

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

JANUARY 13, 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, Thomas Wilkin,  
Kathie Beinkafner, Darryl Matthews, Judith Mayle, Nathaniel Baum

***MINUTES***

December 9, 2014

**MOTION:** Mr. Gorres made a motion to approve the minutes with the following corrections; correct a misspelling on page three and delete a duplication of a motion on page four. Mr. Baum seconded the motion. All ayes on the vote.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

**Rainieri 4 Lot Conservation Subdivision (South St.)SBL#101.2-2-5.11**

Mr. Lawrance Marshall was present, as representative for Mr. & Mrs. Lockhart. Mr. Gorres read the public hearing notice. Mr. Marshall presented the proposal to the audience and the Planning Board members. (Mr. Gorres went through the mailing list of neighboring property owners within the 500 feet). Ms. Hilbert opened up the public hearing for public comment, and asked the audience members to state their name and address for the record. In summary, the comments were as follows: Ms. Connie Verusio of 753 South Street had a comment concerning the traffic and the fact that thirty cars or more would be added to the road and it was already dangerous on the road. Mr. Jeremy Saltzman of 791 South Street had several concerns; he indicated that they bought their home for the country setting and he did not think it was right that the zoning was being considered, and that the rules were all being changed after the fact, and that sixteen mixed use homes were being considered to be put into a residential neighborhood. Mr. Saltzman indicated that he did not think the road could handle it, and that the support services were not there to help it. Mr. Saltzman further indicated that there was a surplus of empty homes all over the town. Mr. Saltzman indicated that he was dumbfounded that two weeks ago they got a registered letter about this and now this is drawn, drafted and negotiated. Mr. Saltzman asked the Planning Board members if there was a study done on the increased traffic on the road. Ms. Katherina Orne indicated that there would be a lot of animals killed because of the traffic. Ms. Orne indicated she bought her house five years ago for the rural setting, escaping New York, and this has become a suburb. Mr. Saltzman indicated they do not want to sit there and dictate how people use their own property, however, there are zoning rules set up for a reason, so after the fact to change them, or think about changing them is a little concerning to them. Ms. Orne indicated she would have liked to have been notified earlier. Ms. Hilbert stated

at the point that the Planning board does the notification for the public hearing, they have gone through a series of steps; they made sure that it is an allowable use and they made sure that it has all its approvals from all the different agencies. Mr. Saltzman asked if there was a D.O.T. report. Ms. Hilbert stated there would be something on file from the Town Highway Superintendent, he would have gone out there and reviewed the sight distance. Ms. Verusio indicated there were quite a few homes that have been for sale for a while. Mr. Wilkin stated the reason it is a worked out plan is because by State Law the board has to review the SEQRA which is the State Environmental Review Quality Act. They used to wait until after the public hearing to fill that out, and because of court cases, they have to have that done before they go to public hearing, and because of that, they almost have to have an engineered plan done before they get to this point. Mr. Wilkin stated he agrees that they should have input earlier, but they have to follow the State rules. Ms. Orne stated that is alright as long as this is not too late, and this is not confirmed. Mr. Wilkin stated they have to address the comments, but if the code says this is an allowable use... Mr. Saltzman asked if this project was zoned for this use. Ms. Hilbert responded that it was an allowable use, and when the parcel was originally looked at, Mr. Marshall had submitted an eleven lot subdivision. The developer and the board had some discussions where they felt there was some type of environmental significance being that the ridge was there, as well as some of the wetlands, and they both decided the best course of action was to try to protect some of that environmental area, and condense it into a smaller developable area. Mr. Saltzman stated right now, that area is primary residence zoned, is it not? Mr. Wilkin answered that the applicant could have had that many units on that parcel if they did a regular subdivision, and you wouldn't have all the conservation easement there. Mr. Saltzman asked what about the environmental study and the beaver dams that are right there, that whole area is a conservation area, and he couldn't imagine that it would have no impact on the animals and wildlife. Mr. Wilkin stated this would have more impact than if they did a standard subdivision. Mr. Saltzman stated he is sure of that, but it would still have an impact. Mr. Saltzman asked if he had a right to have their people review these things and look at these documents and studies and the traffic research that somebody did. Mr. Saltzman added that this was a two lane country road at thirty five miles an hour. Ms. Hilbert asked what Mr. Saltzman meant by their people. Mr. Saltzman answered legal counsel; this was a decision that would directly impact his household and the safety of his children, if he doesn't have a way of vocalizing that then he has to explore what options he has, and to wake up one day and learn that he is going to have this many units across the street from him, he is sure everybody up at the table would feel the same way, if it was across the street from them. Mr. Saltzman added that right where that driveway is going are beautiful woods, a stone wall is there, and there is going to be a basin there, and there will be complete visibility of the units, it's just going to completely decimate the entire street, which is a beautiful street. Ms. Orne added that it was the nicest part of South Street that hasn't been destroyed yet, it is still a rural feeling. Ms. Brooks stated she generally prefers not to speak at public hearings because she will state for the record for those that don't know that she does represent a lot of applicants in this community as a surveyor and a planner. However, she also is a neighbor, living at 652 South

