

**TOWN OF GREENFIELD**

**PLANNING BOARD**

**JULY 25, 2006**

**REGULAR MEETING**

A regular meeting of the Town of Greenfield Planning Board is called to order by Gary Dake at 7:00 p.m. On roll call, the following members are present: Gary Dake, Tonya Yasenchak, Dan Cochran, Lorna Dupouy, Thomas Siragusa, John Streit, Michael Thraikill, and Mark Young. Charlie Baker, Town Engineer is present. Gerry McKenna, Zoning Administrator, is absent.

---

**JULY 11, 2006 MINUTES**

MOTION: T. Yasenchak

SECOND: M. Thraikill

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board waives the reading of and accepts the minutes of July 11, 2006, with the following corrections:

- Correction - ...Mrs. Rossi is a friend of Cathy **Cleary**

VOTE: Ayes: Dake, Cochran, Dupouy, Siragusa, Thraikill, Yasenchak, Young

Noes: None

---

**PLANNING BOARD CASES**

**JELENIK CONSTRUCTION – Major Subdivision**

Greene Road

T. Yasenchak recuses herself. Dave Godomski, Project Manager, is present representing this application.

A public hearing is opened at 7:02 p.m. D. Godomski reviews that they are proposing 7 lots along an existing private road. There is an existing stream crossing that will need to be brought up to code. He states that they have completed test holes; they have had a soil scientist on site and the soil meets code. Bill Ure, states that he has seen the plans and read the previous minutes. He states that the problem he sees is that he owns the road. G. Dake states that is a significant issue. There being no further public comment, this public hearing is closed at 7:05 p.m.

G. Dake states that B. Ure's comment would be a major stumbling block. D. Godomski states that this is new information and he only found that out today. He states that he has been working with B. Ure for months now, so he is sure that information is true. He states that they are proposing this as a Town Road and it would be deeded over to the Town. G. Dake states that it would be difficult for the applicant to give the Town something that belongs to someone else. He states that to even begin the process, negotiations would have to take place between Jelenik Construction and B. Ure, getting permission to do that. It would be a deal killer if they do not have access. Demonstrating ownership and control of the road, and depending on how B. Ure feels about the project, if this road becomes a Town Road, it would also give B. Ure's property road front access to some of his rear parcels. G. Dake states that we did get a response from DEC regarding lead

July 25, 2006

agency with a couple of issues that they have. There is a July 19<sup>th</sup> letter from EDP regarding engineering issues. D. Godomski states that he does have a copy, but has not had a chance to address the issues. C. Baker reviews that the key issues are the road; drainage; the utilities are currently overhead and he questions how that will be handled. Typically new subdivisions are underground utilities. G. Dake asks B. Ure if he owns the power lines. B. Ure states that he does not know for sure, but believes the power company owns it. He did grant them a right of way across the property. C. Baker states that this is a major subdivision and the typical engineering issues need to be addressed in addition to the structural design for the bridge. He has not discussed this with W. Barss yet, but did look in the AASHTO requirements for local town roads. The Board consensus is that there are a number of engineering issues to be discussed, but not until the road issue is clarified. The members who visited the site believe that it is a great site and did not see any questions regarding house placement, etc. M. Thraikill asks if the applicant is buying this parcel from B. Ure. D. Godomski states that they have the parcel under contract with contingencies, not from B. Ure.

---

**JELNIK CONSTRUCTION – Minor Subdivision**

Braim Road

T. Yasenchak recuses herself. Dave Godomski, Project Manager, and Clark Wilkinson, Engineer, are present for the application. G. Dake refers to the Zoning Board minutes where the applicant received an area variance for proposed lot 2. D. Godomski states that D. Jelenik purchased this with the hopes of subdividing it into 3 lots, but is now seeking two lots. The soil conditions at the site are a problem. C. Wilkinson states that lot 1 has a septic system design, which has been submitted to DOH, designed by Paul Male, and perc tests have been completed on lot 2 with Mike Shaw witnessing. C. Baker has not witnessed either one. G. Dake states that rumor has it that M. Shaw was not awed by the performance. D. Godomski states that they are going to put in a shallow system with a pump as M. Shaw asked them to do. He states that the septic design was sent to M. Shaw, was misplaced and they have provided him with another copy. C. Baker states that he would like to see topo; any existing buildings; septic locations; test pit information; wetlands or a signoff that there are no wetlands as M. Shaw felt that there were wetlands here; and an update from DOH. M. Young states there appears to be engineering issues and that he believes that two houses fit the area. Regarding sight distance, he states that the Highway Department is planning to do some work on Daniels Road and there will need to be some trimming from the corner of Braim along this property along Daniels Road. G. Dake states that perhaps the applicant could be asked to do this. M. Young states that perhaps during the subdivision process clearing could be looked at. G. Dake asks if this is a curve issue or vegetation issue. M. Young states that it is vegetation. M. Thraikill asks about the power lines. They do not cross this property but run along the eastern boundary. G. Dake explains that there was a public hearing held by the ZBA, neighbors do not feel that 3-acre lots fit the area, and the ZBA did grant the variances. From a Zoning standpoint, they do have the right to do that with their property. A public hearing is scheduled for August 8, 2006 at 7:00 p.m.

