

Town of Hamilton
Planning Board Meeting
Monday May 15, 2017, 7:30 PM
Hamilton Public Library
13 Broad Street, Hamilton

Present: Chairman Darrell Griff, Elaine Hughes, Bettyann Miller, Bill Nolan, Town Attorney Steve Jones, Deputy Clerk Elisa Robertson, Town Clerk Sue Reymers

Others Present: Drew Dunham, Allie Dunham, Neal Zinsmeyer, Mary Lee Dinski, John and Cathy Oates, Diane Helly, Ronald Burstein, Steven Skollar, Barry Campbell, Roger Foster, Charles Wilburn, Susan Tallman, Michael Zahn

Chairman Griff called the meeting to order at 7:28 pm.

Poolville Country Store, Special Use Permit Application, 1245 Earlville Road, Poolville, Tax Map # 199.12-1-11,12

The Board reviews the information in their packets which includes: a Special Use Application, a narrative, an Ag Data Statement, a Tax Map, a Site Plan (should be labeled Plot Plan), and the SEQRA part 1 short form.

Town Attorney Jones inquires whether or not Planning and Zoning Attorney Scott Chatfield has seen these documents, the answer is no. Chairman Griff explains that he is proceeding as per a telephone conference with Mr. Chatfield the week prior. All of the Documents seem to be in order with the exception of the Site Plan. The tax map is on one side of page 3 and the Plot plan is on the other side. This is the plot diagram that was handed in with the application. There is no Site Plan as of yet. We haven't reached that point in the process. Since it is not an official Site Plan there are no dimensions on the buildings. The board will go through the SEQRA, schedule a public hearing, and send it to the County for a GLM 239 review.

The board reviews the SEQRA part 1 short form and makes the following changes: (Please see attachment #1)

4. Add a check to include "commercial"

Resolution 2017-31: To accept part one of the SEQRA short form from the Poolville Country Store.

Motion: Bettyann Miller

Second: Bill Nolan

Vote: Aye – 4 Nay – 0

ADOPTED

The short form SEQRA does not require this board to notify other agencies.

Chairman Griff signs the GML 239 referral form and states that we do not have a site plan to send just the plot plan. Codes signed off on the plot plan map but not as the site plan, so that is still needed before it can go to the county. The applicants were offered the site plan checklist and they asked why they were not informed about this ahead of time. The Deputy Clerk replied that they were not at the site plan stage of the process yet, that the only thing required at that point was the plot diagram. The Chairman thought that there was a site plan already approved by codes as well.

Mr. Wilburn: "Eve Ann said this was going to be cut and dry."

The Deputy Clerk asks if the only thing missing on the plat diagram is the dimensions of the buildings.

Town Attorney Steve Jones refers to the Town Zoning Law as Chairman Griff goes through the Site Plan Checklist. There is no construction taking place, it is just for the existing buildings. Attorney Jones states that the board has a lot of leeway. He refers to Page 55 in Town Zoning Law, which states:

SECTION 8.2 Required Plans & Submittals

Because the impact of Special Permit uses varies greatly, the information required to be submitted for a Special Permit may vary depending upon the scale, intensity, nature of the proposed use and its proposed location. An applicant for a Special Permit shall submit at least one original and four copies of the following together with whatever other information the Planning Board deems appropriate:

- A. A Town of Hamilton Special Permit application form.*
- B. A plot plan drawn to scale with accurate dimensions providing information sufficient to enable the Board to make an informed decision, and an agricultural data statement as defined in section 8.3-6 below.*
- C. A narrative describing the proposed use and operation.*
- D. A short-form or long-form SEQRA Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) with Part 1 fully completed by the applicant (a long-form EAF is required for all SEQRA Type I actions, but the Zoning Board of Appeals may require a long-form EAF for unlisted actions if the Board deems that the additional information contained on the long-form would be helpful and appropriate under the circumstances of the project proposal).*
- E. The application fee as established by the Town Board, and an escrow deposit for reimbursement of cost of Town consultants (if required).*
- F. The Planning Board may waive or add any requirements for an application submission if it deems appropriate in order to accomplish the purposes set forth herein.*

Everything is in order except for it being drawn to scale. There is nothing in the Law that states that there has to be a site plan. The board has the freedom to add or waive requirements at will. Board member Nolan states that if there were new buildings being proposed that he would want one but since there is no new construction that they could waive it. This does need

to go to the county. The county requires 30 days to respond. The Board is very familiar with the property and nothing is going to be added, just 40x60 tents.

