

Town of Hamilton
Planning Board Meeting
Monday June 19, 2017, 7:30 PM
Poolville Community Center
7484 Willey Road, Poolville

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

Others in Attendance: Rick LaFrance, Patrick Olsen, Karl Roecker, Mike Capetto, Dan Callahan, Ronald Burstein, Doug Smith, Allie Dunham, Drew Dunham, Steve Skollar, Beth Dubois, as well as other community members

Chairman calls the meeting to order at 7:30 pm. Camp Fiver is on the agenda but will be tabled until the next meeting.

Richard LaFrance and Patrick Olsen, SUBDIVISION, PUBLIC HEARING, 8517 Barnard Road, Hamilton, Tax Map # 201.-1-29

This is the first time that this application has been before the board. The applicants are given the opportunity to present their subdivision request to the board. The applicants are under contract to buy a 170 acre piece of land on Barnard Road that they wish to subdivide into 2 parcels of 85 acres each for recreational purposes.

The Board reviews the EAF (SEQRA) short form part 1. The Board continues with part 2 of the EAF (SEQRA) short form answering all of the questions.

Resolution 2017-36: Motion to issue a negative declaration based on review of Part 2 of the EAF (SEQRA) short form regarding the LaFrance/Olsen subdivision application.

Motion: Bettyann Miller

Second: Elaine Hughes

Vote: Aye – 4 Nay – 0

ADOPTED

The board opens the public hearing on the LaFrance/Olsen subdivision. According to Mr. Chatfield, it is the Chairman's job to declare the public hearing open, no motion is necessary. Most Boards use a motion to close the hearing but it is really not necessary but common practice.

Resolution 2017-37: Motion to close the public hearing on the LaFrance/Olsen application.

Motion: Bill Nolan

Second: Bettyann Miller

Vote: Aye – 4 Nay – 0

ADOPTED

Resolution 2017-38: Motion to grant final plat approval to the subdivision known as the lands of Alfred J. Faller and Cynthia D. Faller based on a map made by Brian Chapin of Chapin Land Surveyors dated May 26, 2017.

Motion: Bill Nolan

Second: Elaine Hughes

Vote: Aye – 4 Nay – 0

ADOPTED

Attorney Chatfield states that the chairman does not have to read each question of the EAF (SEQRA) form, that the board can review it for themselves. By making the above motion; it gives the Chairman the authority to sign part 3 of the of the SEQRA form.

Karl Roecker, SUBDIVISION, PUBLIC HEARING, 941 Highway12, Earlville, Tax Map #199.-1-59

This is the first time that this application has been before the board. The applicant is given the opportunity to present his subdivision request to the board. The applicant and his wife bought this property in 1981 with plans to retire there. The intention was for his son to buy the house eventually. Meanwhile, he got married and had kids and can't afford to buy a house. He can't afford the taxes. That is the reason.

The board has had the opportunity to review the Short EAF from part 1. Chairman Griff has a question about # 12b. He asks if the form was computer generated. The answer is yes. There is a question about # 13 has a question as well. It is determined that; considering that this is a subdivision with no disturbance to the land, that these questions are fine as answered. The Chairman reads Part 2 of the SEQRA form and answers them with the board.

Chairman Griff declares the Public Hearing for the Roecker subdivision open. There is no comment from the audience.

Resolution 2017-39: Motion to close the Public Hearing regarding the Roecker subdivision application.

Motion: Bettyann Miller

Second: Bill Nolan

Vote: Aye – 4 Nay – 0

ADOPTED

Resolution 2017-40: Motion to issue a negative declaration based on review of Part 2 of the EAF (SEQRA) short form regarding the Roecker subdivision application.

Motion: Bill Nolan

Second: Bettyann Miller

Vote: Aye – 4 Nay – 0

ADOPTED

Mr. Scott Chatfield explains that technically there is not a subdivision map. "What we have are two maps, one which shows the overall map and the second shows a ten acre parcel that is getting ready to be conveyed". This can be done as a conditional approval. For subdivision purposes there needs to be a survey map of the entire parcel to show where the subdivision will be.

Resolution 2017-41: Motion to grant the applicant a conditional approval based upon submission to the Codes Officer a plat map by Mr. Brian Chapin dated June 19, 2017 showing the entire parcel divided into lots 1 and 2.