---

**UMH PROPERTIES – Site Plan Review**

Brookview MHP/Route 9N

No one is present representing this application.

---

**HARRY VRADENBURG – Major Subdivision**

Dunham Pond and King Road

Harry Vradenburg, his daughter Janet Vitek and Drew Schaufert are present. D. Schaufert reviews that there are 116-acres on which there will be a lot line adjustment done between the existing house and adjacent lot, and the remainder of the property will become 5 lots. There are extensive wetlands and they

July 25, 2006

have been delineated. Perc tests have been conducted and all the tests were very good and should be good for conventional systems. C. Baker states that his March 9, 2006 letter addressed concerns with lot 3 and he does not feel that there is a very big building envelope on that lot. He had suggested that some test borings be done to demonstrate the seasonal water table; topo is on the map; also needed would be storm water Notice of Intent and an erosion control plan. Wetlands delineation has been done. D. Schauffert states that they can do some soil borings and he will take care of the storm water issues. G. Dake suggests demonstrating that lot 3 has a building area. T. Siragusa asks about lot 4. D. Schauffert states that J. Vitek has talked about building herself a home on the high ground. Board consensus is that lot 3 issues need to be addressed. G. Dake states that this is a great plan, as long as the engineering issues can be addressed. A public hearing is scheduled for August 8, 2006 at 7:00 p.m.

---

**SCOTT FORO – Site Plan Review**

Whispering Pines, Sand Hill Road

No one is present representing this application

---

**JEFFREY COLLURA – Major Subdivision**

Locust Grove Road

Jeffrey Collura is present with a preliminary drawing and would like input from the Board regarding subdivision of lands at the corner of Griffen Road and Locust Grove Road. J. Collura states that he is unsure of where the road ends and states that he could put a turnaround area for the snowplow at the end of his property and indicates the location on his map. Discussion takes place regarding exactly where Griffen Road ends and W. Barss explains that they currently plow to the gate on P. Aven's property. He states that ideally he would like to see a turnaround area at the edge of the property. W. Barss states that he will investigate where the road actually ends. G. Dake explains that under the new zoning, this area of the Town will be going to 6-acre zoning and that he would prefer to see this subdivision with 6-acre lots with Griffen Road brought up to Town specs as the applicant will be adding to the volume of traffic on the road. Discussion takes place regarding which property to the north of Griffen is vacant. J. Collura questions at what point in the process any grandfathering would take place. G. Dake states that will be up to the Town Board and he would much rather keep them from having to make that decision and this is still in the concept phases. He states that the Zoning rewrite Committee has turned the document over to the Town Board and that he does not believe the Town Board has had any discussion on the subject yet. J. Collura questions the legal ramifications of not approving something as it is presented and questions when the new zoning will be approved. G. Dake states that he believes it will be a faster review for the applicant with 6-acre lots. M. Young asks if J. Collura has had any conversations with P. Aven. J. Collura states that he has and likes the plowing arrangement as it is. M. Young states that he would be for requesting that the applicant do some major improvements to Griffen Lane, and asks if the applicant thought at all about bringing another road out to Locust Grove or bringing Griffen back on to itself and not create another cul-de-sac. G. Dake states that the applicant might get more lots that way. J. Collura states that he has not ruled anything out. M. Young states that if the Town continues to maintain Griffen to the point that it does now, and then the applicant creates this cul-de-sac, what bothers him is that it becomes a confusing little piece of roadway for the Town. He states that he would like to see the applicant do a little more work with the neighbor and in the planning perhaps do another access onto the road or something different there. G. Dake agrees with the confusion and states that it hinges on where the Town's responsibility ends, because if it does end at that line, then he thinks the applicant goes back and builds a cul-de-sac, paves the cul-de-sac, and not the driveway, and then the issue is resolved. He thinks that could potentially solve this, but it hinges on where the Town's legal responsibility ends. J. Collura asks what the road frontage requirements will be and G. Dake states that he does not recall. The setbacks and frontage do not vary dramatically from what is there. T. Yasenach asks about sight distance. J. Collura indicates the crest of the hill and states that was a consideration when doing

