

**MINUTES** of the Village of Montgomery Planning Board held at the Village Hall Meeting Room, 133 Clinton Street, Montgomery, on Wednesday, December 20, 2023, at 7:30 pm.

**ATTENDENCE:** Mbr. Frisbie, Mbr. Romano, Mbr. Steed, Mbr. Meyer, Mbr. Reynolds, Vlg. Atty. Joseph McKay, Vlg. Eng. Scott Sicina of Lanc & Tully, Jay Samuelson of Engineering & Surveying Properties, Trustee Conero, Trustee Picarello

**OPEN:** Mbr. Frisbie opened the meeting with the Pledge of Allegiance.

**Mbr. Steed** - By resolution of the Planning Board of Village of Montgomery, appointing Amy Frisbie as Planning Board Chairman,

**WHEREAS** on or about November 21, 2023, Kevin Conero Planning Board Member with 30 years of service as Member and Chairperson of the Planning Board resigned from the Board to accept an appointment to the position of Village Trustee on the Village of Montgomery Village Board and

**WHEREAS** on November 28, 2023, Robert Reynolds Sr. was appointed by Mayor L Stephen Brescia to fill the member position vacated with the resignation of Kevin Conero and

**WHEREAS** pursuant to section 7-718 of the New York State Village Law, in the absence of a chairperson the Planning Board may designate a member to serve as chairman. Now therefore, be it hereby resolved that after due consideration, the Planning Board hereby appoints member Amy Frisbie to serve as Chairperson of the Village of Montgomery Planning Board for the balance of her term as a member of the Board.

**A MOTION was made to APPOINT AMY FRISBIE AS CHAIRWOMAN OF THE VILLAGE OF MONTGOMERY PLANNING BOARD FOR THE BALANCE OF HER TERM AS A MEMBER OF THE BOARD by Mbr. Steed, seconded by Mbr. Romano and carried 5 Ayes, 0 Nays.**

**Chrwm. Frisbie** – There's going to be some bumps, but we'll get through it, and officially welcomed Mr. Bob Reynolds to the Board. They are very fortunate to have him with them.

### **ADJOURNED PUBLIC HEARING**

KSH is postponed.

### **OLD BUSINESS**

#### **ROWLEY DEVELOPMENT – RAILROAD AVENUE –202-13-1.123, 5.21 & 5.22**

**Jay Samuelson** of Engineering Properties is representing the applicant, Rowley Development/Brian Rivenburgh. This project basically has conditional approval subject to getting their approval from the Orange County Health Department. They went round and round with the water issue, the Village instituted the building moratorium, they cannot obtain an approval so they're asking for an extension to their conditional approval until such time the moratorium is lifted.

**Chrwm. Frisbie** - Thank you. Joe provided the Board with some context from the Village code, and it seems that they are within the authority to be able to do this, correct?

**Atty. McKay** - Yes, and he has no legal objection to the Village extending both the site plan approval and also the subdivision and the only recommendation he made is that the Board keep them to the same date whatever that is, he knows the applicant is requesting 180 days, he thinks that 180 days from today is May 20 or about May 20, 2024. They have the option just to extend it to the May Planning Board meeting in 2024 if they want to use that date, so that's really just up to the Board.

**Chrwm. Frisbie** - This has six months on the letter that they received, so that would take them into June. That is 6 months from today; takes them into that but it's based on when the initial filing was.

**Atty. McKay** - This goes back to the way our code is drafted. It doesn't really say approval beginning on a certain date and ending on a certain date or extensions beginning on a certain date ending on a certain date, so the way I prepared the resolution was accepting that they were entitled to an extension using today's date as the starting date of that extension and going forward for the amount of time that they requested which would be 180 days, which would be approximately May 20<sup>th</sup>. I don't know if that's on 179 days or 178 days.

**Chrwm. Frisbie** – If they could make it May 22<sup>nd</sup>, which is our Board meeting, then at that time they can revisit if an additional extension is needed.