Resolution 2017-32: To accept the Plot diagram without dimensions of the buildings or scale from the Poolville Country Store.

Motion: Bettyann Miller

Second: Elaine Hughes

Vote: Aye – 4 Nay – 0

ADOPTED

To accommodate the applicants schedule, the Board will schedule the next meeting for Monday, June 19, 2017 at 7:30 pm. The Board will hold the Public Hearing and have their regular meeting at this time. The venue is yet to be determined.

Camp Fiver, Site Plan Review, Special Use Permit Application, 7464 Mill Street, Poolville, Tax Map # 199.-1-31

The Board reviews the information in their packets which includes: a revised narrative, a list of proposed conditions on events, a list of proposed conditions on camp, a sample contract, a site plan, and a site plan review checklist.

The board decides to address the site plan first. The Board has a copy of the Site Plan Checklist that CEO Mark Miller has signed off on as well. The Board has no comment about the site plan at this time.

The board makes a motion to be lead agency on this application. However, the Deputy Clerk reminds the board that they made this declaration as noted on record on page 12 of the April 25th 2017 minutes as Resolution 2017-25.

The board addresses part two of the SEQRA long form. Chairman Griff reads through the form and the board answers the questions. (Please see attachment #2)

This is a renewal of a previous permit for the camp, however they now wish to add events. It does change the way some of these questions need to be answered.

Number 4: answered YES

a-g: No, or small impact

Number 5: answered YES the property is within the 100 year flood plain area, even though tons of fill was brought in originally, There is discussion regarding the difference between a flood plain and a flood way.

a-f: No, or small impact

All other questions are marked NO.

Part two of the SEQRA long form is completed.

Chairman Griff starts to address part three of the SEQRA form.

Drew Dunham asks if questions are allowed. He then inquires if the applicant has to do a sound study. Chairman Griff replies that we are renewing a previous application.

Town Attorney Steve Jones recommends that he board review the County Planning Departments recommendation dated April 25, 2017 (please see attachment #3) before they make a negative declaration.

He wants to review the County's concerns to make sure that they have been addressed.

He makes a list including:

1. Mill Street Bridge- the bridge is not scheduled to be updated at this time but it is understood by the town that it does need some work done on it. Mary Dinski informs the board that Fiver needed to update the bridge in 1999 to be able to have construction vehicles go over it. It has been nearly 20 years, the bridge probably does need some maintenance at this point. The County regularly checks the bridges especially after storms and such. Town Clerk Sue Reymers will look into the status of the bridge and get back to the board.

2. The water supply- water is tested 60 days before the opening of camp and then monthly. The department of health gets copies of those reports. It may need to be addressed for the expanded months for events. It is added that water and septic need to be in accordance with Department of Health regulations for the extra events.

3. Septic system- leach field is checked regularly

4. Camp Best Management practices for manure from the horses- is already being addressed

Other items of concern for the county about the added Spring and Fall events are:

1. Square footage of the venue- under 5,000 sq. ft – 3,456 sq. ft. according to the map

2. Intended hours of operation – set forth in conditions and the narrative. There was a question during the public hearing concerning the months of operation. Camp has a well established history of months of operation. The website advertised different months than what was included in the proposed conditions, which also differs from the conditions. The web site is down now. April and May are very difficult because of preparations for camp so there would be no large events then, only small events. Camp starts the second week of June and ends the third week of August; this year is June 12 to August 18. Camp is open for a total of 10 weeks.

3. Intended maximum size of events-200 for pavilion, 250 for tent

4. Parking-for events-CEO signed off on plans however it does not appear to be enough parking. Mary Dinski states that parking is in the lot and along the path to the dining hall. There is concern about the width of the road and the ability for emergency vehicles to get in. They would need 63 parking spaces. The Board would like the Codes Officer to review the site plan again. Mary Dinski asks if parking can be on the grass, the answer is yes.

5. Any new features to the buildings such as lighting or signs- no new lighting or signs

6. Noise – The camp currently uses a PA system and plays music for the campers on weekdays until 9:30 pm. Special Events could go until 9 pm on weekdays during the school year and 11 pm on weekends. Town Clerk Reymers asks if amplified music must stop at those times. Does that mean that the events end at that time or can they continue on?