July 25, 2006

the east side of the road and the placement of the driveways. G. Dake states that driveway sight distance is different from intersection sight distance. G. Dake discusses how the sight distance issue on Locust Grove Road would be solved by having access from Griffen Road. Cluster developments are discussed and possible configurations.

---

**STEVE SMERO – Site Plan Review/Special Use Permit**

Route 9N

Steve Smero, Jama Peacock and Charles Sableski are present. L. Dupouy discloses that she has no financial standing or anything to gain, but has a connection to J. Peacock, the proposed tenant of the building. C. Sableski reviews that they are proposing a 2-story doctor's office for the property at 3102 Route 9N. This would consist of approximately 7000 square feet of medical offices with 28 parking spaces - 1 per 250 square feet of leaseable area; there will be one handicapped space and an ambulance pick-up area. C. Sableski indicates the areas that will be plantings or lawn and they are proposing to narrow the entrance from 80' to 24' allowing for some green space in the front. There will be a new 1250 gallon septic system, which is being designed by Keith Manz and will have 3 drywells along Route 9N. G. Dake suggests considering reserving the parking areas at the north edge of the parking lot for future expansion so that there can be more green space. He does not believe that all of the parking as presented will be needed initially. G. McKenna will need to review the map and buffer issues are a concern. He believes that DOT should not have a problem with the proposal for narrowing the driveway or for taking storm water out of their drainage system. M. Young states that overall it looks good and asks about the doors on S. Greenfield Road. C. Sableski states that two of those will be left. M. Young questions that these will be for fire exits only with no parking as that was an issue previously. M. Thrailkill states that the concept looks good, states that he believes in Wilton any medical building must have public water and sewer, and questions that this is a DOH or Wilton rule. G. Dake states that he believes it depends. If you want to be a doctor's office, like McGregor Medical he believes is still served by well, because it is a doctor's office. The Urgent Care out at Exit 15, that has a CON from the DOH, therefore that is DOH regulated and they need to have municipal water or DOH approved public water treatment. Prestwick Chase and the Stewart's Plant both have State regulated water systems where they have chlorinators, UV, etc. J. Streit asks the number of doctor's who will be in this building. J. Peacock states there are currently 4 provider offices and there are two local doctors, herself included, plus a nurse practitioner. She anticipates anywhere from 5 to 6 providers. J. Streit states that he thinks that will fill up the parking that is indicated as necessary from the beginning. If they have 8 employees plus providers, you pretty much fill up the southern portion of the lot. L. Dupouy asks about an architectural elevation. S. Smero states that initially he had thought about doing a cupola but he knows that there is a height restriction. T. Yasenchak states that according to the way G. McKenna is interpreting height, that 35' would be the floor level of the highest story as in the application of Saratoga Polo. Discussion takes place that the exterior will remain wood siding, it may possibly be a different color. L. Dupouy states that she believes they will need all of the parking spaces suggested. T. Siragusa asks the type of practice. J. Peacock states that it will be a family practice. T. Siragusa asks about the pre-existing buried fuel tanks on the property. S. Smero states that they were removed and written off by DEC. T. Yasenchak states that she likes the project and asks where the main entrance will be. C. Sableski indicates this and states that sidewalks will be at grade level. T. Yasenchak questions the entrances on S. Greenfield Road being over the property line. S. Smero states that he has discussed this with G. McKenna who does not have a problem. He is not going to reconstruct the porch, just put a copper roof on it. G. Dake asks about signage. J. Peacock states that they are thinking of something along the front of the building and she is working on a logo. C. Baker would like to see detail on the well, assumes it is going to be a public water supply and states that the applicant should initiate a conversation with DOH. S. Smero states that K. Manz suggested putting a chlorinator in the system. C. Baker states that he likes the project and thinks it is a great use for the property, but has a concern with the septic system. It doesn't look like there is enough area to do it the way it is shown. S. Smero states that he believes K. Manz is detailing that. A public hearing is discussed and set for August 8, 2006 at 7:00 p.m. and SEQRA will be discussed. C. Baker states that this may not require SEQRA. T.