**A MOTION was made to APPROVE A SIX-MONTH EXTENTION TO ROWLEY DEVELOPMENT - RAILROAD AVENUE, FOR SITE PLAN AND SUBDIVIDION by Mbr. Steed, seconded by Mbr. Meyer and carried 5-Ayes, 0-Nays.**

#### **BUTLER CONSTRUCTION GROUP – 213-3-5**

**Jay Samuelson** is representing the applicant. They were there in Octoboer and were granted conditional preliminary approval. They went to the Village Board in November, received Village Board approval based upon that section of law for being greater than 4000 square feet, so tonight they're there just to adopt the conditional final; but this is not subject to the moratorium because they had SEQR completed prior to the issuance of that moratorium, and they have their our own well and septic.

**Atty. McKay** - He provided the Board with a draft of the final approval. It is virtually identical to the approval that the Board granted the last time, the only difference is a recitation of an engineering comment from Scott which was later responded to by Engineering and Surveying Properties and those things are there. It also makes reference to the fact that the Village Board has now subsequently approved this Board's preliminary approval and other than that the word preliminary has been changed to final, those are the only changes to the document. I have no legal objection if the Board wanted to go forward and approve that tonight.

**Chrwm. Frisbie** - Does anyone have any questions or comments?

**Mbr. Reynolds** - In the future, if there is water and sewer provided along that roadway, are they required to tie into that?

**Scott Sicina** - He'd have to look in the Village code. There are a lot of municipalities that would have a provision giving them a certain amount of time with which they would have to make connections. Most

municipalities have that code that way if you extend something there everybody starts connecting. Not out there for no reason.

**A MOTION was made to APPROVE THE FINAL RESOLUTION OF CONDITIONAL SITE PLAN AND SPECIAL EXCEPTION USE FOR BUTLER CONSTRUCTION GROUP, INC. by Mbr. Romans, seconded by Mbr. Steed and carried 4-Ayes, 0-Nays, 1- Abstain (Mbr. Reynolds).**

### **81 Union Street – 206-1-9**

**Jay Samuelson** is representing the applicant. They were there in November and had their discussion about the variances that had been obtained. They received comments from Lanc & Tully's office. They have responded to them and resubmitted. They addressed all the comments. They did go to the AHRB this month and met with them. They did not make a final decision. They wanted him to come back and talk to you guys about it because they had two things they wanted to discuss.

The first one was they had requested that we make a lot line here and not here (indicates on site plan). They had asked if we could get rid of this and make a lot line in this general vicinity, and this was a request made by one of the members. His feeling was that Meade Alley was a service alley and with this subdivision, this lot no longer had access to the service alley, so by doing this they would still have property available on Meade. His original comment about it was so that they could put a driveway or a garage in. He (Jay) said, well that's highly unlikely because the driveway would be too close to the intersection no matter which way they went. They already have provisions for parking for both lots in the existing parking area. He says they don't have a garage now. He (Jay) said if they ever wanted a garage, no matter where they drew this line, they would have to come back and get a variance and he's not sure that the Village really wants another building on this corner.

**Mbr. Romano** – She doesn't know why everyone's jumping to the building, but wouldn't that alleviate the easement for the parking?

**Jay Samuelson** – No, where would they park because this is all lawn.

**Mbr. Romano** – Isn't it pretty much blacktopped there?

**Jay Samuelson** – No, this area here is all gone. There's a gravel parking area back here. They want to get rid of this and give lot 1, which is the existing house, some frontage on Meade Alley. He understands it but the reasoning was to put some sort of garage on this corner for access where it comes in, because we told them no matter which way they do it, the garage doors would face this garage. (Indicates on site plan) So, the garage would be here with garage doors coming in this way. No matter what we did here, additional easements or additional variances would be required for that building. He doesn't have an objection to it, he can still make this lot meet zoning. He doesn't know if he necessarily agrees with it but if that's what everybody, if the Board feels that makes more sense, and architecturally and legally they still meet their lot area for this building, he'll do it. He wanted to bring it back and discuss it.