7. Horses - No more than 10 horses.

8. Cabins – not feasible to rent in April, May, or after September 15th. There would only be two weekends in September where overnight accommodations would be possible. Most of the time people want to have the event and then leave but there have been times that people have requested to stay on camp. Lodging for events would only be for the first two weeks of September.

9. Heat – bathrooms in the dining hall are heated. Town Attorney Jones refers to the April 25, 2017 minutes where the CEO brought up the 2015 International Property Maintenance Code regarding heating (see April 25, 2017 Minutes).

The board will need to review both the proposed conditions on the camp and the proposed conditions for the special events. There is discussion as to whether or not there should be two sets of conditions because of the two different uses. The board decides to review the conditions for the camp first and then move on to the special events.

Chairman Griff reads through the conditions for the camp and compares the original to the proposed. The only new condition is #4 on the 2017 list. There is discussion of having two separate lists of conditions for the one Special Use Permit. The Chairman suggests moving # 4 to #14 and then adding the event conditions all on the same page. Number 12 would need to move to the end. The last two conditions would remain the last two. That keeps the conditions all on one list because it is going to be one permit.

The next issue is noise. They have full speakers on the property. Their contract states that events end at 11 pm on weekends and 9 pm on week nights. Special events will only take place in May, September, and October. Lodging for special events will only be available prior to September 15 in accordance with state mandated heating for buildings. There is some discussion about the time of year for events and the buffering of noise by the foliage on the trees.

Town Attorney Steve Jones reminds the board that all three applications have received the same response from Madison County's Planning Department regarding noise. Board member Nolan feels that the sound should be tested. The board really struggles with the lack of a sound ordinance in the Town of Hamilton. There is some discussion about the Town of Rochester, and how they dealt with sound/ noise levels in their municipality. They do not have a sound ordinance either, however, according to section 140-20 General Commercial and industrial standards addresses sound standards for any new use of a parcel. The board looks at the findings provided by Acoustical Solutions which lists the sound mitigation techniques used. The board also considers the Owers sound study.

Town Attorney Jones asks the board how they would like to handle this. Deputy Clerk Robertson reminds the board that we do have a baseline study for the area that was done for a previous applicant. Chairman Griff asks if it is possible to use that baseline study to write a condition that the decibel levels are not to go beyond a certain level. Attorney Jones replies that he feels that we do not have enough knowledge or expert testimony to establish what that decibel level should be.

Chairman Griff was curious how the numbers at Owera were generated.

Deputy Clerk Robertson informs the board what the acceptable sound levels are for the Village of Hamilton, 65db at the property line or 75db with a special sound permit. There are some exceptions, such as lawn mowers and the Block Party.

The board deliberates what to do.

Town Clerk Reymers asks that the properties across the lake be included in the past there have been issues with noise and those properties.

It is noted that water provides no barrier for sound.

It is brought to the attention of the board that the Owera study was done using topographical maps and calculation; no one came to the property and ran a sound study. Chairman Griff points out that both the applicant and the Planning Board in that scenario had their own noise experts. Allie Dunham states she contacted the firm that is recommended by the County in the GML report she is unsure if they are the one who did an extensive study or not.

There is discussion of how this type of resolution has been worded in the past and the need for the board to be consistent. The board is hearing multiple applications like this where noise is an important issue. Though these applications are similar, there are differences. Chairman Griff states that having the study done is one part of a two part process. First, is to see if there are unacceptable decibel levels or noise level regardless of decibel. Second, there will need to be noise mitigation done. It is better for the applicant to deal with a company that also deals with mitigation services.

Attorney Jones inquires about the firm that was mentioned in the county GML report. Allie Dunham called them and asked about the process, and was told that they come to the site, look at elevation, screening, etc. and then make recommendations. She is unaware of his qualifications. Board member Miller feels like they need to be consistent with what was required of the Dunham's application.

Resolution 2017-33: The board requires the applicant to produce a noise impact study to ensure the compatibility of this project with the surrounding neighborhood.

Motion: Bettyann Miller

Second: Bill Nolan

Vote: Aye – 4 Nay – 0

ADOPTED

Fiver needs to get the sound study done and they need to clarify the parking on their site plan. The number of spots, the handicapped parking, locations, and road width need to be addressed with the Codes Officer. Mark Peterson will meet with Codes.

