



Town of South Bristol
6500 West Gannett Hill Road
Naples, NY 14512-9216
585.374.6341

Planning Board Meeting Agenda

Wednesday, August 16, 2023 at 6:30 pm

Meeting in-person or by joining Zoom

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/87561553007?pwd=c1BMZGdmNUJKRFpTb0pYdHNINU1SQT09>

Zoom Meeting ID 875 6155 3007, Password 212360

Call to Order

Pledge of Allegiance

Reading of Vision Statement

As stewards of both the land and the lake, we will preserve and protect our safe, clean, naturally beautiful, rural and scenic environment with thoughtfully planned residential, agricultural, recreational and commercial development.

Meeting Etiquette

Meeting Minutes

Approval of Planning Board meeting minutes for July 19, 2023

Old Business

Public Hearing

Site Plan Approval Application 2022-0002

Owner: Rochester Museum and Science Center

Representative: Rory Stave

Property: 6472 Gulick Rd, Cummings Nature Center

Tax Map #: 182.00-5-7.000

Zoned: PD (Planned Development)

New Business

Site Plan Approval Application 2023-0004

County Planning Board Referral #:

Owner: Denise K. Buchanan Trust

Representative: Bill Grove

Property: 6985 St Rt 21

Tax Map #: 191.17-1-20.110

Zoned: LR (Lake Residential)

Site Plan Approval Application 2023-0006

County Planning Board Referral #:

Owner: Robert W. Hurlbut & Sarah M. Hurlbut

Representative: Jon Schick

Property: 6513 Longs Point Dr

Tax Map #: 185.17-2-1.100

Zoned: LR (Lake Residential)

Other

Motion to Adjourn

Town of South Bristol Planning Board Meeting Minutes Wednesday, August 16, 2023

Present David Bowen
Jill Gordon
Jason Inda
Michael McCabe
Frederick McIntyre
Sam Seymour
Kevin Stahl

Excused Paul Miller

Guests: Rory Stave, Bill Grove and John Schick

Call to Order

The meeting of the Town of South Bristol Planning Board was called to order at 6:30 pm. All Board Members were present except Paul Miller.

Reading of Vision Statement

Kevin Stahl read the Comprehensive Plan Vision Statement.

Meeting Minutes

Old Business

Public Hearing Continued from July 19th

Site Plan Approval Application 2023-0002

Owner: Rochester Museum and Science Center
Representative: Rory Stave
Property: 6472 Gulick Rd, Cumming Nature Center
Tax Map #: 182.00-5-7.000
Zoned: PD (Planned Development)

Chairman Stahl: Has there been any changes since our Preliminary meeting?

Mr. Stave: Yes, we have the DEC permit which was sent to Diane and hopefully sent to everybody. We have approval from the DEC to go ahead and build the tower.

Chairman Stahl: We received that on the 26th of July. We do have that. I think that is all we need.

Mr. Stave: Correct, from the last meeting I remember.

Chairman Stahl: Judy, do you know if any comments were received?

Clerk Voss: She didn't say that she had any so assume not.

Chairman Stahl: Any comments from the Board? Any comments on Zoom?

Clerk Voss: No one is attending the meeting on Zoom.

Chairman Stahl: I will declare the Public Hearing closed. This application is exempt from the County Planning Board referral recommendation. No septic system review or approval required. No storm water and water control measures or recommendations are required. No State or Federal or Threatened endangered species determination is required. Archaeological site determination received a No Impact letter dated 3/23/2023. No Agricultural Farm within 500 feet, and no flood plain determination, flood plain development permit is required.

Chairman Stahl made a motion declaring the SEQR to be a Type 2 action under paragraph 617.5, Section C, No. 9 with no further review required and asked the Board's permission to answer SEQR questions 1 through 11 with "No" or "Small Impact" and sign on behalf of the Board. Motion seconded by David Bowen.

All in favor.

7 Ayes: Bowen, Gordon, Inda, McCabe, McIntyre, Seymour, Stahl.

Nays: 0

Chairman Stahl read the findings:

1. The proposed project is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.
2. The proposed project is consistent with the Zoning District in which the project is located.
3. The proposed project will not have an adverse impact on the physical or environmental conditions of the District.
4. The proposed project will not adversely affect the character of the neighborhood.

Jason Inda moved to approve findings 1-4, seconded by Sam Seymour.

All in favor.