Street, and she has watched the board work so diligently with these land owners, and she has watched the landowner's painstakingly work with the board. It is to a certain extent a negotiation, and working out what is best for the land and still conform to zoning. Ms. Brooks stated she wanted to commend the board and the landowners for working so hard to achieve what everybody felt was the best utilization of this property, and the best property management for it, taking into consideration the rights of the landowners and the regulations of the town. Ms. Brooks added that as an adjoining landowner at 652 South Street, she does feel they do have a beautiful area that they live in, and she really does believe that this application before the board will best find the balance between what are the rights of the landowners and the preservation that they all deserve to continue to have. Mr. Saltzman stated he is sure that the board is doing the best that they can, he doesn't know the rules and regulations to the "T" he didn't think he had to, but apparently he has to do a little more research. He can't attend every meeting to be apprised of what his neighbors want to do with their land, but this town has a deficit in their support structure, in its school, and its community and he thinks that many units on that particular street are really going to cause many issues. Mr. Saltzman asked what rental rates were being looked at. Mr. Dunn asked where the entrance would be located. Mr. Marshall indicated on the map where the entrances would be located. Mr. Dunn went up to take a look at the map. Mr. Marshall showed Mr. Dunn where his property was located in reference to the proposed project. Ms. Hilbert stated Mrs. Dunn had a question about the land that was located behind them being preserved, and the actual document that was currently being created takes that part of the land and makes that undevelopable, so it will remain wild. Ms. Hilbert explained to Mrs. Dunn how the Planning Board came to the conclusion that the conservation subdivision would be the best fit for this parcel. Ms. Hilbert stated she was not sure what the difference was between eleven single homes and eleven units. Mr. Saltzman stated there is a difference between renters and homeowners. Ms. Orne added that there is a big difference between a homeowner and renter on South Street. Mr. Saltzman stated he would like to think that he had rights to look at the documentation, so he would ask before a decision was made that they have the proper amount of time to review that documentation and if it is all on the up and up, that was what the great United States is all about. But, if there was some underhanded, sloppy deals and re-zoning that was not supposed to happen, and he is sure that there isn't, but they would like the opportunity to see, because if he can find a way to stop this, he is all about it. Mr. Saltzman asked what the rental amount would be. Mr. Wilkin stated he did not know, if Mr. Saltzman wanted to come in and take a look at the file, he could come in during business hours and the clerk would let him see the file, if Mr. Saltzman wanted to foil the information that would be a cost for him to get copies of it. Mr. Wilkin stated Mr. Saltzman was welcome to look at the whole file. Ms. Hilbert stated included in the file was a copy of all the minutes that describe where the process started. Mr. Saltzman asked how much it would be to look at the whole file. Ms. Mayle stated it was twenty five cents a page, and maybe more for larger documents. Mr. Saltzman stated that the letter (legal notice) didn't really say sixteen units, the letter said four units and they didn't know what that meant. Mr. Saltzman asked what the rental rate would be for a two bedroom projected. Mr. Lockart answered that it would be twelve hundred dollars, it would be the same as his units right up the road. Mr. Lockhart added that he has been up there for ten years at 913 South Street. Ms. Verusio asked the board if the land was going to be raised to the ground to grass. Ms. Hilbert

