less than an acre, for the construction of these two projects that was something that needed a site plan. Ms. Mayle asked Mr. Hurd if that was the only operation that is being cited as being in violation, the pillow and Sand Mountain? Mr. Hurd stated from his understanding, it was difficult for the time allotted because he didn't know in what direction...Ms. Mayle stated she didn't want him to go through this only to find out that he is being cited for other violations over there. Ms. Mayle stated that Hurd's Farm has been out there for fifteen years at least. Mr. Gores asked Mr. Hurd how long he had been using the bouncy house and sand mountain. Mr. Hurd stated this was the second season. Ms. Mayle asked what a bouncy pillow was. Planning Board member Darryl Matthews explained what the pillow looked like and stated K.O.A. and Yogi Bear Campsite have them. Ms. Mayle stated she does not remember K.O.A. coming in for a site plan. Mr. Hurd stated there are probably a thousand of them on farms across the Country. Ms. Hilbert asked Mr. Hurd what the dimensions of the jumpy pillow were. Mr. Hurd indicated 30 by 40 feet and to the top rail of the sand mountain is about 20 feet. Ms. Mayle asked what the sand mountain was. Mr. Hurd explained what sand mountain was to the Board members, showing the Board pictures of the site. Ms. Mayle asked how close the nearest neighbor was. Mr. Hurd stated 178 feet. Ms. Mayle asked If that was to the property line. Mr. Hurd indicated yes, it was to the property line. Ms. Mayle asked if the Board was looking at a site plan for a jumpy pillow and a sand mountain for an existing operation. Mr. Wilkin stated where the Town got this from was at the training with the Association of Towns, and the lawyer from the Association of Towns said that this would not be considered part of an AG operation, but recreational,

and he thinks that is where the Town went with this. Ms. Mayle asked when this training took place. It was indicated the training was June 11, of this year. Ms. Mayle stated that Mr. Hurd has been talking to the Town since March, so that doesn't sound like that had any impact. Mr. Gorres stated that the Town doesn't have anything specific in its code to cover what Mr. Hurd is doing. Mr. Gorres stated that AG & Markets will consider this germane to agri-tourism and sustaining of the farm. Mr. Gorres added that the money from doing the agri-tourism will keep the farm going. Mr. Gorres stated that the Town doesn't have a code in place to cover what AG & Markets says. Ms. Mayle stated that he has a farm and they have a farm stand and they are selling produce that they grow on the property, so as part of the farm stand they have some additional items that attract people to the farm stand. Mr. Matthews stated that the problem was depending on who you talk to from AG & Markets or from the Association of Towns you are going to get ten different answers. Ms. Mayle asked why they are selecting those two items, they have a maze out there, why aren't they violating them for the maze? Mr. Wilkin asked Mr. Hurd what the primary purpose of the air pillow and sand mountain was. Mr. Hurd stated that they are a seasonal operation, and it is to bring people into the farm. Mr. Wilkin stated that the prime purpose is not for the jumpy pillow itself or the mountain itself? Mr. Wilkin read a section of an article titled "Guidelines for Review of Local Laws Affecting Direct Farm Marketing Activities... the primary purpose of the activity must be to sell products and services and not recreation, and these are deemed not a stand alone for recreation, but a secondary. Mr. Wilkin added, when you look at the SEQRA form, if you go by that ruling than it becomes part of the farm operation and he would say that it would be a Type II Action under SEQRA and not an Unlisted Action. Mr. Wilkin added that he did not feel that this qualified for SEQRA. There was discussion regarding Type I and Type II Action under SEQRA. Mr. Matthews stated that because there is nothing in the code book, the problem that the towns are having is that the farms are doing certain things and there is nothing in the codebook to figure out how to handle it, whether they need a permit or not. Mr. Gorres stated that the basic rule of thumb that they said (Association of Towns) was, does the activity help promote the farm and does it make money for the farm. Mr. Gorres stated in both cases, he would say it does, maybe the location is not the best because they are getting complaints from the neighbors about the noise. Ms. Mayle stated if the Building Department is classifying this as outdoor recreation and amusement, then bring in the roller coaster, because that is what they are saying this can be classified as. Ms. Mayle stated instead of them saying this would be an accessory to an agricultural use, they have opened the door wider to allow for that kind of stuff. Mr. Matthew stated it is either that or try to find a way to curb it. Mr. Gorres stated it is an accessory to a structural use. Audience member Ms. Fitzpatrick stated they are charging an admission fee and charging \$200.00 a season pass and having children's birthday parties at the cost of \$200.00 for two hours. Mr. Matthews stated it is hard, because without the code what do you do. Ms. Mayle stated if the Board reviews this as an outdoor recreation and amusement the sky is the limit. Mr. Gorres stated that the Planning Board could ask the Building Department why they came up with that use. Mr. Matthew stated that they are in a gray area, and unfortunately with AG there is a lot