7 Ayes: Bowen, Gordon, Inda, McCabe, McIntyre, Seymour, Stahl.

Nays: 0

Chairman Stahl requested a motion for preliminary and final site plan approval for application 2023-0002.

On a motion made by Jason Inda and seconded by Sam Seymour to approve the preliminary and final site plan approval for said application.

Roll Call Vote:

Jill Gordon: Aye

Jason Inda: Aye

Michael McCabe: Aye

Fred McIntyre: Aye

Sam Seymour: Aye

Kevin Stahl: Aye

David Bowen: Cannot vote, not present for preliminary.

Chairman Stahl: Motion is carried.

Chairman Stahl said to speak with Scott or Diane for the rest of the paperwork.

New Business:

Site Plan Approval Application 2023-0004

County Planning Board Referral #: TBD

Owner: Denise Buchanan Trust

Representative: Bill Grove

Property: 6985 St Rt 21 S

Tax Map: 191.17-1-20.110

Zoned: LR (Lake Residential)

Chairman Stahl said we have Site Plan Approval Application #2023-0004 which is for Review for Denise Buchanan Trust. Representative is Bill Grove, this is on property located 6985 State Route 21 and it is zoned Lake Residential.

Chairman Stahl: Can you describe the property.

Bill Grove: Sure, so the property is the Windemere Cottage that is down on Coye Point and the Buchanan's bought it few years ago and want to add a one-bedroom addition on the north side and then reconfigure the existing deck just to make it more user friendly off of the addition. So, on the site plan you can see where that is. We've got septic approval; we did a septic replacement system that was sized for that additional bedroom. There was some, Kevin was in on it, but I am not sure the rest of the Board was on the fact that this was two parcels. There was a land-locked parcel in the southeast corner that was supposed to have been annexed into the bigger parcel at some point in 2014 I think it was when the dock work was done. That was never followed through on and so they are currently working on that. They've got their attorney working on the annexation. Part of that the attorney answered, annexing that little lot into the bigger lot, and so by doing that....

Chairman Stahl: We did receive a letter from their law office, so they are working on it, yes.

Bill Grove: So, that helps us with the lot coverage, I mean, it probably is one of the biggest lake front lots in Woodville, but it still doesn't meet the maximum lot coverage requirement for the Town. It is a pre-existing, non-conforming lot, we've got a certificate of non-conformity, so Scott got us that a few weeks ago. But because the addition lies outside of the allowable setbacks even though it is much further from the right-of-way line from the existing structure we have to go to the ZBA and get a variance for that. The variance is the distance from the right-of-way line and the lot coverage are the two we end up having to have.

David Bowen: Was there a variance requested for the side lot set back? I couldn't tell.

Bill Grove: No, it's 10-foot side setbacks so we meet the side set back requirements.

Chairman Stahl: Do you have on the diagram a proposed deck, was that figured in for the proposed lot coverage, or not?

Bill Grove: Yes. Some of the existing deck goes away and the new deck is the hash lines that are at 45° and the part that is being removed is the honeycomb, it is hard to see, but it is the eastern most part of the deck that is going to be removed.

Chairman Stahl: All right, are there any questions from the Board Members on what they are seeing? All right, if not, you answered my questions on the proposed deck and the different variances that you will have to get.

David Bowen: Is there a water softener on the property already?

Bill Grove: Not that I am aware of, no.

David Bowen: How about a garbage disposal?

Bill Grove: Not that I am aware of.

David Bowen: Do you know?

Bill Grove: No. I have not been inside the house.

David Bowen: When they reviewed your septic plan, did they take those things into account? I know you bring them up in your plan.

Bill Grove: I am sure with the septic approval.

David Bowen: I can't imagine its former owner not having a garbage disposal, knowing him. The water is out of the lake.

Bill Grove: A garbage disposal wouldn't be much of a concern because we've got the two existing 1,000 gallon tanks that we are going to keep, so tankage is not an issue and that's the only reason you have in increase of tankage if you have a garbage disposal. You have more solids, technically you use more water, you probably do use a little bit more, but not considerably more, but you have more solids. So they require you to have more tankage, but we've got lots of tank capacity.

David Bowen: Is there any benefit to removing the old leech lines?

Bill Grove: Not really.

David Bowen: And this new system will presumably be better?