Motion: Bettyann Miller

Second: Elaine Hughes

Vote: Aye – 4 Nay – 0

ADOPTED

Chairman Griff fills out part 3 of the EAF (SEQRA) form.

Poolville Country Store, Special Use Permit Application, PUBLIC HEARING, 1245 Earlville Road, Poolville, Tax Map # 199.12-1-11, 12, 13.

Mr. Chatfield confers with the applicants. Mr. Chatfield informs the board that the applicants' wish to include in their application the ancillary use even though it may result in some delay.

Deputy Clerk Robertson speaks in reference to the tents. She spoke with the Codes Officer, who was unable to attend this meeting, about the tents permits. The type of permit that they will need to get from codes each year is not part of the Special Use Permit, it is a separate permit. It can be issued for 180 days at a time. Each year they can come in with the tents details for the season. They do not need to come in and get a separate permit each time. It can be issued for the entire season as long as they tent is the same.

Mr. Charles Wilburn: "Is this something that is required of the whole town?"

Mr. Chatfield: "Yes."

Mr. Wilburn: "Any one that is throwing a graduation party?"

Deputy Clerk: "If they are going to put one up periodically throughout the season? Yes. If someone is having a one-time event? Yes, they are supposed to have a permit."

Mr. Wilburn: OK

Mr. Chatfield explains that they are two different types of permits, one is a zoning issue and the other is for codes.

Chairman Griff opens the Public Hearing on this application.

The applicant explains their project. They wish to continue to run a restaurant that has been open for 34 years, along with providing seasonal accommodations, as well as including seasonal use of tents for outside events such as weddings or graduation parties, and the like. Chairman Griff asks if there is anyone who wishes to speak regarding this application.

Michael Capeto: Lives near the applicants' restaurant.

"The Poolville Country Store has been in business in our community for 34 years. It is my understanding that its original owners failed to obtain the proper paperwork. It has been very active; it has been sold twice since then. The current owner bought a business that they assumed was permitted in good faith, and it is an asset to our community, both Poolville and the surrounding area. I know people drive from far away to come here and uh... have dinner in a fine restaurant. I would encourage the board to give them the permit. I would be a shame for them to lose it after 34 years of operation. Thank you."

Mr. Dan Callahan: "For the sake of brevity and everybody I agree with everything that he said it was exactly what I was going to say."

Chairman Griff asks if there are any more comments. He inquires whether they should close the hearing or not. Mr. Chatfield informs the board of statutes 274 A&B that calls for a determination within 62 days, however if you close the hearing it does not start to run until the environmental significance determination is made. It is the board's discretion. The board discusses whether to close or not.

Resolution 2017-42: Motion to close the Public Hearing regarding the Poolville Country Store.

Motion: Bettyann Miller

Second: Elaine Hughes

Vote: Aye – 4 Nay – 0

ADOPTED

Considering the applicants wish to keep the tents as part of the Special Use Permit there are still some questions that will need to be addressed such as parking and noise. There is little information in the narrative. Mr. Wilburn states that he met with Town Supervisor Shwartz in March and that she stated that as long as it was less than 3 events a month that the on street parking as they have always had it was adequate.

Chairman Griff states that the Planning Board has discretion over parking not the Town Supervisor. These issues need to be addressed if for no other than a matter of fairness to other applicants. We need to follow the law and follow the same process no matter the applicant.

Mr. Chatfield explains that section 5.1-2 (page 14) of our zoning law spells out what is needed with regard to parking for the restaurant (section 5.1-1F) as well as for the seasonal accommodations.

Regarding the restaurant:

The requirement is that one parking space be provided per every four seats in the restaurant. The number of spaces needed, is based on the maximum occupancy of the restaurant. It is stated that the maximum capacity of the restaurant is 55, therefore need to have 13.75 parking spaces. There are some discrepancies between the submittal and the actual space available for parking. Since the site plan is not to scale it is difficult to see and measure exactly how many spaces can fit. They can fit 7 spaces along Poolville Road and five spaces on the adjacent property. One of the seven would be the handicapped space that requires an extra five feet for accessibility. A few more, adding up to ten or eleven, if you add the spaces in front of the seasonal accommodations. Though traditionally people have parked along the street, which is legal because there are no signs prohibiting it, that cannot be counted as part of the site plan or as part of the required spaces.