**Chrwm. Frisbie** - Have you looked at the size and how it would work with the lot size?

**Jay Samuelson** - They'll still be able to meet the minimum lot size for this lot don't know exactly where this lot line would be, it would be somewhere right around the edge of the parking area, but no matter where he put the setback, he would still be required to get a variance to put any type of garage in there.

**Mbr. Meyer** – This is in a historical district, what are the historical aesthetics going to look like if we're looking even at them from the street? Or the back end of the garage?

**Chrw. Frisbie** - That's just hypothetical if they were ever...

**Jay Samuelson** – He (AHRB Member) said it gives the appearance that this lot still has lawn area and access to that. They still legally have access to it through this driveway and this is going to remain as lawn, it still gives that appearance, but this lawn area wouldn't be for their use. That's the only difference. he doesn't have a preference either way, if the Board feels that they agree and that's where they want the lot line, they can adjust it. It still needs the same intent. He can still meet the lot area on lot 2 but he wanted to come back and discuss it with them before they agreed on anything.

**Mbr. Steed** – Can they see a revision? Which would include the new property line.

**Jay Samuelson** – Yes, he can draft it up, but again it's literally going to be a lot line that is so...he could get about 60 feet off this corner (indicates on site plan), is where the lot line would be to make this still be 5000 square feet. He could only go about 60 feet which is roughly about where he has the easement line drawn now for the parking. It's pretty close to being right here (indicates on site plan) ±4 or five feet.

**Mbr. Steed** – Then you'll present it to them?

**Jay Samuelson** - He discussed it with them. He told them the same thing. He even has, they can see the same kind of marks at the AHRB meeting. Here's his drawing, so it's a matter of whether they want the line here or not. It's not going to change anything on this plan other than this line being drawn here or this line being drawn here.

**Mbr. Meyer** - Either way they're still considering building a garage.

**Jay Samuelson** – No, this was the Architectural Board's request. They have no intention of building that garage ever.

**Chrw. Frisbie** - This in front of the garage, is this gravel or is this green. Where it says a lot 2?

**Jay Samuelson** – This is green.

**Chrw. Frisbie** - Because if you remove that end, there's no green.

**Jay Samuelson** - The actual entrance into that unit is back here, but the rest is all green.

**Mbr. Reynolds** – The existing curb cut that's on Boyd Street.

**Jay Samuelson** - It's been there forever, there's no intention to use it. It's overgrown; we've done some trimming; they've made additional notes for them to go back in there and clean some more up to make sure they get adequate site distance coming out of Meade.

**Mbr. Reynolds** - But in the future, could you put, if they put the garage there, they could come in off of Boyd Street into it?

**Jay Samuelson** - They could but it would have to come back to this Board and the ZBA to get approval because it's in the historic district, it wouldn't fit within setbacks, so it's got to go through all the approvals if somebody really wanted to do that. The applicant has no intention whatsoever of building that. This was purely a request of the AHRB.

**Mbr. Reynolds** – It would make sense to change the property line for the future to do that though if they wanted to go through all that...

**Jay Samuelson** - He couldn't move this over enough to not get a variance and still meet lot area for this lot. He couldn't meet the minimum lot area if I took this any further to be able to construct the building within the setbacks over here. Again, this is not something they want to do with the garage, this was a theoretical from Bob Williams.

**Mbr. Romano** – She doesn't see the point of changing it unless they can alleviate a couple of parking spots.

**Chrwm. Frisbie** – She doesn't see the point of changing it and asked Scott his thoughts.

**Scott Sicina** - I mean access on the corner, as Jay pointed out, you're not going to be able to put a driveway in most likely because of the relationship with how far away it's supposed to be from an intersection. I think also, as Jay is pointing out, you're not going to really be able to face that garage out on either of those roads, so to be facing internally into the property, you're going to be looking at the back of the garage, so I think it's a little odd. He doesn't see where the historical or, and he's not on the AHRB Board so, he doesn't pretend to know that.