Bill Grove: Much better, yes. It is an aerobic system, but it is a passive aerobic system. I know Sam knows what we're *** but it does it passively through venting so it draws air through the system and then the roof vent acts like a chimney and creates a draw for air to flow through the system.

Chairman Stahl: The old system won't be connected then right, as it looks on the diagram?

Bill Grove: Correct. It will be disconnected there.

Sam Seymour: And you are building the new presby system on 26 inch of sandbed.

Bill Grove: It is but it will be excavated so it will end up being at grade with the existing grade. Points specifically have good soil on them so we can put the system in the ground. And we did get a sign-off from the DEC and Fish & Wildlife Service about the Bald Eagle impact, and the lack thereof and SHIPA clearance on the Archeological.

Chairman Grove: I'll bring up all the things that we receive so the Board members all know. We did receive a Certificate of Non-Conformity on the existing house, we received a On-Site Wastewater Treatment System for a 5-bedroom design approval letter. That was dated June 15, 2023. We received an Archaeological Site Determination No Impact letter dated July 3, 2023. We received a Bald Eagle Determination email from NYSDEC and the US Fish and Wildlife Service. We received a Flood Plain Development Permit application. So we have all of those. Any other questions we want to ask? If not, I would schedule an Application for Final Review and a Public Hearing on September 20, 2023, pending we receive the following: Zoning Board of Appeals approval for a front setback and lot coverage variances; Ontario County Planning Board referral comments and a lot annexation of tax map numbers 191.17-1-20.110 and 191.17-1-20.200 completed and filed at the Ontario County Clerk's Office.

Bill Grove: So you are looking for that annexation to be filed prior to your Board making the decision?

Chairman Stahl: Yes, we've already had it kicked back from the County Planning Board. They were looking for that, so I know that is going to be a big concern for them.

Bill Grove: It did go the County?

Chairman Stahl: We always present what's coming down to the Board and they kind of review it in a hurry and they kicked it right back because they were waiting for that annexation. So it will be given back to them once we get this all set up.

Bill Grove: Okay.

Chairman Stahl: According to that letter they said it might be 2-3 months, I don't know if it takes that long or not.

Bill Grove: I don't either, it shouldn't take very long, I think it is just paperwork.

Chairman Stahl: I think it would go quick. I guess we are all set on that, there are no more questions.

Bill Grove: Not for me.

Site Plan Approval Application 2023-0006

Owner: Robert W. Hurlbut and Sarah M. Hurlbut

Representative: John Schick

Property: 6513 Long's Point Dr

Tax Map: 185.17-2-1.100

Zoned: LR (Lake Residential)

John Schick: Hello, my name is John Schick and I am an Architect for the project on 6513.

Chairman Stahl: Let me let everybody know: This is Site Plan Approval Application 2023-0006. And it is for Robert and Sarah Hurlbut and the representative is going to be John and this is for 6513 Long's Point Drive, which is Lake Residential.

David Bowen: Just for the record, I am going to recuse myself from this matter. I have known John Schick for a long time, he was my Architect for my house and the Hurlbut's are my neighbors and good personal friends of ours. I can't vote on this one.

Sam Seymour: I recuse myself for similar reasons. I've known Bob and Sarah for decades.

Chairman Stahl: Okay, we will let you describe the project.

John Schick: I am here, I think, primarily because we need a setback variance for the proposed house. We are planning on tearing down the existing house and building a new one. It is an odd shaped lot, you look at the buildable area, once you put in all the setbacks, it is kind of a triangular shaped buildable area. The existing house is probably half of the house is encroaching on the setback to the road, which is not really not the front of the house because it is a steep bank right there. Access is through the neighboring property which is also owned by the Hurlbut's. So, we are, the existing setback is 29 feet to the property line; 27.67 to the edge of the house and then the proposed house is actually going to be, has rotated, so it actually faces the lake. And it is going to be pulled forward because we had some area on the lake side of the house where we could still meet the setbacks. So we pulled the house a little bit forward to also enhance the view. So rotating it to enhance the view. So the proposed setback is actually 31 feet so we are slightly less non-conforming than the existing house. And that is basically the reason that we are here. I don't believe we need any other variances for the house.

Chairman Stahl: I did see on the diagram and in their application, you stated the old house is around 2,400 square feet and the new home will be 2,900?

John Schick: The existing house is 2,492 square feet, and the new one is 2,914 square feet, so it is about a little less than 500 square feet.