There is some preexisting nonconformity relating to the parking. The board will need to make a reasonable determination on that question, as well as factor in the requirements for parking for the seasonal accommodations (Section 5.1-1E, page 14). The applicant has indicated that they have 4 units for rental, four spaces are required. Additionally, there needs to be parking for employees (section 5.1-1C page 14). For the purposes of establishing a baseline for the number of spaces there will be 3 employees. They need a total of 18 spaces; the site plan demonstrates approximately 11. There is a short fall of 7. The Planning Board does have the authority to increase or decrease the number of spaces based on the evidence that is presented to them, it is up to their discretion under section 5.1-1H. This pertains only to the restaurant and the seasonal accommodations.

Resolution 2017-43: Motion for the Planning Board to use its discretionary power according to Article 5.1-1H on page 14 of the Town of Hamilton Zoning Law to reduce the number of required parking spaces from 18 to 11 for the Poolville Country Stores restaurant and seasonal accommodations.

Motion: Bettyann Miller

Second: Elaine Hughes

Vote: Aye – 4 Nay – 0

ADOPTED

The board now looks to the ancillary use for the property, specifically the tents. There are the issues of parking and noise regarding this portion of the application. There does not seem to be anything in our codes that address the number of spaces for this type of ancillary use. It does say that you can look to other industries standards in section 5.1-1H4. Using their discretion, the board has the ability to fix a number of spaces.

Chairman Griff asks if section 5.1-1B Public/Commercial Facilities would be appropriate. The Deputy Clerk states that in the past the CEO has stated that the number of spaces needed is determined by the capacity of the tent, there is a state regulation to determine that. Attorney Chatfield agrees with the chairman that sub-section 1B could be adequate. The requirements are the same as those for the restaurant.

According to the application they can have 100 -128 people in a 40'x60' tent. It is also stated that they have used similar tents that accommodate 225. That is a very wide range there. They would need from 25 to a maximum of 57 spaces, which are supposed to be on site. It is acknowledged that on street parking is allowable however the board needs to take the disruption to the community into account.

The applicant had access to an off street parking area with a previous application. Attorney Chatfield asks if they still have that right and if the area is sufficient to accommodate 25-57 vehicles.

The applicant consults with the property owner Ms. Beth Dubois; her reply is "Yes". That may be a potential solution since a variance was already granted, it was for use of a building that is no longer going to be built. However, the use will remain the same. This is a potential solution to that issue.

If a special permit is allowed for the ancillary use, that parking would be provided at an adjacent site sufficiently accommodating between 25 and 57 vehicles.

Chairman Griff refers to the parking agreement that the Dubois' had with the Partners that states that they have permission to use their property for parking.

Mr. Chatfield asks the applicants if they feel that this is an acceptable solution to the problem of events parking. The applicants verbally acknowledge "yes".

Another issue of parking that is up to the boards discretion is access. There are no sidewalks in Poolville and the lighting at night is not the Applicant has stated that they will hire a shuttle to move people to and from the tents. This is an agreeable solution.

Noise also needs to be addressed. In the past they have had amplified music, DJ's, canned music. The applicant states that they have never gone past 10 or 10:30 pm. Mr. Capetto Speaks up, it was his daughter's wedding that was 225 people, "We were required to hire a bus to take people back and forth and the music had to stop at 10 o'clock".

Mr. Wilburn: "We will not go to one or two o'clock in the morning out of respect for the community. Ten to ten-thirty at the latest."

Chairman Griff asks if there have been any complaints about noise in the past, the applicant says no and that the county did a sound study. The Chairman reminds him that the sound study was done by the county to document ambient noise, not with music playing. There have been no complaints logged at the town office.

The board has received one letter dated May 19, 2017 though it was hand delivered to the office by the author on JUNE 19, 2017. The letter is from Neill Joy and discusses noise.

It is very difficult for the board to set levels for sound because of the difficulty of measuring sound based on decibel levels on the "A scale". It is not a real indication of the intrusiveness of the sound. The board has faced this issue with other recent applications, and it is a difficult one. This application is a bit unique because this is an a long standing establishment without any record of complaints but still the board needs to establish some type of guidelines to move forward.

Mr. Chatfield explains some of the factors involved in judging sound for the audience. Much of the issue surrounding sound is subjective depending on many factors. It is a difficult problem to "nail down". One way to do that may be to conduct a simplified sound study. There have been tent events in the past. There is some discussion about an off-site party that the applicants will be doing in the near future and if it is similar enough. There may be industry standards for the tents regarding the amount of sound that they suppress.