July 25, 2006

Yasenchak asks that the applicant define a little more what is being suggested for the buffer planting. C. Sableski will do a plan showing what types of plantings will be done. Signage is further discussed as to the type of sign that the Board likes to see.

---

### **DAVID EVANS – Lot Line Adjustments**

Plank Road

D. Evans is present and explains that on the one application, all the lot lines are being moved to the north west to give a little more frontage to the lot that he would like to subdivide. He has two applications before the Board tonight for Lot Line Adjustments. G. Dake states that D. Evans was asked to address and get a determination as to what happened to the lot that got 'lost'. D. Evans states that the answer he got back was that there is no answer. G. Dake explains that until we get an answer, the Board cannot give the applicant any answer. D. Evans states that he has been to Real Property and to the Town asking why that line was removed. He spoke with G. McKenna who does not know why it was removed and he accepted the subdivision application to make that a conforming lot. He explains that the property is under the ownership of two different people and that there was no conveyance. G. Dake states that according to the tax map, that lot does not exist and that he will work on that tax map. D. Evans states that Real Property states that they will change it back again if the Planning Board gives permission. G. Dake states that he will not do that, he did not ask them to change it to what it is. D. Evans states that they say that the Town did ask them. G. Dake states that it wasn't him or this Board. T. Siragusa states that if Real Property is saying that the Town asked them to remove it, they should have documentation or some correspondence. D. Evans asks where he stands with the first application for the lot line adjustments for road frontage. G. Dake reviews where the lot lines for frontage shift. D. Cochran states that he is not comfortable reviewing this without topo. G. Dake asks the applicant the purpose for these changes. D. Evans states that it is to give greater frontage to the 89, or 99-acre, parcel. D. Evans clarifies that it is approximately 290' and will be going to 364.5'. G. Dake states that the frontage will go from enough for one lot to enough for one lot. He states that the lot line adjustments relate to what the applicant is trying to be do on the other side, and he is not comfortable acting on lot line adjustments without knowing what the plan is on the other side. G. Dake states that the 5-acre parcel previously discussed, is likely to be changed to 8 acres under the new code. D. Evans asks if he comes back with the topo and withdraws the second application, will the Board act on the first application. G. Dake states they will not because the Board knows it is there and he wants to see the proposed subdivision and while the lot line adjustment is a separate act, it is part of the subdivision. He discusses the laws relating to SEQRA. D. Evans states that this morning he made an application for subdivision that includes topo lines, asks if that could be immediately available and if the Board had that information available, could they give further consideration to this first lot line application. G. Dake states that he thinks the Board will want to act on the lot line adjustments in the same meeting as acting on the subdivision. He states that there is a lot of confusion over where lot lines are today and it only gets worse every time we do these things. D. Evans has been granted previous subdivisions on this property and lot line adjustments. T. Yasenchak asks if D. Evans answered the question regarding why he wants to do the lot line adjustments for frontage. D. Evans states that it is in preparation for the further subdivision of that parcel. G. Dake reiterates that the Board needs a response to the questions of the 9.5 acres, will recognize the lines on the tax map or the applicant should find out why the property was combined. D. Evans states that he thought that it was this Board that eliminated that line. G. Dake states that if they did it was as a result of the previous subdivision. That may have been done because the applicant may have taken away the frontage and 'the remaining lands of' may have all gone in as one 'remaining lands'. D. Evans states that at one point he was thinking of combining that with his father's property, but that did not happen. G. Dake states that any plans that the County has received are ones that the applicant delivered, the Town does not file plans for applicants. G. Dake states that the lot line adjustments are inexorably linked to the subdivision plans and looking at them in isolation is inappropriate and bad planning. G. Dake states that to make this clear, he would like the applicant to give us one map that includes the lot line adjustments and the subdivision with the topos. D. Cochran suggests the building lots, setbacks, wetlands, etc., also be included. These applications will be on the August 8, 2006 agenda.

July 25, 2006

## CORRESPONDENCE

G. Dake refers to the correspondence from a neighbor of Sam Holland. He called S. Holland and left a message for him suggesting that he speak with G. McKenna because this is an enforcement issue. G. Dake states that he did not hear back from his message, but R. Rowland thinks that P. Gargan took a call from S. Holland for G. McKenna.