stated the majority of the proposed lot would remain forever wild, but the buildings are going to have to be excavated to put in the infrastructure. Mr. Wilkin stated the catch basin was part of the stormwater plan to catch the added runoff and that was the reason it was right by the road. Mr. Wilkin added that if the ground sloped the other way, it would be in the back where you wouldn't even see it. Mr. Saltzman stated he can't even build a shed in the front of his house, and he is going to wake up one day and have all this in front of his house. Mr. Saltzman added that if he is bringing a tax base of sixteen units versus one home, that yields a bigger stick too. Mr. Wilkin stated there are twelve (proposed) units and a single family house. Mr. Saltzman stated for the record that he is shocked that there is a need for twelve, twelve hundred dollar a month apartments. Mr. Saltzman asked the board what the process would be from here. Ms. Hilbert stated that the board has the public comments now and the board would discuss and take everything into consideration and then they either close the public hearing or make a decision as to whether or not they need more time to address the comments. Mr. Saltzman asked if the public hearing would be closed tonight? Ms. Hilbert stated sometime the public hearing is closed, and sometimes they are left open if something is pressing that the board feels needs to be addressed. Mr. Saltzman asked if they had the right for time to review this subject matter. Mr. Wilkin stated they could leave the public hearing open for comments. Ms. Mayle stated the board has left the public hearing open in the past to take comments. Mr. Wilkin stated if they closed the public hearing they could also take written comments for thirty days. Mr. Wilkin stated they have to take into consideration the written comments and address them somehow. Ms. Orne asked why the public hearing had to be closed, why couldn't it be open to the public. Mr. Wilkin stated legally, the board has to close the public hearing before they can proceed. Ms. Orne asked how she could prevent this hearing from being closed. Ms. Hilbert stated it would be up to the board members as to whether they want to close the public hearing or not. Mr. Saltzman stated as neighbors and taxpayers and citizens of this area, he would like to request a thirty day grace period so that he could digest this shocking information.

Mr. Wilkin stated at this point to summarize this, these were the comments that he heard were concerns:

- Traffic
- Support services
- Environmental concerns which include wildlife
- Possible landscaping
- Property values

*Ms. Orne stated that property values were a big concern for her*

- Drainage

Mr. Marshall described the infiltration basin, stating it was a shallow depression with modest side slopes. Ms. Verusio asked how big the units would be, and if they would have vinyl siding. Mr. Lockhart stated they would have vinyl siding. Mr. Saltzman stated they would like to formally request a moratorium on this decision so that they could review the information. Mr. Wilkin stated they could not put a moratorium on the project, they could discuss the length of time they would allow for comments. There was discussion regarding being able to have a final public hearing on the project. Ms. Mayle stated that the final public hearing could only be on the subdivision not on the site plan. Mr. Marshall stated that he would like the board to consider that

the public hearing notices were mailed out on December 17<sup>th</sup>., and most of them were delivered on the 18<sup>th</sup>., the following day. Mr. Marshall stated the board could check the signatures as to when they were received. Mr. Saltzman indicated that there was not a lot of information, they didn't realize the severity or the magnitude of the situation. Mr. Marshall stated that didn't prohibit anyone from coming in or contacting the Planning Board Clerk. Mr. Saltzman stated the letter was vague in its language. Ms. Orne stated nowhere on that paper did it say, if you want more information to see the plans. Ms. Hilbert stated that the legal notice does say, please direct all inquiries to the Planning Board Clerk with the phone number and extension. Ms. Orne wanted to know if there was anybody on the board that would represent them as taxpayers. Ms. Hilbert stated that is what the Planning Board's job is. Ms. Orne stated is there anyone on the board that is saying that this is not a good idea, maybe we shouldn't do this. Ms. Hilbert stated it isn't the Planning Board's job to say whether or not the property owner should or shouldn't do it, it is the Planning Board's job to say if you want to do it, these are the guidelines that you have to follow, this is what you need to do to make it work, and these are the rules that you have to follow. Mr. Saltzman stated as long as there isn't a negative impact to the neighborhood. Mr. Wilkin stated that is what the SEQRA is for. Mr. Saltzman stated he would ask at this time to review the SEQRA form. Ms. Hilbert stated to get a better sense instead of reading the SEQRA, he may want to start with the minutes, because those are much more detailed. Ms. Mayle stated at the end of the day, she thinks that they want to know if we will keep open the public hearing and allow them the opportunity to do that. Ms. Mayle added that she did not have an objection to keep open the public hearing until the next Planning Board meeting to allow them the opportunity to come in. Mr. Saltzman stated that was better than nothing, and asked when the next Town Board meeting would be held. Mr. Saltzman added that Plattekill Elementary School is struggling, drowning and it is over populated. Mr. Wilkin stated they are thinking of scaling back at the Wallkill Middle School because they don't have enough kids there.