The applicant expressed in their letter that they will not be holding any outside events this summer. With the boards consent the applicant could split the application and seek approval on the restaurant and seasonal accommodations and hold off on the tents until the board can acquire more information about any adverse effect on the neighborhood due to noise.

All other issues have been addressed rather than sound. The applicant asks about the frat parties, etc., what the minimum sound levels are for those. It is explained that the village has a sound ordinance and that the town does not. In the Village, the code is that the sound can be no more than 65 dB at the property line. There is some discussion of the sound research that the Deputy Clerk did last year and some examples of different dB levels are given. Mr. Chatfield explains the formula for measuring distance with relation to decibels. There is discussion of different methods for measuring the sound.

Chairman Griff asks the Dunham's permission to share the information about how they ran their sound study. The Dunham's agree. The Suggestion is made that they could talk and get some ideas. Mr. Chatfield warns that the situation is not "apples to apples" that the applications are different.

An audience member asks if they can make a referendum after the fact. The answer is that it is not legal and that even though some of the applications that come before this board are similar, there is enough difference to make each of them unique, and therefore what is applicable in one instance may not be applicable in another. It is important that no matter what decision is made, it is based on facts on the record.

The board would like some information from the applicant that they will be able to rely on as to what the noise levels will be so that they can make a reasonable determination as to what is the appropriate levels in the Poolville Country Store situation, in the totality of circumstances. Because this is part of the environmental review process and because the application cannot proceed with the other special permits until we complete the environmental review process we either have to table the determination on everything or we can split the application.

The applicants initially decide to bifurcate the application but ultimately decide to keep the application as it is in its totality.

The board reads through EAF (SEQRA) Part 2. With the following comments:

#3 – Moderate to large impact – Noise – Pending further information

#5 – Moderate to large impact – Off-site parking/Shuttle

#7b – Moderate to large impact – Will use portable restroom facilities for tents

The Board consults the EAF (SEQRA) Long Form, specifically question M on page 8 in the category of project operations. On part 2 of the long form, question 15 on page 8 addresses noise. The Board may choose to mix parts of the long form and the short form as they see fit, if the applicant is agreeable. The applicants verbally agree to this process to avoid having to go back and fill out the long form.

The Board has identified and eliminated all the environmental concerns but for the noise on part 3 of the EAF (SEQRA) form.

Resolution 2017-44: Motion for the Poolville Country Store to provide some information upon which the board can rely to be able to make a reasonable determination that the anticipated level of noise at the property line will be within a reasonable range.

Motion: Elaine Hughes

Second: Bettyann Miller

Vote: Aye – 4 Nay – 0

ADOPTED

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

The public hearing was closed on April 25, 2017 and part 2 of the EAF (SEQRA) was completed.

The board looks at the Sound Study that was provided by the applicant and prepared by Neal Zinsmeyer of Napierala Consulting. Chairman Griff explains how the study was done to the audience. Chairman Griff reads through the report (see attachment).

Chairman Griff explains to Attorney Chatfield that even though noise is discussed at great length in the May minutes the Town office did not receive the official report on the study until June 6, 2017. The study was done the day of the last meeting and what was presented was for informational purposes only.

The applicant completed the Long Form EAF (SEQRA) form. Attorney Chatfield asks how the question regarding noise was answered that there was concern about noise. The Board refers to the Sound information that was prepared by the Deputy Clerk to look at comparisons. There was a significant increase of noise was measured up to a 30 dB increase. That is an x8 increase.

Board Member Miller is concerned that there were no people in the barn while the test was conducted, and that could affect the readings.

Ms. Allie Dunham states that with the barn doors closed the decibel level would not be only the DJ's music but all of the noise coming from the barn in its totality.

There is some discussion as to whether people would absorb sound or if they would increase the ambient level and make it so the volume needs to be increased. No one present is a sound expert that can answer to this.

Chairman Griff had asked Mr. Zinsmeyer if he could calculate the noise levels mathematically at the different locations if the source decibels were lowered by 10 dB increments. Mr. Zinsmeyer replied that he could. That information is not included in the report. There is concern over the sufficiency of the report. Considering that the board is aware of the fact that the decibels on the A scale is not always a true indicator of how a noise is perceived.