Frank Flanagan has provided a map and C. Baker will take this to look at before passing it along to G. McKenna. There were parking and driveway issues that need to be discussed. T. Yasenchak states that she thinks that the Board is happy with the way that it was laid out. G. Dake states that this is an application where the Board may need to apply a little bit of judgment and rationale as to what is right, what is fair and what is reasonable otherwise C. Baker and G. McKenna would do all the work and the Planning Board would not have to meet. T. Yasenchak states that she was expecting plans with similar detail as what the Board normally gets and she does not think asking the surveyor to adequately draw the parking lot on the plans, is a big deal. She states that what he has provided is good for a concept but not, in her opinion, good enough for a final if you are asking everyone else to have the same level of detail. G. Dake comments that this is a hard working guy who has put a lot of effort into this, more than a lot of other applicants. M. Young states that he has definitely done a lot of work out there.

---

## DISCUSSION

G. Dake states that he had a meeting with Mr. Vitaliano who is proposing a 48-unit apartment complex with a day care center towards the road, just north of where the Chwaz's are building their ice cream stand at the corner of Spier Falls Road and Route 9N. Being that he is from Long Island, he thought that was very low density and that we would be thrilled with only 48 units. G. Dake states that he explained to Mr. Vitaliano that he was talking maybe 15 or 16 times the proposed density and that perhaps the Town would not be as excited as he thought, but that he was welcome to approach the Town Board for a PUD application. He states that he did suggest that perhaps if they were serious about doing a project of this type, finding a mobile home park where you could trade density for density might be a possibility.

G. Dake states that at his bank board meeting the other day he got some numbers that were very interesting relating to the real estate market. In 2001, a home on the market in the Town of Greenfield took on average 149 days to sell and in 2005, 69 days. In Saratoga County, the average price of a single family home in 2001 was \$161,204 and in 2005, \$268,561. This information is from the Capital District Regional Planning Commission. In the Town of Greenfield the average building permit estimated cost to build was \$264,814 and in the Town of Wilton \$240,000. G. Dake states that this is one of the reasons that the Town has some very serious issues to look at. He states that he is very concerned and does not want to live in a place where all you can build is half-million dollar houses. That is not his vision, it is not the Town's vision. These numbers are something to keep in mind.

G. Dake has a meeting with Saratoga Polo on 7/26 and on Thursday at 9:30 a.m. with the Supervisor, F. McNeary and Polo at the Sewer District Office to talk about that. He also has a copy of the most recent map of the route of the proposed waterline in the Town of Greenfield. He describes the path it may take and states that he talked to Lisa Nagle about this also, and it would be nice if the Town and applicant can avoid repaving this once for sewer, once for water and once for the traffic. He states that he has spoken with the Supervisor because F. McNeary has been calling him on a regular basis about water and the Supervisor gave G. Dake permission to talk to the County about what are the options. He is going to talk to Jim Mitchell, EDP, who understands from the Town's perspective and also is a part owner in a water system in the Town of Milton. He hopes to try to get some sort of a presentation to this Board as to what options the Town is looking at in terms of a municipal system vs. a private system vs. a transportation corporation, buying direct from the County, bypassing the Town altogether, etc. He does not know what all those options are. With

July 25, 2006

Polo using 50,000 gallons a day, Prestwick Chase using 7,000 and the Stewart's Plant using 75,000 a day, you are talking a meaningful amount of water. It is worth spending a little bit of time looking at it. If Polo, McNeary and Stewart's agree to pay for the whole line and the Town is not out a dime, and you allow everyone along Denton to tap in, you are only benefiting about 4 or 5 houses, and they may not even opt to tap into it. A. Janik asks if G. Dake is going to have J. Mitchell do a presentation. G. Dake states that he wants to talk to J. Mitchell and see what he is willing to do and if he does not feel a conflict. A. Janik states that if something is set up, he would like to have the Town Board included. W. Barss asks about a timeline. G. Dake states that he does not know, but suggests that a dry line could be run now knowing that it is coming later.