Drew Dunham, Special Use Permit Application, 1647 Poolville Road, Earlville, Tax Map #184.-1-35,36,37

This is for information only because the sound study that was conducted took place earlier in the day. Allie Dunham explains that they hired a DJ to set up in the barn; they took base level decibel readings before music and while music was playing with both the doors open and the door closed. They also did outside readings with speakers outside of the barn in the back. They went to neighbors and did readings at the property line.

Neil Zinsmeyer from Napierala Consulting did the actual meter readings. He states that they will be providing a report to the board. He worked on a similar application in the Town of Cazenovia, Red Barn 20. He explains the process that they went through. The base line was 48 dB and was very consistent to Eaton Road. He hopes to provide the board with enough information that the Dumhams can get an approval but also so the Town and neighbors can be happy as well. He states that the report should be finished by the end of the week.

Allie states that they feel the max they would be is 90 dB at the entrance of the barn with music playing with the doors open and 80 dB with the doors closed. They agreed that is the loudest that they would allow it to be. The doors lowered the threshold about 10 dB. At Mr. Skollars house it was 55 dB. The readings would change during the different fluctuations in the songs. They tried to keep a consistent 90 at the barn.

Deputy Clerk Robertson comments that at one point Drew came to the barn and turned the music down to 80 dB inside. Mr. Zinsmeyer says that the music got louder at one point and that is why Drew came to turn it down. Deputy Clerk Robertson states that she was with the DJ the entire time and he never turned the volume up. They dropped it 12 percent.

Ms. Allie Dunham states that the base was 48 dB at Mr. Skollar's house and that it was 73dB when a car (a regular pick-up) drove by. All of this info will be in the report.

Chairman Griff states that all of this was just for information that there will not be any action taken on this application. Town Attorney Jones points out that there are a number of neighbors in the audience. Chairman Griff asks if anyone would like to comment.

Mr. Steve Skollar:

"Well, the first thing you say about the decibel readings of a car or a truck going by that's a one-time event as opposed to a consistent thing. I don't understand why you wouldn't just play the same song over and over, you want a consistent reading."

Board member Hughes states that every song has variations.

Mr. Skollar:

"It doesn't matter. You just have to establish sound, you could have a cow mooing at a certain pitch over and over to establish a baseline, so I don't understand even how the study makes sense?"

Mr. Drew Dunham: "We did repeat the same song at both levels."

Mr. Steve Skollar:

"I listened to you play songs, it was a dance party. It was different stuff, Dire Straits at one point.

Mr. Zinsmeyer: I understand what you are saying, but you want an average.

Mr. Skollar:

"So what does that tell us? So again, I would say to all of you is would you want this across from your house? Who would say honestly, 'Hey, I want an event center across from my farm?'"

Mr. Drew Dunham: "Well, I live next to the barn."

Mr. Skollar: "Really, Drew? You are going to say 'I do'?"

Chairman Griff interrupts and asks that all comments be directed to the Board.

Mr. Zinsmeyer:

"What we were trying to do with tonight's experiment is give an indication of what that sound is. I know that not everybody could make it which is unfortunate. But what we are hoping to help the board establish what 70dB is; what 80 dB is. Me, speaking right now, is probably 65dB. Forty- eight is what we heard and what we recorded at the side of the road on a typical day, it was a bit windy. That is the baseline there."

Mr. Michael Zahn:

"Yeah, well the whole thing about decibels and everything, trying to be scientific about it... what it amounts to is that there is going to be music playing. You know, four hours worth, six hours worth and the people who live nearby are going to hear that music. It's not going to hurt their ears, it is not going to be so loud that you can't stand it but do you want to listen to music for six hours on Saturdays during the summer that wasn't there before. To me that is what it amounts to."

Mr. Ron Burstein:

"My house, I could hear every word that was said when they were singing. I mean it was quite loud, I can't see where they are getting 48 dB."

Chairman Griff states that that was the ambient level before the music.

Steve Skollar:

"Again, I think we have to be careful about, you know, we make it decibels levels and stuff and it's not about that. It's about us sitting here in a room (starts snapping his fingers) and this is going on."

Chairman Griff: "Point taken."

Mr. John Oates:

"All I have to say is that Bruce Springsteen comes in loud and clear in our driveway during the test. Born in the USA. If I was listening to that at 11 o'clock at night I would be a little uncomfortable. Now, the pick-up truck thing, that is very interesting too. Because a north bound vehicle on that road do make a lot of noise to go up the hill; south bound vehicles make no noise."