Mr. Chatfield asks some questions regarding the structure of the barn. What type and how many doors and windows. It is explained that there is presently one barn door and that two regular pedestrian type doors will be added as well as any windows that codes will require.

Chairman Griff explains that there are many issues that codes will have to address like ventilation, and a sprinkler system to name two.

Mr. Chatfield asks about other issues that were identified as issues in the EAF (SEQRA) part 2. There was also some concern expressed about the headlights of vehicles as they drive in and out of the parking area. Mr. Chatfield explains that even though something is not identified as having a significant environmental impact, it can still be addressed with conditions. There is one condition (noise) that is a major factor; the board has received some information from Napierala Consulting. He cites Town of Hamilton Zoning Law page 58 section 8.3-8A Compatibility. Attorney Chatfield states that unless the board is comfortable the next appropriate step is to hire someone whose allegiance is strictly to the board to review this and give you their recommendations. The DEC has broad general standards for new proposals. They say that anything that raises the dB levels less than 6 dB is presumed to not have a significant effect, anything beyond that is open to interpretation; some of these levels are significantly higher.

There is some discussion of the different levels at different locations, whether the doors were open or closed, position of the speakers, and distance from the road. The chairman felt that the recommendation at the end of Mr. Zinsmeyer's report was a bit presumptuous.

The board has two choices. They can:

1. Informally get someone to review this, with the applicants consent because they will be charged with that cost.

2. Formally, by issuing a positive declaration, and requesting a review pursuant to 6NYCRR 617. That is the statute that allows you to engage the services of experts to help you analyze data that you do not fully understand so long as it does not exceed 2% of the total project cost.

Mr. Steve Skollar asks from the audience if the increase in traffic is taken into consideration for the noise, considering that a pick-up truck going past is in the report measuring at 75dB. The lights from cars are also a concern of his. Mr. Ron Burstein expresses his dismay at the owners of the property are not at the meetings and questions if it is legal for someone who does not own the property to do a project such as this.

The Chairman reminds the Audience that the hearing is closed, but that if people wish to write letters they may do so. Mr. Chatfield states that the applicants are entitled to copies of any documents submitted in writing if they are requested.

The board is in agreement that they would like to have someone with expertise take a look at this and give them some guidance. The Board may charge the expert with recommending mitigation options. The expert may be able to shed light on timber, tone and perception.

The Chairman asks the Dunhams if they want to proceed with bringing in an expert, and if that expert says that they need the sound levels to come down will they be able to negotiate some kind of sound mitigation.

Mr. Drew Dunham states that he feels the best kind of sound mitigation is turning down the dial. He is unsure what an expert could tell the board if he was not there, to help understand what these readings were.

Chairman Griff states if that for nothing else the expert could tell them if there is enough information there to make a decision.

Ms. Allie Dunham expresses concern and confusion because she felt that that was the purpose of hiring the engineer and DJ, to provide the board with some information that they did not have.

The Chairman explains that the board is representing the town and that they are not comfortable with the numbers and the procedures placed before them that they can make an informed decision. They need someone that is working for them and can make recommendations with the town in mind.

Mr. Dunham asks about the 2% cost and it is explained that it is not to exceed 2% of the cost of the total project. He states that they do not know what the cost of the project will be. Mr. Chatfield then states that they will have to use their best judgement. Mr. Dunham asks if that means he is writing a "blank check". He continues on to say that they need to get the Special

Use Permit before they can start building so he does not know the costs yet. He also inquires if the board researches sound experts and they get to approve the cost first.

Mr. Chatfield explains to the Dunhams their options, either doing this informally or with a formal Positive Declaration. The board could choose to just do the Positive Declaration, they are trying to make the process as simple as possible and less costly. It is up to the applicant.

Mr. Chatfield suggests to the Board they set up the next meeting as a scoping session, he continues on to explain how that is conducted.

The Deputy Clerk asks if they could get a contractor to give them estimates to use for their project costs? Mr. Chatfield says that it is possible or that they could propose mitigation measures, submit them to an expert of their choosing to scientifically predict what the levels would be to get them down into that range that we know that the DEC has said that is acceptable.

Chairman Griff believes that is what he asked for from Napierala. He asks if it would be possible to take the same study and go back to Mr. Zinsmeyer and have him do the calculations that Chairman Griff originally asked for.