G. Dake states that he and L. Dupouy met to discuss the administrative meeting. He states that the Board can have a meeting which is not public, which is legal, as long as the Board is not discussing any projects or planning policies, if we are talking about how we function as a Board. L. Dupouy states that she brought it up because it is hard, as a new member, to catch up and get your self up to snuff with everyone else and know the technical terms. Sometimes during the meetings if you can see someone asking a question or going in a direction, you could tell them how they could have found out the information before hand. She states that these are things that you are not able to say to one another in a working meeting where if there is some question you don't want it brought to attention before the public. G. Dake states that he and M. Young had a conversation, and M. Young likes the fact that G. Dake goes around the table and asks each Board members opinion. G. Dake states that the Board does not have the opportunity to give him much feed back about how meetings are run, and their likes and dislikes about procedure. He states that the Board could not talk about real planning issues - that would be a violation of the open meeting laws or about a specific project. Discussion could center around how the meetings are run and the way members conduct themselves within a meeting. Even though M. Young will be leaving the Board, it would be a benefit to have him and A. Janik or T. Kinsella, attend as recent members of the Board. Discussion takes place that this type of thing could be discussed at the end of a Planning Board meeting. D. Cochran states that once you have been on the Board for some time you learn, and there is critiquing that takes place along the way. He states that most of the time everyone is in agreement and if not when there are divisions, it works out. L. Dupouy reiterates that as a new member she did not feel that she was afforded the learning curve she wanted at the speed she wanted, because there wasn't set in motion a place where she knew when was the appropriate time to ask a question about something. M. Thraikill states that he agrees with D. Cochran and that when he first came on he said very little for the first couple years. There is a learning curve. L. Dupouy states that she is thinking in terms of new members and how we can make things better for them. G. Dake suggests assigning someone to be a mentor to a new member, talking to each other between meetings and sitting next to each other at meetings. T. Siragusa states that we are talking about freshman orientation and how can we make it easier for the rookie. He states that it is all on-the-job training and no matter what you do, most of it will still be on-the-job training. He states that putting together some type of case studies and getting together might be worthwhile. L. Dupouy states that the Board wants people's driveways to be compliant and safe enough so that the fire department can get in. We have said this a number of times, when are we going to talk about that. G. Dake states that is the type of thing that we are required to talk about in front of the public, because it is a planning policy or something that we are going to try to establish. D. Cochran suggests possibly a manual of procedures and issues that are constantly discussed. G. Dake states that for a few of the newer members he did have a brief orientation. He comments on the different backgrounds of the members contributing to their learning experience. M. Young states that there is a difference in what is on the agendas now compared to when he first started. The agendas are more complicated. He states that there is a tremendous amount more to read and to get a grasp on, and he is sure that as a new member you feel overwhelmed. A new member can be the quiet rookie for a time and they will come in with a comment that the older members may have overlooked. L. Dupouy comments on all the different training opportunities that come up and when someone has been around for a while they would know which would be of greater value to attend and the new members do not know that. She states that a separate opportunity a couple times a year to discuss the housekeeping things even if meeting a half hour before going on a field trip would be helpful. G. Dake states that this could also be done at the end of a light meeting. C. Baker states that he

July 25, 2006

would like to compliment this Board. From what he has seen on other Boards, people coming before this Board are not always well prepared. This Board has to opportunity to send them away but he has never seen these guys do that. Something the Board might want to think about is how prepared the applicants are when they come before the Board. G. Dake comments that one of the things that would be key to that, would be the Supervisor making sure that we have staff, are adequately staffed or that staff's time is managed in such a way that if we could have applications reviewed and looked through, with a check list perhaps, to make sure that the applicant has everything necessary. G. Dake uses an example of someone dropping off a map a couple days before a meeting and if C. Baker has not had the opportunity to look at, it is a waste of time for the Board. T. Yasenchak states that in any other Town, if you miss the deadline you are out. She states that the Board is not doing justice to the applicant when they are handed a map and asked to comment on the spot. G. Dake states that there are different opinions as to what is good enough on a map, but the objective is to do the right thing in the long run, that is more important that meeting every dot in the book. T. Siragusa discusses ways to facilitate so that people are prepared when they come in to ask questions. G. Dake states that he does not want to get to the point of turning away applicants who come in for feed back from the Board. The benefit of site walks is discussed.

T. Siragusa states that if M. Young is thinking about leaving the Board he would like to say that it will be a huge loss. M. Young states that he has made up his mind to leave, he has had a really enjoyable time, but in order to volunteer this much time you have to keep a certain spirit for what you are doing and his has dwindled. He thinks it is best for him and for the Board to step away for a while. G. Dake states that he would welcome M. Young's application for a future vacancy and that M. Young has promised to stay until a replacement is found. He has made a suggestion and G. Dake is going to talk with that person. G. Dake states that while he is not happy that M. Young is leaving, he has put in more good work for this Town than most residents will. M. Young states that when the Board is planning site walks, to give him a call as he would be glad to still take the members around.

---

Meeting adjourned 9:19 p.m., all members in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Rosamaria Rowland  
Secretary