**MOTION:** Ms. Mayle made a motion to keep the public hearing open until the next Planning Board meeting (January 27, 2015). Mr. Gorres seconded the motion. All ayes on the vote.

Ms. Hilbert asked the audience if they had any type of engineering questions for Mr. Lockhart or Mr. Marshall. Mr. Saltzman stated he is sure that the file has a site plan and landscape plan. *Mr. Marshall added as a clarification that the public hearing would not be re-noticed.*

### **Ulster County Planning Board comments**

The Planning Board members went over each of the comments from the Ulster County Planning Board.

### **Health Department Approvals**

Mr. Marshall stated that they did receive preliminary approval many months ago (via e-mail)

### **Active Recreation Areas**

There was discussion regarding active and passive recreation. There was determination that there would be open areas where horseshoes, baseball or tag could be played. Mr. Lockhart stated that he felt there would be a liability issue with putting up swing sets. Mr. Marshall stated they would

designate an area on the map as active recreation areas. Mrs. Beinkafner asked if there was any requirement in the code for active recreation areas. Mrs. Beinkafner added that the whole reason for a conservation easement was to leave open areas. Mr. Marshall stated it is his understanding under the code that the Planning Board has discretion as to requiring passive or active recreation.

Density Requirements and Advisory comment will be forwarded to the Town Board for their review.

Mr. Wilkin asked about the Conservation and Open Space Easement. Ms. Hilbert stated that was being worked out between the Town Attorney and Mr. Lockhart's Attorney. Ms. Hilbert asked if everybody got a copy of the Conservation and Open Space Easement. Ms. Hilbert asked the board if they would like to do a review and put some comments together and send them to the Planning Board Clerk.

*The public hearing will remain open until January 27, 2015*

## **OLD BUSINESS**

### **Dennis Chaissan 4 Lot Subdivision/Site Plan (Crescent Ave)SBL#95.1-3-2.12**

Patti Brooks was present to represent the applicant, Dennis Chaissan. Ms. Brooks stated they were last before the Planning Board last December 9<sup>th</sup>, the public hearing was opened and closed, and final contingent approval was granted on the potential for a review by the Ulster County Planning Board. Ms. Brooks stated they did receive the Ulster County Planning Board review letter and noted that the comments were required modifications. Ms. Brooks added that she did have an opportunity to speak to Mr. Samuelson about the recommendations, and she had expected that there was some kind of misunderstanding because both the multi-families were already approved, and she believed that he thought they were being changed from seasonal to year round multi-family dwellings. Ms. Brooks stated her concern was what she had to provide to this board in order that they had the comfort level that they had already met those required modifications. Ms. Brooks stated she put the note on the map, which the board has asked them to do, and the board had done their own research of the file, but in regard to the specific concerns about the Ulster County Board of Health and the Department of Public Works, she did bring documentation that was in the original file that a four family apartment was constructed in 1977, there was a permit and a Certificate of Occupation available for the four family by the Code Enforcement Officer at that point and time. Ms. Brooks added that the three family dwelling was actually approved as of June 2000 for a capacity of sixty migrant farm workers, so they took approval for sixty migrant farm workers and turned it into three-one bedroom units. Ms. Mayle asked Ms. Brooks when it switched from the sixty unit to a three family. Ms. Brooks stated in June of 2000 it was re-approved. Ms. Mayle asked Ms. Brooks when it converted from the migrant farm workers to the current housing. Ms. Brooks stated December of 2000. Ms. Brooks stated she also brought a copy of the map and tried to reach the Code Enforcement Officer today, to try and get a letter from him saying that the site is in compliance because he issued a Certificate of Occupancy for the four family in compliance with the Ulster County Board of Health and Ulster County Department of Public Works. Ms. Brooks added that instead of the five units that was approved in 2001 he has the three units. Mr. Wilkin stated for the three and