of gray area. Ms. Hilbert stated that she was always under the impression with AG & Markets that if the agricultural economic unit was the primary use of the property, everything else was secondary. Ms. Mayle stated it could be put under Accessory Use and Structure (110-15F). Audience member Ms. Fitzpatrick indicated that with 120 acres, it could have been put somewhere else and if there had been a site plan submitted beforehand, it would not be in her back yard, and she would not have the amount of noise coming from children on that bouncy pillow within 100 feet of her home. Ms. Fitzpatrick added that she would not have an almost three story view of that mountain instead of her view of the Gunks from her 5 x 7 bathroom window. Ms. Fitzpatrick indicated that there were people on top of Gem Mountain that could look into her bathroom window. Ms. Mayle stated just because this didn't go through a site plan does not mean it wouldn't be in that area. Ms. Fitzpatrick stated they would have had an opportunity with 120 other acres that it wouldn't be on the back acre behind her yard. Ms. Mayle stated Ms. Fitzpatrick certainly would have been able to make comments, maybe put up some buffers or trees, all that could have been addressed, but they are looking at this as an outdoor recreation and amusement which is much broader. Ms. Fitzpatrick stated she couldn't tell why the Building Inspector made that determination, all she can do is let them know the complaints that she made. Ms. Fitzpatrick added because of the activity fees for \$200.00 for two hours of wood burning opportunities, the fact that people could buy a season pass for \$200.00., that really, especially since the season started July 1<sup>st</sup>., what are you selling on an apple farm starting July 1<sup>st</sup>. Mr. Hurd indicated that he had a completely different point of view as the view from the window and the noise for the code violations that are already on the books, the noise ordinance are already existing. Mr. Hurd added if there is a problem let's handle it that way. Ms. Fitzpatrick stated that they tried. Ms. Mayle stated this is not the forum for this. Mr. Hurd stated that he would like to have the accusations listed and he would certainly give his opinion of them, but as far as this is concerned, this is a farm that produces enough fruit to feed 120,000 people for a year. Mr. Hurd added that the Town of Plattekill camp came in and they picked tons of vegetables. Mr. Hurd stated that there are tons of vegetables over there, people are taking bags home, they have thousands of dollars worth of applesauce which they created last year, there are jams and jellies. Mr. Hurd stated the money is coming from agricultural products, if you look at the end of the year, admissions versus the sale of fruit and vegetables, it is not even close. Mr. Hurd stated what it is, is getting people to come to the farm to buy their products, and that is where the money comes from. Mr. Hurd added that it is not like they are a five acre farm and they have amusements on it, and a couple of goats, they bring people in, and they buy other products. Mr. Hurd stated that they are producing on that land and there are trees that are completely surrounding the neighboring property and he is sure that there are lots of different uses for that site and over the fifteen years they have kept it as a buffer. Mr. Hurd stated they also asked what they could do, what type of fencing, can they plant trees, there is no way from keeping their guests from going into the neighbor's lawn if they don't put up some type of buffer. Mr. Hurd stated they walked through the