Chairman Stahl: It is going to remain 3-bedroom?

John Schick: It is going to remain a 3-bedroom house, there is a den on the first floor I know that that's been a point of, has become an issue, some people want to consider it a bedroom, but, Bob is insistent that it is no way that is going to be a bedroom. So, we are proposing in keeping the existing septic system. It has been enhanced once all ready. It has been functioning very well, it has been maintained and inspected as needed. It is a difficult area where the septic system is, it is on that steep bank which has been terraced to do that. So we really don't want to do anything new there if we don't have to. The house is slightly larger, it is still a 3-bedroom house and the same number of people living in it. It will be used the same as it currently is, there has been no issues with the septic system in all the years that have lived there and not had any problems.

Chairman Stahl: We received a comment from our Watershed Inspector and our Code Enforcement Officer. In our Codes we have a design standard, it is 120-7, that talks about the size of the home. Your septic system is based on the number of bedrooms but the size of your house is also looked at. So, what our Code is saying is a three-bedroom, or bedroom equivalence, are for a 1,201 square foot – 2,250 square foot and if you go over the 2,251 square foot – 3,300 square foot, now you are looking at a 4-bedroom design. I am not sure that is going to work, how they are going to, I mean you'll have to have some type of variance probably from the Zoning Board. I don't know how they are going to look at that. If they are going to request you downsize the size of the building or upsize the septic.

John Schick: I guess we were, so your reading of the Code is that it's the number of bedrooms equivalence, or the square footage. Or as far as it's not an and, it's not one or the other, it's both. I guess is what. So our reading of this is that it's three-bedrooms or the square footage. Either use the number of bedroom equivalence or use the square footage number. But not necessarily both. And so if you use the number of bedrooms, which is three, we determined that we really don't have any bedroom equivalence based on your Code, so we've been trying to make the claim that it is a three-bedroom house. We are using the bedrooms plus bedrooms plus bedroom equivalence versus the square footage to make that determination.

Jason Inda: Would not the den be considered a bedroom equivalent? I understand that your client has no intention but your client may not be the only person that owns this house.

John Schick: Understood, but if you look at your definition of bedroom equivalence, one of the requirements is that it have reasonable access to a full bathroom on the same floor. The only full bathroom on the first floor is in the master suite. We are saying that is not a reasonable access to a full bathroom. That's the gist of the claim.

Chairman Stahl: I think what the concern is being down by the lake if it is that size of house, whoever could purchase it later, maybe, they could easily put 4 bedrooms in there or do what they want. Which I don't know if we would know about it or not, but I think that is why that law, or that rule, is stated like that, for the size and square footage.

Bill Grove: It is usually either or when they put the wastewater law into effect. That they wanted to make it as restrictive as possible so that is why they added that square footage so you couldn't have a 2-bedroom 4,000 square foot house. But what you said you got comments back from the watershed inspector, what did he have to say about it? Because with the existing system that I think there is a little bit of gray area there. So it is not an automatic upgrade if it is 3-bedroom and it is going to remain 3 bedroom.

Chairman Stahl: Scott, were you with Tyler?

CEO Martin: No, he just sent an email and he is the one that basically pointed out the square footage. I think it comes down to the interpretation of the word "or."

Jason Inda: You said there was written comment from the Watershed Inspector?

CEO Martin: Just an email.

Chairman Stahl: It is basically what I read, right?

CEO Martin: Right.

John Schick: So my client asked me to talk to Tyler because he was the one that pointed it out that we needed to upgrade the system. So I called Tyler and I explained to him our perspective on things and he said, well, it is not anything I am enforcing, it is the Town's Code and I am just informing you about. So that is when I started talking to Scott and my client talked to his attorney and sent you guys a letter. I don't know if you guys have a copy of that letter.

CEO Martin: I gave Kevin a copy of that.

John Schick: It basically says what we just spoke about, the interpretation of the Code and what is an equivalent bedroom and it's not which is more. Your Code doesn't say which ever is most restrictive, it just says "or." So our interpretation is that it is just that. You either go with 3-bedrooms plus bedroom equivalence or we go by the square footage. It doesn't say which ever one is more restrictive, it doesn't say you have to meet both of these requirements. It just says you pick whichever one you want to use, I guess. That is our interpretation. That may have not been the intent, but that is kind of how it reads. It doesn't say "and" it says "or."