Mr. Chatfield says that would be up to the board. It is an approach that the applicant could take if they wanted to. The applicant cannot be compelled to do that.

Chairman Griff states that he understands that. However, if they voluntarily agree to do that it could get us a little closer without them having to expend a bigger sum of money and maybe we can come to an agreement before we go to that point.

Chairman Griff: "Is that something that you would be..."

Ms. Dunham: "Absolutely, we would appreciate that a lot more."

Chairman Griff: "I am not saying that when we look at it at the end that that is going to answer all our questions but I think it is going to get us a lot closer."

Ms. Dunham: "Okay. So, the questions are now the results of if we went down 10 decibels the affect that it will be at the locations, and that we will get from the engineer, on a mathematical basis..."

Chairman Griff reads an excerpt from the previous month's minutes where he asks Mr. Zinsmeyer about the calculations for the reduction of noise.

The applicant has concerns with the perception of the noise and its interpretation, she gives the example of the truck driving by at 73dB but the music playing wasn't nearly as loud, and wonders if the information provided is not enough.

Attorney Chatfield explains that there is far more involved with sound than dB readings on the A scale. That is the reason for hiring an expert, they can give clarity to how to interpret the

information. There is no reference to mitigation in the report suggesting measures that the applicant can take to render these questions far less significant. The applicant has suggested that their mitigation would be to turn the level down. The problem with that is that there needs to be someone to monitor it.

Chairman Griff again raises the two main questions. Do they want to go to the expense of hiring an expert? And are the applicants willing to do some mitigation?

Ms. Dunham states, "So our two forms of mitigation that we are willing take on are: Planting trees in required spots, if you see in the sound test where it only went up one decibel from 56 to 57 at the intersection of Smith Road. That is because of the house and the trees in the way, so we are definitely willing to plant trees in specific areas in the path of other neighbor's houses in order to cause that barrier. And the other form is that there is technology that you can buy that will shut down the system at a certain decibel level. And so, that is kind of the way to prevent...it's like your police. It will turn it off when it gets to a certain level."

The Chairman asks if it will only let the sound system go to a certain level or if it shuts down. Deputy Clerk Robertson states that it is called a sound limiter and it shuts the system down if it goes past a certain decibel level.

The applicant expresses that they do not want to do anything to the barn, like insulation because it would destroy its authenticity, so they feel that these are that these are their only two options.

There is discussion about the construction of the barn.

Mr. Chatfield discusses the variables that go with sound and comments that they want to get this done as inexpensively as possible but that there are some serious issues.

The board has indicated that they do want to get an expert, especially one that would make mitigation recommendations. To have them just look at the sound without the mitigation recommendations would just be a waste of time. It is the Attorneys recommendation to get the expert to supplement the information that they already have, to give general guidance, or look at additional information to be presented by the applicant.

Chairman Griff cites The Town of Hamilton Zoning Law, page 64 Section 9.3-7 Reimbursable Costs.

Ms. Dunham asks if they are permitted to approve the expert that the board hires.

Mr. Chatfield explains their options and refers them to the law 6NYCRR part 617 which they can look up on-line; the Chair has referred to local regulations which do not have such limitations.

The noise is not the only issue but the sound consultant may help give enough information to help the board make a decision. There are still issues with the lights and traffic.

Mr. Chatfield explains the Environmental review process and how it differs from the permit review process.

Mr. Dunham asks if the 2% cost is advertised for the public to see. His concern is that builders will see the scope of their project and that it may affect bids on the project.

It is noted that the estimated costs should have already been known to the board in the application.

The applicants request the board to table further consideration of the noise issue pending a quotation from a qualified expert of the anticipated cost or range of costs to provide adequate guidance to the Planning Board under these circumstances which quotation will be shared with the applicant hopefully by the next meeting.

Resolution 2017-45: Motion to approve Minutes from May 15, 2017.

Motion: Bill Nolan

Second: Elaine Hughes

Vote: Aye – 4 Nay – 0

ADOPTED

The Board looks to stick to Monday nights to accommodate an applicant. The calendar is consulted.

The next meeting will be held on July 17, 2017 at 7:30 pm venue to be determined.

Resolution 2017-46: Motion to adjourn at 10:31 p.m.

Motion: Bettyann Miller

Second: Bill Nolan

Vote: Aye – 4 Nay – 0

ADOPTED

Respectfully submitted by
Elisa E. Robertson