neighbor's house, they toured, they looked from the outside, they felt that they did due diligence concerning the neighbor. Mr. Hurd stated they are amenable to continue to talk to the Town and work with them about future activities and discussing whether they fall into needing some type of review. Mr. Hurd stated these operations, the bouncy pillow and sand mountain seem to fall well within what is industry standard in this agri-tourism operation. Mr. Hurd stated there are other towns across the mountain and there are local examples (of the jumpy pillow) that led them to believe they did not need to get site plan approval. Mr. Wilkin asked Mr. Hurd when he started marketing his vegetables? Mr. Hurd stated they actually grow less vegetables now, they have raspberries that come in early July, they have sweet and hot peppers that come in a little bit later, early eggplants, kale and cabbage. Mr. Hurd stated the apples that are by the neighbor's house, they will pick them sometime next week. Mr. Wilkin stated where the apples would be marketed in the Fall, the vegetables would be marketed in the summer. Mr. Hurd stated that the apple sauce is year round. Mr. Hurd stated that if they wanted to stay open all year round, as a farm operation, they have enough product that they produce themselves that they could, there are cultural and marketing reasons why they don't want to be open those months out of the year. Mr. Hurd stated that they do have product that goes throughout the entire year. Mr. Hurd stated they do Christmas trees so they are open on weekends starting black Friday until the weekend before Christmas. Mr. Hurd stated when people arrive they are open from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. and they close down activities at 4:30 p.m. Mr. Hurd stated they did some night's in October and decided that they may only do one or two nights this year. Mr. Hurd stated with the exception of those days, they are normally out of there by 7:00 p.m. and that is counting down the registers, the guests have long gone. Ms. Fitzpatrick stated it was a pick your own up until two years ago that was the end of August until the end of October, early November, since they have moved to this activity it has been every weekend. Ms. Mayle stated that Hurd's Farm has been more than a pick your own from the onset, they opened with a maze out there at that time, as an attraction to bring people in, and started the pick your own and the farm market and they have expanded in that direction. Ms. Fitzpatrick stated it was fifteen years ago that they bought the house and it was a pick your own until the last two years and then they started earlier and earlier. Ms. Mayle stated that was not the case because she was there on the opening day. Ms. Fitzpatrick stated that she lives there. Ms. Mayle stated the problem here is that they have a determination for outdoor recreation and amusement, so that is what they are looking at. Mr. Shiba stated that AG & Markets didn't consider the cow train agri-tainment. Ms. Mayle stated she didn't know how the Board could segregate those two items out from this facility and do a site plan for those two pieces on that property. Mr. Wilkin stated there is no way because how would they figure the parking. Mr. Gorres stated they don't have any guidelines. Ms. Mayle stated they do, they have regulations here on outdoor recreation and amusement. Mr. Wilkin stated that the argument could be made that it is covered under agriculture. Ms. Mayle stated she could make an argument that it is an accessory use to agricultural, but the fact of the matter is that the Building Inspector made a determination that this is outdoor recreation

and amusement. Mr. Wilkin stated that they could go to the Zoning Board of Appeals and ask them for a determination. Ms. Mayle asked Mr. Wilkin if he wanted to challenge the Building Inspector's decision? Mr. Wilkin stated that they did it before. Ms. Hilbert asked the Board what they wanted to do. Mr. Wilkin stated they could ask the Zoning Board of Appeals for a determination. Ms. Mayle stated if they are going to get into that, she would like to go into executive session to discuss potential litigation. Mr. Gorres stated that he is not comfortable going with that determination. There was some discussion regarding doing a modified site plan so that the Board could have some control over what happens. Mr. Wilkin stated he would like a determination from the Zoning Board. Ms. Hilbert stated she felt that the Zoning Board was going to come back and concur with the Building Inspector's Determination because there is nothing in the code that readily describes this, so they are going to put it on the closest thing they can find. Mr. Baum stated the Planning Board needs some outside direction. There was discussion regarding contacting the Planner from Association of Towns, George Frantz. There was discussion regarding having the applicant do an accelerated site plan. Mr. Wilkin suggested that they contact AG & Markets for direction because the Commissioner of AG & Markets can overrule the Zoning Board of Appeals. There was discussion regarding having the Town Board render a decision. Section 110-11 (B) was discussed. Ms. Mayle stated the problem is that you have a determination from the Building Inspector. Mr. Gorres stated he did not agree with the determination, it was too broad. Ms. Hilbert asked Mr. Gorres if he would like to discuss the issue in executive session. Mr. Gorres stated yes, he wanted to discuss it in executive session. The Board made a determination to go into executive session after discussing the next agenda item. Ms. Hilbert stated that they could put Mr. Hurd on the next agenda and the Board would decide whether they wanted to send it to the Town Board or whether it was a question of the determination of the Building Inspector, and the Board would let Mr. Hurd know. Ms. Fitzpatrick stated she would make an offer to the Planning Board members that she had made to the Town Board that if anyone would love to come to her house 2189 State Route 32 and see from their prospective the impact that this has had, the Board was more than welcome to come to their home. Mr. Hurd stated he would recommend that the Board go and see it from the neighbor's point of view. Ms. Mayle stated that if Mr. Hurd had an objection to the Building Department's decision, he should not wait for the Planning Board to file his own appeal. Mr. Hurd asked Ms. Mayle where would that be filed. Ms. Mayle stated it would be under the zoning code. Mr. Hurd asked how long did he have to file. Ms. Mayle stated she believed it was thirty days. Ms. Fitzpatrick stated that her name was Tara Fitzpatrick for the record.