Sam Seymour: Do we know what kind of system is in place now?

John Schick: I know it is an anaerobic system, the house next door has a new system and that is peet modual.

Chairman Stahl: My concern would be protecting the lake, I don't know what the other Board members, you want to comment in on or not. But to me I follow the rules.

Jill Gordon: I agree with Kevin. You don't know what future owners will do, with a house of that size you certainly have another bedroom.

John Schick: This is a plan of the system, so in it is an aerobic system. I don't know who designed it, I can find out.

Chairman Stahl: How about the other houses down there? That's not tied into that same system is it?

John Schick: No, the house next door has it's own system, on the other side of the garage.

Bill Grove: And the new code takes into account water saving fixtures; the State Code. The local law doesn't allow you to take advantage of that so you've got to use 150 gallons per day per bedroom, instead of 110. There is a buffer in there. I look at it just as the same as somebody were selling a large house and had a septic inspection, and it still maybe appropriate for the number of bedrooms, but it may be undersized by the square footage, you are not going to make those folks replace the system, just based on the house square footage. I don't think you can do that.

Chairman Stahl: You could on existing homes but a new build I would think you would want to be looking at that. Which this would be. You guys have any comments on it?

Jason Inda: That "or" word is kind of throwing me because I can see your argument that it's one or the other, but I can see the argument that it's "if you don't meet this or that, then." I guess I'd like some

clarification from somebody's that a little more scholarly than myself. Unfortunately, he's not commenting here. Is that a question we can sent to our lawyer for interpretation?

Sam Seymour: I think it is.

Chairman Stahl: Tyler didn't have any other concerns? It didn't matter one way or the other to him? He was just making a comment that this is what we need to look at?

CEO Martin: Right, he was just pointing out the square footage.

John Schick: He said it was up to the Code Enforcement Officer. That is what letter "G" says. Final authority.

CEO Martin: Right, Tyler cannot make the final determination.

Michael McCabe: It seems like the it would be the opportunity to engage the Town Attorney?

Chairman Stahl: Okay, we can do that. The result would be he will set you back another month. You will have to come to the next meeting next month. I am not sure if that is a Variance with the Zoning Board handles or is that a Special Use Variance that we handle? I would have to look into that too.

John Schick: Or is it looking at the Code.

David Bowen: I don't think design standards are part of the ZBA's authority.

Bill Grove: Are they part of the Planning Board's authority? Septic design?

David Bowen: No, they are part of Site Plan Approval.

Bill Grove: Typically, you would ask the Watershed Authority for review and go by that.

Chairman Stahl: I wish Tyler had made a comment, what he really thought.

Jill Gordon: The fact that he pointed it out, is that a red-flag he wants us to look at? I don't know how to interpret what he said.

Chairman Stahl: I agree, it is a decision that we just have to make, whether we think it is bad for the lake or good for the lake.

Sam Seymour: What we don't know is what is in the ground right now, and how big the leech field is. Looks like there is a little bit extra there up in back.

Bill Grove: 6 lines at 25 feet long, an aerobic unit.

Chairman Stahl: Put it to a vote.

John Schick: The schedule is tight, we have contractors ready to start. Can you make it, if it doesn't pass, can you make it separate motion that is conditional along with upgrading the system. I don't want to be

responsible; at least I would want to get my client the way to move forward without waiting a whole another month. If possible.

Chairman Stahl: My opinion on it for the best of the lake is either to reduce the size of the house or increase the septic system to handle it to go with these. How does the Board feel?

Clerk Voss: Don't septic systems get inspected every 5 years?

Bill Grove: You have a maintenance contract so it is twice a year the unit gets inspected but the property itself inspects it every 5 years on rotation that is part of the Water Waste Law.

Clerk Voss: If it fails inspection, if the house is too big, and the septic isn't?

Bill Grove: If they use too much water and that's where it all comes down to. You could have a properly sized septic system or an oversized septic system and it is still not going to guarantee that the people are going to use the appropriate amount of water.

Chairman Stahl: I guess for that reasoning, that's why I go with what is set up here. Other than that, does anybody else see anything else they want to discuss on this? I would feel better if you went back to your client and asked them about either reducing the size or increasing the septic and that would give us a chance to.

John Schick: I mean, we'd have to reduce the size by 700 square feet, I wouldn't even do it.

CEO Martin: Based on what you saw Bill, what would it take for them to upsize it to 4 bedrooms?