four family twelve acres was set aside. Ms. Brooks stated 9.67 acres when it was seven units, and it was 12.55 when it was nine units. Mr. Wilkin asked Ms. Brooks if there was any discussion from the Planning Board about health department approval on 2001. Ms. Brooks stated no, they still had sixty people approved for the site, and they were still only going to have five-one bedroom units. Mr. Wilkin asked Ms. Brooks if there was a separate septic for the laundry. Ms. Brooks stated yes, there was a separate septic for the laundry because they were told if they were going to put a laundromat in, it needed to have its own well and septic, but that was never done. Ms. Mayle stated the map shows two septic areas now. Ms. Brooks stated the septic's are on two separate lots. Ms. Brooks stated the four family has been in place since 1977 and the three family has been in place since 2000 via site plan approval and replaced a sixty bed migrant labor camp. Ms. Brooks stated the last issue from the Ulster County Planning Board comments was preserving rural landscape, and she thought they had done that. Mr. Wilkin stated the labor camp was only seasonal. Ms. Brooks stated some people were there year round. Ms. Brooks stated they are looking for final approval, and she does believe that they have maintained the rural landscape for the past fourteen years, and she believes that they have met all these modifications. Mr. Wilkin stated as far as the Department of Public Works goes, they can have that contingent on getting a letter from the DPW. Ms. Mayle stated all this is, is a modification of a pre-existing site plan for a subdivision, and the only reason it came in for site plan was because there was a site plan on the property with a certain amount of acreage. Mr. Wilkin stated it had to go to the Ulster County Planning Board under the regulations of the modification. Ms. Mayle stated all the Ulster County Planning Board comments are as if they are starting from day one. Ms. Mayle added she was ready to move forward on this project. Ms. Hilbert stated the board should have discussion on each of the Ulster County Planning Board comments.

### **Ulster County Planning Board comments**

#### **Health Department**

Ms. Hilbert stated that as Ms. Brooks has stated the approvals were already sent up and already approved back on the original site plan in 2000. Ms. Mayle stated it sounded like some of it was secured back in 1977 when the first unit was constructed, and subsequently modified in 2000 when it was converted to a three family on lot #1. Ms. Hilbert stated the board is in receipt of a Notice of Determination from the Code Enforcement Officer, approving the four family which were constructed in 1977.

#### **Department of Public Works**

Ms. Hilbert stated the second comment was that the applicant coordinate with the Department of Public Works for any type of comment or questions that they may have for the ingress and egress for the property. Ms. Hilbert stated that those issues were addresses with the original site plan back in 2000 and they did offer an County approval which would have been accepted and used in the original and eliminated two access points on the County highway. Ms. Mayle stated that was for lots #1 and #2, there is a note on the plan for lot #3 (see plan for note #15).

## **Rural Landscaping**

Ms. Hilbert stated that Ms. Brooks already addressed the landscaping, they left the majority of the area open as active orchard land, which is currently there now, there has been no change with the property since 2000.

**MOTION:** Ms. Mayle made a motion that the Planning Board reject the recommendations of the Ulster County Planning Board on the Chaissan four Lot Subdivision dated 1/7/2015 for the following reasons:

- Regarding the requirement to coordinate with the Ulster County Department of Health, this Board finds that as it relates to lot #1 the applicant had previously constructed a three family dwelling unit that was approved by the Planning Board in December of 2000 including a review of the septic system that would serve a unit that was housing approximately 60 seasonal workers. The Planning Board also reviewed Lot #2 and found that the four family dwelling on a property that previously received approval from the Town in 1977 for its construction, at the time had Health Department review.
- The Department of Public Works and the required modification that the applicant coordinate with the DPW with the necessary approvals. We find that as it relates to lots #1 and #2 in 2000 when the applicant came in before the Planning Board for a site plan review and received such approvals, that there was coordination at that time with the DPW for the location and the relocation of the driveways that currently exist and there is no proposal to date to alter those existing driveways.
- The applicant has supplied a note on the plan for lot #3 and in the future if that lot is to be developed, the applicant will have to coordinate with the Ulster County Department of Public Works to locate a driveway or road entrance whatever the application requires.
- In regard to the rural landscape, the Planning Board notes that on lots #1, #2 and #3 there will be no modifications of the existing site, and it will continue to retain its rural character, as it was approved back in 2000, and that it does not require further modification at this time.

Mr. Gorres seconded the motion. All ayes on the vote.