**Jay Samuelson** - There are other lots that, along Union Street that don't have access to Meade, as well. They would still have to utilize the existing easement to access the lot and then cross over the property line to get into the garage.

**Chrwm. Frisbie** - They're just basically saying it's the configuration of the lot.

**Jay Samuelson** – They would rather not increase the gravel area that they have here, just utilize what they have there rather than creating additional impervious on this corner and something else.

**Mbr. Romano** - If they can make the gravel area smaller for the second lot and give the house access to the back for their garbage or to pull up a car, even at the property line.

**Jay Samuelson** - They do with the plan that we're proposing. This lot will be able to pull in this driveway, park in on these gravel spots; they'll have two of these spots reserved for them. Two spots are reserved for the barn. The utilities for this building go through that area so there is a reservation because it's owned by the same person. We can't grant an easement to ourselves. This person can't grant themselves...so there's a

reservation in here, we are going to file a deed restriction upon approval saying that if this lot is ever sold, then an easement and a maintenance agreement must be filed. They have all of those aspects except for that garage which, who knows if anybody's even going to want it and we're changing and making this a smaller lot. They need zoning, it's an aesthetic thing on a map. He brought it to them to discuss.

**Chrwm. Frisbie** - The Zoning Board has already taken and given variances in the historic district where they (The Planning Board) didn't anticipate they were going to do that, so they've already created something with a nonconforming lot in the historic district. That's out of their capacity to be able to control that right. The Zoning Board did that, so she thinks that this makes no sense why they have to now have lots that conform to the architectural, whatever, historic aspects. It was taken out of our hands to control this when the Zoning Board granted all the variances in the historic district, so while she understands the concerns, she doesn't think it makes any sense.

**Mbr. Romano** - The only reason it would make sense is if they were in the parking lot, the easement for the parking was eliminated where they could park on their own. Forget the garage that whoever is talking about. So, if that's not happening where they can park in the back, then why?

**Chrwm. Frisbie** - There's no way for them to access it utilizing this space. It doesn't make any sense.

**Mbr. Meyer** - Unless the line changes make it more likely to build the garage in the future. So, if you leave the line, is it less likely that they would build it in the future? Would it make it more difficult?

**Jay Samuelson** - They wouldn't be able to do it at all without more variances.

**Mbr. Meyer** - So, to change it, that leaves open the possibility of putting the garage in.

**Scott Sicina** - The only thing I'm looking at here Jay, he calculated quick, if they shift that down lot 2, was I was thinking building coverage, so if lot 2 stays the way that it is now, I'm not sure if they would put a garage on there that they'd be able to meet the building coverage code.

**Jay Samuelson** - No, the garage would go on lot 1.

**Scott Sicina** - If lot 2 would remain the way it is shown now, and then lot 2 would come in and say well we want to put a garage over here,

**Jay Samuelson** - Lot 2 already has a garage in the building itself so shouldn't need another one. The garage discussion was for a lot 1.

**Scott Sicina** - What he's saying is that Scott's right. This does give the potential for a garage to be constructed in the future because there's now space for it if this lot line is changed the way that the AHRB would like to change it. If they don't change it, he doesn't think either lot would be able to put a garage so if you don't have them change the property line, they're likely should never ever be a garage there.

**Mbr. Meyer** - With the aesthetics and everything else involved whether it should be there anyway.

**Jay Samuelson** - He's not sure the historical board would approve a building there and he doesn't want to ask them.

Too many people speaking at once.

**Mbr. Reynolds** – This is a big house. Let's just say there are 4 bedrooms. They've got kids that are growing up. They'll be 16 years old, where are they going to park? They've got two parking spots.

**Jay Samuelson** - There's six total. There are four spots and two in the garage, in the existing building. They could extend the gravel towards the corner if they needed to create more spots, as opposed to building a garage, but that's nothing they're proposing.