Ms. Susan Tallman: "When would I have found out about this project as an abutter, as I heard about it from friends."

Chairman Griff: "You would have gotten a letter."

The various ways the Town advertises public hearings is discussed. She was not on the mailing list because she doesn't fit the criteria.

Ms. Diane Helly: "I was at my mom's (Catherine Smith) tonight, she lives at 1664 Poolville Road and I did not know that there was a study going on and I had to come out of the house to see what's going on. I could hear the noise."

Mr. Ron Burstein: "Bebe James came out of her house it was so loud. Sue went and talked to her."

Ms. Sue Reymers:

"I did. I talked to Beatrice James and she expressed concern. When we were listening to the different sites, when we were in front of your house it was quieter because of the trees. The houses block, but when you went up on Eaton Road in front of Beatrice's house so you could hear it more clearly, so there are definitely differences based on where you were."

Mr. Zinsmeyer: "You could hear it, there is no argument. I mean to me it was not excessive. It was background noise, at that point because we were 700 feet away or so I don't know the exact measurement".

Ms. Allie Dunham: "Another thing to keep in mind, in the beginning, he really blasted it. He said 'Ok, this is what it sounds like at cocktail hour, and this is what it would be medium and then he went really, really, loud. So, some of those really loud times, we would never reach that level, may have been when it triggered some of these people to come out, verses what it's like... at that medium level, how much you can hear from the inside."

Mrs. Oates:

"I think where I am coming from is that our background noise right now is the Sangerfield River trickling down the brook. It is the birds in the trees and the leaves. And as Dr. Zahn said we are going to now have the honor and privilege of 4-6 hours of music of not our own choice. It's sad, it is just sad. I am not mad or angry, just sad."

Board member Miller states that she understands because she has, in the past, had neighbors that had a band that used to practice all day Saturdays.

Mr. Zinsmeyer: "The Dunhams certainly want to be good neighbors. That is what we are trying to do. We are trying to establish what works for the town, what works for the neighbors; that could as well work for the Dunhams. We do not want to discount this project hopefully just because of something that we may be able to address somehow."

Chairman Griff: "Well, that is where we get into sound mitigation."

Mr. Zinsmeyer:

"And that is the point going forward is if... what's acceptable, if it's not acceptable at that level, can we do something differently. Or do we just limit it right at that door, cut it 18% right there..."

Attorney Jones: "Do you do sound mitigation?"

Mr. Zinsmeyer:

"We do not do sound mitigation. The issue with the Dunhams is, the intent for the events are to be inside, doors closed. When you start getting inside the building, that's not me; that is architectural. That is how sound resonates inside the building and all that good stuff. Our goal tonight was just to walk around to the neighbors just like we did, to take those baselines and the preferred readings, but if the board says no the preferred readings don't work for us can you mitigate it, just turn it down.

Ms. Allie Dunham:

"Yeah , when it comes to sound mitigation, I mean we are not going to ruin the integrity of the barn by adding insulation or adding walls, I mean. And it would not be aesthetically pleasing to put certain devices up there to mitigate the sound. So our main goal for that is to just monitor the noise level. Maybe not add other devices but just have a limit, for decibels or whatever."

Chairman Griff: "So, that study tonight never went below the 80 dB outside the door?"

Mr. Zinsmeyer:

"You are correct. We wanted to create a worst case. To me it was too loud. You know there were some other board members and town members that were there. It was loud inside the barn at that 80. But the intent was to provide a worst case. You know it is going to be personal preference. If they have a, I hate to say it ... a wedding venue with people that don't like loud music, what that venue is going to be. So, we try to do a worst case and those will be the readings that we will be providing, those are the readings that we took tonight."

Chairman Griff: "So would you be able to give us any recommendations of... So we were at 90 in the building, 80 with the door closed, and these were the readings at sites a,b,c,... if you reduce that down to 70 in the building, 60 at the door. Can you give us any idea what those readings would be at sites a,b,c?"

Mr. Zinsmeyer: "We should be able to because there was time that we cut it down 12% and that decibel reading.."

Chairman Griff: "The 12% was you cut it back from 90 to 88?"

Mr. Zinsmeyer: "No we turned it down 12% of 90. I'll have to do the calculations, about 80 something."