Bill Grove: I mean it is already, the aerobic unit is sized for that, if it a 600 gallon per day unit, then that's properly sized. If it is a 500 gallon, then is slightly undersized, you'd have to design it for four at 150 gallons per day which is 600. Probably new leech lines, within the same footprint as the existing. It is a retaining wall right John?

John Schick: Yes, there two levels, I think the upper ones that were added.

Bill Grove: So it wouldn't be anything, in my opinion, looking at it, on paper, not being at the site, but I would think it would be in the same footprint of the existing system. You wouldn't want it any closer to the lake, certainly. I don't think it would affect any of the proposed addition work, right?

John Schick: No, the new house is actually further away from it. That is the existing house, you can see the dash line.

Bill Grove: I think it would be easy enough to do if they had to. You can make that wall taller and give you more room toward the road away from the lake. Add some fill there if you had to.

John Schick: You mean to add additional lines?

Bill Grove: I would see it as two separate issues, almost nonrelated.

Chairman Stahl: I personally would hate to approve a questionable system whether it worked or not because I don't want it coming back on the next homeowner and the next homeowner wants to do the same thing and pretty soon we have got 4 or 5 homes out there that are undersized next to the lake.

Bill Grove: I agree but you know, the Board doesn't control how much water someone uses or what if they put grease down the drain and wreck their system. You do what you can to size it properly, but people will still use the system the way they want.

John Schick: What is the setback to the road? Requirement?

Bill Grove: For the system, generally it is 10 feet.

Chairman Stahl: Well, how does the Board feel? Do you want to pass this on for further discussion?

Jason Inda: I'd like to hear from the Town Lawyer on the interpretation on whether we are going with three bedrooms or the square footage.

Chairman Stahl: Alright, I would say to get back to your clients with those two options and we will also get, do our part on our side to find out what the wording is good or bad, or whatever, and then I think we can make a decision. But it is not going to help get things going faster.

John Schick: So, can you give it a conditional, I mean, would you do it conditioned on having the upgrading the system as required? Per your Code section? Because that way I can go back to them and say, we can start but you have agree to upgrade the system.

Jason Inda: You still have to go through another meeting right?

John Schick: We have Zoning Board next week.

Jason Inda: And then you have to come back here anyway because we have to do a Public Hearing. So I think between then and now you can talk to his client and we can find out my question on the interpretation, because the way it reads to me, you can interpret both ways. Who is the one that makes that determination, is it the applicant or is it the Planning Board? Or the Code Enforcement Officer? I agree that the actual line in the law seems to be worded poorly, that is something we will take into consideration, but we are not approving anything tonight. That would be done after the Public Hearing.

John Schick: So this is not a Public Hearing?

Chairman Stahl: This is a Site Plan Review, and then we will schedule a Public Hearing and a Final Review. Right now for the Public Hearing and the Final Review, we need, from you, the Zoning Board of Appeals approval for the front setback variance, the Ontario County Planning Board referral comments, an On-Site Waste Water Treatment System, and the Bald Eagle determination from the NYSDEC and US and Wildlife Service. If we receive those before our next meeting, we go ahead have our Public Hearing and approve it at that time.

John Schick: So Erin Arnold hasn't sent anything to you?

Chairman Stahl: As of right now those are the things that are lacking.

John Schick: I think that Tyler is on parental leave for like 6 weeks.

Chairman Stahl: If nobody has any comments or questions, I guess we call it a day.

John Schick: You said Bald Eagle, what was the other?

Chairman Stahl: You have to have the Zoning Board of Appeals for the front setback variance, we have to give this to the Ontario County Planning Board which will be before the next meeting. We will get their comments back.

John Schick: I thought they already commented on it?

Chairman Stahl: I haven't seen it yet.

John Schick: Nevermind, that is another project, I'm sorry. I have two projects that are doing the exact same things, very confusing.

John Schick: The Agricultural Data Statement, is that for Planning Board or is that for Zoning Board? Shipha did send a letter and said there was nothing.

Chairman Stahl: I don't see where we need that, Diane must have that.

Other

Short-term rental local law update and discussion

Motion to Adjourn

Being no further business, Jill Gordon moved to adjourn the meeting. David Bowen seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously adopted and the meeting was adjourned at 7:24 pm.

Respectfully submitted,



Judy Voss
Town Clerk