**Jay Samuelson** - The second issue. He submitted copies of pictures that they all got. Let's go back. So, the existing building before he made repairs, the outside bottom of the building was all rotted and covered with a piece of plywood; right here, on the outside on the bottom. He went and replaced it. First of all, he jacked up the building to level it out and make it more stable and secure and structurally sound. When he did that, he put a stone façade, to show a stone foundation around the base of it. Apparently, this is not historically period correct and they're not sure if they like this or not. They wanted to know the opinion of SHPO, because we did send this to SHPO because it was in the historic district. We got the letter back from SHPO saying they had no issues with any of the work that's been done.

**Mbr. Meyer** - Who had an issue in the first place?

**Jay Samuelson** – The AHRB.

**Deputy Clerk Murphy** – (Asked if she could speak). He (the applicant) went to the building inspector who called the Chairman of the AHRB. They discussed it without having to bring it to the AHRB, that's why he was allowed to do it.

**Jay Samuelson** – There are a lot of barns that I've seen that have stone foundations on them. He thinks a lot of it has to do with the drip ledge. The reason the stone was put on there was that gutters weren't put on the roof because gutters are not architecturally historic in in that area on the barn. But when the water runs off the roof, it hits the ground and jumps back up against the building, so that's what was rotting all the plywood. They didn't say they weren't going to approve; they actually made a motion to accept it with a note saying that if the barn was ever remodeled, it would be removed. There was a motion made, but it never got submitted, so they said we'll see what SHPO has to say, see what the Planning Board has to say, and they sent some of this stuff to Elise and haven't heard back from her yet. SHPO said that they have no issue with it. He's going to let them form an opinion on it. He's going to wait until he hears from Elise and then go back and ask them to make a decision on it one way or another.

**Mbr. Romano** - There's nothing they could say about that, that's historical.

**Jay Samuelson** - They have a visual. They can look at it as it pertains to a visual impact. Right?

**Atty. McKay** - Before you start referring it to SHPO...

**Jay Samuelson** - They already referred it to SHPO because this whole place is in the historic district.

**Atty. McKay** – Yes, there was the first referral right but now you just said that the board is asking potentially to refer it back to SHPO...

**Jay Samuelson** – They knew he referred it to SHPO; they didn't have SHPO's response at the time. These exact pictures went to SHPO. They submitted to them before they even submitted to AHRB. They received the response from SHPO on the 14<sup>th</sup>. They are still waiting on Elise.

**Atty. McKay** - Maybe there needs to be clarification between two members of both the AHRB and the Planning Board to try to determine whether or not there should be some kind of modification, or at least to clarify what they're proposing that the modification would be so that this Board could act. Which leads to something that Scott had suggested previously. He had a quick call today, Scott Amy and himself, just to go over the agenda, and it's not really something to discuss for him tonight but one of the things being, which Scott has suggested in the past, having TAPPED meetings, but certainly in some of the larger projects that we have they would be helpful. The only reason he raises it, with respect to this which is a small project, is only to try to have clarification between the two boards. So, having future TAP meetings is something that he thinks jointly Scott and Amy are going to recommend to the Board, he would not attend them unless necessary. So, going forward, the Board should discuss if they should be done regularly, set a schedule so they can occur as needed, who will present, who will be present on a rotating basis. The Board can figure out all those things.

The question is, do you want to set up a meeting or call the AHRB to try to get some clarification on if there's going to be a lot line change? Where? How? If it's necessary. If it comes back as a recommendation from AHRB, this Board will know what its position is and either accept it or reject it. Still waiting for Elise's comments anyway, so now the issue of the AHRB not being pleased with the something that they did with respect to the foundation?