Drew Dunham: "That is also at the barn doors; whereas the limits for example at the village are at the property line."

Chairman Griff: "Well, we aren't the village."

Mr. Drew Dunham:

"Understood, but it is almost safe to say that the decibel readings at the property lines or at the neighbor's front door is significantly less, almost half of what you are getting right at the event."

Mr. Neil Zinsmeyer:

"That is why we went to the spots that we did. We went to your house and your house as well. Because we knew, those are the closest neighbors, so of course that is where we are going to take the readings at. That is why we chose those locations."

Chairman Griff:

"But you can give us a recommendation of a lower or an indication of what they would be, where those decibel levels would be if you dropped the inside from 90 to 80 to 70 to 60 and what they would read at those points a,b,and c, if you dropped them by to decibels inside the building?"

MR. Zinsmeyer: "Correct."

Mr. Ron Burstein: "Well, it is not only music. You're going to have 200 people hollering and hooting too."

Mr. Dunham: "Which is also a natural sound mitigator. We had no people in that barn."

Board member Miller: "People absorb sound."

Mr. Skollar: "I have one question. Theoretically, so could we have a night on Poolville Road where the Dunhams have a party, the camp has a party and the Country Store has a party?"

Board member Miller: "Theoretically, yes."

Mr. Skollar: "Just a thought. I don't know I think they should move it over to you guys houses."

Laughter ensues.

Chairman Griff restates that there is to be no action on this application at this time and that they will need to see the report from Napierala Consulting.

Town Clerk Reymers reminds the board of the noise/sound mitigation research that the Deputy Clerk did the year before for another application. It has been sent already.

Dr. Michael Zahn asks if this proposal is permitted by special use permit or unpermitted. It is confirmed that it is a permitted use with a Special Use Permit.

Mr. Dunham: "With respect to the Zahn's...I was on my way home from work today and called Allie when they were at full music or the 90dB at the door and I stopped just past your house"

(Zahn) and didn't hear anything but silence. I also went up to the red house just after, the same thing, I didn't hear any noise. Just to let you know that I did that during..."

Dr. Zahn: "What time did this happen?"

Mr. Dunham: "That was at 6 o'clock."

Dr. Zahn explains that they can hear Camp Fiver, he would prefer not to, but that he does not want to dampen their enthusiasm.

Chairman Griff asks if there any other comments.

Ms. Allie Dunham asks about the next step in the process. The board will review the report and discuss what they determine to be acceptable.

Chairman Griff: "And there again, I would not be surprised that we're going to be looking at some type of noise mitigation, if you want to move forward with the project. Whether that is simply turning down the volume in the barn or how that is going to be accomplished but I would not be surprised to see that, as we move forward."

Ms. Dunham asks if there is a possibility of bringing this to a vote at the next meeting. Chairman Griff feels that the noise is of the greatest concern and that if they can come up with acceptable conditions.

The board looks to what has already been addressed, such as the site plan, water, restrooms, catering, etc. Since the houses were removed, all of the info dealing with them is up to the Codes Officer.

There has been some concern by some neighbors about lights of vehicles leaving the venue at night. The board may need to think about some screening and or foliage. In particular the larger parking lot in the back of the venue where the lights would shine on Eaton Road.

The applicant is anxious to get started.

Proposed subdivisions, LaFrance and Roecker

Both of these applications are simple 2 lot subdivisions that are only waiting on their survey maps. They were unable to get their info in time for this meeting and are hoping to be on next month's agenda. They were hoping to have their public hearing the same evening as their application comes before the board. This proposition is debated by the board.

Chairman Griff asks if there is a reason for these time constraints. The Deputy Clerk is unaware of any reason at this time for their desire to speed up the process. They look to the Subdivision Law to see if it is possible. Legally it can be done. The next planning board meeting will be quite busy with large projects. They can be scheduled for their preliminary hearing for next month.

Resolution 2017-34: To approve the minutes from the April 25, 2017 meeting.

Motion: Bill Nolan

Second: Elaine Hughes

Vote: Aye – 4 Nay – 0

ADOPTED

Resolution 2017-35: To adjourn the meeting.

Motion: Bill Nolan

Second: Elaine Hughes

Vote: Aye – 4 Nay – 0

ADOPTED

Respectfully submitted by:
Elisa E. Robertson
Deputy Clerk
Town of Hamilton