Ms. Brooks stated at this time, since they have received final conditional approval, they don't need anything else from the board this evening, they have met all the conditions. Ms. Brooks stated she will present the board with final maps, and the final fees will be paid.

*The applicant will provide final maps for signature, and pay the final recreation fees*

**Town of Plattekill Lot Line Revision (Route 32 & Patura Road)SBL#101.1-5-9 & 10.2**

Ms. Brooks was present to discuss the lot line project. Supervisor, Joseph Croce was also in the audience. Ms. Brooks stated that the town was working with the Veteran's Committee for quite some time to establish a Veteran's Park. Ms. Brooks stated tax map lot 10.2 which is currently 10.89 acres of land is vacant land owned by the Town of Plattekill, which is not part of the park parcel. Ms. Brooks stated for reasons of obtaining grants and funding and for the purposes that it is designated as park land, the Town has determined that it would be appropriate to convey the Veteran's Memorial Park to the existing Tom Felton Park, so that it becomes one parcel of land and can all be designated as park land. Ms. Mayle stated her concern was that they were taking one lot from across the street and adding it to this property, and why not create this as a separate lot in the park. Ms. Brooks stated they left plenty of frontage on both sides of the road and Route 32. Mr. Wilkin stated he felt this should be a stand-alone lot because they usually don't have lots across the road, when they subdivide, and they ask that the road be dedicated. Ms. Brooks stated then the Town would be dedicating the road to themselves. Ms. Hilbert asked Mr. Croce if it was the recommendation from the Recreation Committee that they wanted it included in the Town Park. Mr. Croce stated it was a decision made by the Town, with input from the Highway Superintendent. After further discussion, the board was polled as to whether the lots should be subdivided, or combined:

- Mr. Wilkin felt it should be a subdivided, separate lot
- Mrs. Beinkafner also felt it should be a separate, subdivided lot
- Mr. Gorres felt the lots should be combined
- Ms. Hilbert felt the lots should be combined
- Mr. Matthews felt the lots should be combined
- Mr. Baum felt the lots should be combined
- Ms. Mayle was undecided

Ms. Hilbert stated with a majority consensus they will move forward with the concept of combining the lots and continue to review this application as a proposed Lot Line Revision 0 00 0 0. Ms. Brooks asked the board about the fifty-foot conveyance to the Town for road purposes. Ms. Brooks asked if she would do the same thing as she did on the subdivision maps for the landowners and say that she is not going to convey it and show the highway bounds. Mr. Wilkin stated yes. There was discussion about completing SEQRA and whether this would trigger a Type I Action.

**MOTION:** Mr. Wilkin made a motion that the Plattekill Planning Board take Lead Agency with Mr. Baum seconding. All ayes on the vote.

Ms. Mayle asked if this was adjacent to an Agricultural District. Ms. Brooks stated yes, she submitted an AG Data Statement. Ms. Brooks stated that she would verify as to whether they have triggered a Type I Action.

*The applicant will be scheduled for the January 27, 2015 Planning Board meeting.*

**VOUCHERS**

Voucher-in the amount of \$431.80 to come out of the escrow of Dennis Chaissan's 4 Lot Subdivision.

**MOTION:** Mr. Gorres made a motion to approve the voucher for payment with Mr. Baum seconding the motion. All ayes on the vote.

Voucher-in the amount of \$696.60 to come out of the escrow of Dunkin Donuts.

**MOTION:** Mr. Gorres made a motion to approve the voucher for payment with Mr. Baum seconding the motion. All ayes on the vote.

Voucher-in the amount of \$475.20 to come out of the escrow of Lands of Rainieri.

**MOTION:** Mr. Gorres made a motion to approve the voucher for payment with Mr. Baum seconding the motion. All ayes on the vote.

Voucher-in the amount of \$207.60 to come out of the escrow of Messina & Sons Site Plan.

**MOTION:** Mr. Gorres made a motion to approve the voucher for payment with Ms. Hilbert seconding the motion. All ayes on the vote.

Voucher-in the amount of \$492.00 to come out of the escrow of Hudson Valley Flyers Club.

**MOTION:** Mr. Gorres made a motion to approve the voucher for payment with Mr. Baum seconding the motion. All ayes on the vote.

**ADJOURNMENT**

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

The meeting adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by  
Susan Bolde, Planning Board Clerk