**Jay Samuelson** - They took a plywood skirt off, wainscoting, and put stone back up.

**Mbr. Reynolds** – There was no foundation?

**Jay Samuelson** – There was a flat one in there. It was a slab. He believes there was a lot of concrete work. They did a lot of foundation work and support; they raised the building up in some corners over a foot to level it all off. He doesn't know exactly what structurally was done but they covered the whole outside...yes, that's the whole issue. Permits were issued for all of this prior to coming to any of these Boards. It was raised up to level the building, structurally stabilize it and to cover up the now gaps that they had...

**Mbr. Romano** - As long as Bruce inspected it.

**Jay Samuelson** - The structural repair permit he believes is closed out and now the current permit is the conversion to residential use. There were two permits issued, one for structural repair and one to convert.

**Scott Sicina** – Asked Jay if he knew when that all happened.

**Jay Samuelson** – They got involved in August. It (the work) was done before they got involved.

**Mbr. Reynolds** – There were two permits. The structural permit but it was to raise it as a garage and now it's going to be converted to a...



**Jay Samuelson** - There was a permit to structurally stabilize the structure. There was no change of use at that time. The second permit was issued to convert it to a residence.

**Mbr. Reynolds** - So, if you convert it to a residence does that change the difference of requirements on the structure?

**Jay Samuelson** - I don't do interior buildings. I don't know that answer. That's the building inspector question.

**Chrwm. Frisbie** – So, regarding this aspect of the submission, they need to have a conversation with the AHRB, maybe a member or two from this Board. She asks Scott if he would attend so that we can better understand their concerns with the lot line. They can hear it directly from them and then hear directly this second issue, with regards to the visual aspects of the stone on the bottom of the building.

**Atty. McKay** – He suggested they wait until after receiving Elise's comments.

**Chrwm. Frisbie** – Regarding Scott's comments, so item number 1, which is the request of the Board to waive the Village code requirement around off-street parking with regards to curbing, pavement, striping and drainage facilities. They know obviously that four stone posts have been there. Did he have anything that he wanted to add regarding any of the items on his list?

**Scott Sicina** - He didn't cover the last meeting; John O'Rourke was there and covered the meeting. There was a note that he had in his notes that the Planning Board requested that the front entrance be paved. He didn't know to what extent that was being requested, if that is still being requested.

**Chrwm. Frisbie** - She had asked the question if their code required a certain frontage.

**Jay Samuelson** – It was whether the code required it not if it should be done.

**Scott Sicina** – Technically, the code requires it in the sense that all parking lots are supposed to be paved and curbed, the Planning Board does have the authority to waive that so I think you'd be well within your rights to say if you want an apron, you could specify a certain point to which it should end. If it's not the whole parking lot or if you say that the whole parking lot...

**Mbr. Romano** – She feels it will alter the historic aspect of it, especially the fact that it's so gravely is concerning, too. But I think if you add curbing and everything else it'll make it worse. It'll look like an office.

**Chrwm. Frisbie** agreed. She thinks it will make it look like an office. Her concern was directly right off the roadway, if there was some amount of pavement to reduce the dirt coming on to Meade Alley.

**Scott Sicina** –That's their decision. They have the ability to authorize them to pave it, partially pave it or remove the requirement. Other municipalities that require it, it's up to the right of way line. There would be Village control. With that being said, something to take into account, if something had to be repaired in there, by the Village and now there's pavement, the Village will have to replace that pavement if they go in and dig it up.

**Mbr. Romano** suggested, her neighbor's driveway has something that looks like lattice on it. When you're looking at her house, you see grass but it's strong. She would love to see that there especially in such a high visibility area, maybe the whole thing.

**Scott Sicina** - He would mention on that, is if it's a straight or linear driveway, it does tend to work a lot better. But where you want it, as they pull in off of Meade Alley, they're going to have to immediately make a turn, so what you end up with is while those pieces are structurally solid, once they get off of them, they might end up running on the side and they'll become unlevel.

**Mbr. Meyer** – What precedent, if any, do they have, how they've handled this in the past? When he envisions gravel, it could get messy. It might pour out onto Meade.