*The Board will further discuss the application.*

**DISCUSSION**

**Kitty Lane Properties LLC-proposed 6 Lot Subdivision (Huckleberry Turnpike)SBL#108.1-5-3.11**

Ms. Brooks was present to discuss the project with the Planning Board members. Ms. Brooks indicated she sent a letter to the Board (June 16, 2015) which gave the history of how they got to this point. Ms. Mayle stated the question was, would a lot that was existing from a prior subdivision that has more than six lots be restricted, and would it fall under that private road restriction. Ms. Brooks stated that lot #1 always had separate access to Huckleberry Turnpike. Ms. Mayle stated the issue is that it was a lot in a subdivision that has more than six lots on it, so does that preclude it from being able to be segregated out and excluded from that previous subdivision and now look at it as a standalone lot, so that you can put your own private road on it. Ms. Brooks stated lot #1 stopped being part of that subdivision in 2004 when it was combined to the adjacent property. Ms. Mayle stated that lot that you are taking and combining with another is still part of that previous subdivision. Ms. Mayle stated that the letter that they were sending Planning Board Attorney Jason Shaw was a general question. Mr. Wilkin stated they could use the June 16<sup>th</sup>. Letter from Ms. Brooks as an example. Mr. Wilkin stated that anyone can expand with a lot line and make the lot much bigger, and at some point, why can't they subdivide. Ms. Mayle stated she didn't think the question was could they subdivide, the question is can they put in a private road. Ms. Brooks added, the extenuating circumstances on this one is that lot #1 of that filed map from 2004 is not a buildable lot anymore because the wetlands expanded. Ms. Brooks stated lot #1 of that original filed subdivision map is not a buildable lot and could not be used for anything. Ms. Brooks stated that she is here tonight to make sure that the Board doesn't have any questions about the history that she wrote (see file for letter dated June 16, 2015) and the Board can then craft a letter to Jason Shaw clearly outlining what the Board wants him to render an opinion on. Ms. Hilbert asked the Board if they had any questions on the narrative. Mr. Gorres stated the letter was pretty clear. Mr. Wilkin stated he would include how this would be handled for SEQRA. Ms. Mayle stated that the issue is, there is a lot that is part of a ten lot subdivision, there is a restriction on private roads to six lots, how do you take the lot out of the fifteen lots and segregate it and now make it into a private road. Ms. Brooks stated since lot #1 was purchased by the current applicant as part of a second subdivision, does it expand the past nine lot subdivision, thereby precluding a private road which is limited to six lots. Ms. Mayle stated it is not just this subdivision, it is a general question, this could easily occur in a number of other cases. Ms. Mayle stated the Board has people who have come in and tried to put in a private road and were told no, what happens when they come in five years later, do they get to do it. Ms. Hilbert stated when they get some sort of directive from the Planning Board Attorney, they would notify Ms. Brooks. Ms. Brooks thanked the Board.

*Ms. Brooks will be notified when the general question is answered by the Planning Board Attorney*

*Executive Session*

**MOTION**: Ms. Mayle made a motion to go into executive session to discuss possible litigation with Mr. Gorres seconding the motion. All ayes on the vote.

Time in: 9:30 p.m. Time out: 10:15 p.m.

**MOTION**: Ms. Hilbert made a motion that the Planning Board file an Appeal with the Zoning Board of Appeals regarding the Building Inspector's Determination dated July 7, 2015 in regard to Tony's Orchard LLC a/k/a/ Hurd's Family Farm regarding family activities. Mr. Gorres seconded the motion. All ayes on the vote.

**MOTION**: Ms. Mayle made a motion that the Planning Board send a letter to AG & Markets along with a Letter of Determination dated July 7, 2015 asking for their determination as to whether the addition of a jumper brand air pillow and a sand mountain for peddle cars is only one component to a farm operation and not the primary use and if it still constitutes an accessory use to the farm. Mr. Gorres seconded the motion. All ayes on the vote.

***VOUCHERS***

***David Clouser & Associates***

<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Motion/2<sup>nd</sup>.</u>
Huckleberry Bluestone	\$478.20	Mr. Gorres/Mr. Baum
Shawangunk Estates	\$ 81.00	Mr. Gorres/Mr. Baum
Messina & Sons	\$351.00	Mr. Gorres/Mr. Baum
S.L.W. Holdings	\$329.80	Mr. Gorres/Mr. Baum

***ADJOURNMENT***

**MOTION**: Mr. Gorres made a motion to adjourn with Ms. Hilbert seconding the motion. All ayes on the vote.

The meeting adjourned at 10:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by

Susan Bolde  
Planning Board Clerk