**Chrwm. Frisbie** – Her only thought down the road, he's going to own both of these properties so he obviously has whatever he can use, the this piece to be able to access the other, but down the road he sells off the big house and now that he's got a grant an easement there for them to be able to utilize this and then with an easement comes maintenance requirements and with maintenance it's sometimes easier to maintain if it's paved or if it's a more solid surface. I didn't know if that's something that we should consider at this juncture, granted it's the same owner and maybe this is also something we could talk to the AHRB.

**Scott Sicina** - It's something you don't have to make a decision on tonight. they're going to have a meeting with HRV it's something good to bring up with them and maybe they have an opinion on it that works for you guys.

**Chrwm. Frisbie** – The last thing that she knows, Sophia brought up the water.

**Mbr. Romano** – She asked them last month to show her the connection at the water main.

**Jay Samuelson** - There's one connection on the water main. When this was done, he (the applicant) had met Buddy and the water department out there he asked them to originally just connect into the existing main that went to the existing house and pull service off the house. Buddy said no, because now you're going to have two services. You need two separate meters, which once you have a separate meter, then yes you can come off the same the same line. That's what was done.

**Mbr. Romano** - If he sells it in the future...

**Jay Samuelson** – There's still two meters.

**Mbr. Romano** – It's not the meters, it's where do they tap? Do they tap in two different spots?

**Jay Samuelson** – Again, that's going to be part of the common maintenance agreement that both units are going to have to share.

**Mbr. Romano** - But in our Zoning, she was told, each building has to have its own line off the main.

**Jay Samuelson** – He agreed. And the applicant asked Buddy that and he said, no you can tap here as long as you have to...

**Mbr. Romano** – But that was before he subdivided. It's a subdivision. Any subdivision has to have its own water main.

**Scott Sicina** – They can have a discussion with Buddy about it. Jay, we know it's definitely one tap off the main, correct?

**Jay Samuelson** - There's two taps for the sewer, one tap for the water.

**Mbr. Romano** - The sewer, she saw on the map that it's two.

**Chrwm. Frisbie** - It has to be directly connected to the Village water and sewer.

**Mbr. Romano** - Each building has to be.

**Scott Sicina** – What they're on is each premises shall be supplied through a separate street service connection curb and box so, do we know if it was made after the curb stop or was it made prior?

**Jay Samuelson** - He doesn't know but he can find out.

**Scott Sicina** - He'll keep talking buddy about this and see what info he might have and if he has any info from the applicant...

**Chrwm. Frisbie** - Scott is going to talk to Buddy about this.

**Jay Samuelson** – Can they schedule a public hearing to see if there's any more comments and concerns from the public while we're going through all this?

**Mbr Romano** – Were there any concerns at the Zoning Board public hearing?

**Jay Samuelson** - Not a single person showed up.

**Chrwm. Frisbie** - They're going to have to wait anyway,

**Jay Samuelson** – We can leave it open but at least get it on the books to see if anybody wants to come now it's... I'm not asking that we close it in January because there's going to be stuff open but at least let's get it started and see if anybody has to say anything,

**Mbr. Romano** - Thinks they should address the property line first, instead of going to public hearing.

**Jay Samuelson** – Let them know if they want them at that meeting or if you don't want us at that meeting and that it happens before the next scheduled Planning Board meeting.

**Chrwn. Frisbie** – She said it doesn't make sense to not have you guys there and just iron all this out with them, so she thinks that makes sense. It's the best use of everybody's time and they can figure this out.

**MINUTES**

**A MOTION was made to APPROVE THE NOVEMBER 15, 2023, MINUTES by Mbr. Meyer, seconded by Mbr. Romano and carried 4 Ayes, 0 Nays, 1-Abstain.**

**ADJOURNMENT**

**A MOTION was made to ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:26PM by Mbr. Steed, seconded by Mbr. Romano and carried 5 Ayes, 0 Nays.**

---

Tina Murphy, Deputy Village Clerk