

**VILLAGE OF WOODBURY
PLANNING BOARD MEETING
JULY 17, 2019
TABLE OF CONTENTS**

ITEM	PAGE NUMBER
Minutes	1
Regular Agenda	
Woodview Hts./39M LLC Tax Map 204-1-34.2	1 – 4
Hartman/ARB – Tax Map 255-1-7	4 – 7
Homeland Towers Tax Map 225-1-38	7 – 11
Genco – Tax Map 231-3-6.1 & 6.2	11 - 12

WOODVIEW HEIGHTS/39M LLC – TAX MAP 204-1-34.2

area variances. K. Naughton then explained that, the way that Woodbury has asked the Board to proceed on this is to consider it an amended application, which would require a new application. It also requires a freshwater wetlands permit. She said it would be good if these two items were submitted to the Board at the same time as they both require a public hearing so the Board would try to have both of them together. Also, an EAF is required for this project.

Chairman Gerver then asked D. Lindsay to give the Board a synopsis of this project from where it was to where it stands now. D. Lindsay explained that this application was reviewed and filed in 1989. There was a GML referral, a public hearing was held in 1994 and there was a Negative Declaration at that time. The Board granted preliminary approval in 1995. The plans were subsequently revised and there were numerous extensions from 1995 to 2019. Then there was a request for his office to take a look to see if there had been any changes per the code and the land area definitions. This was done, and from that there were some modifications and they went to the ZBA to try to receive approvals for some variances. They were denied so they sought and obtained relief from the courts and the ZBA granted the variance because of the remand of the court, and now they are back for a 13 -lot subdivision. D. Lindsay said it has changed in terms of storm water requirements. He said the roadway swings from Hill Avenue around and the inner lots haven't really changed, but the outer lots have been changed. They have provided an area that is now designated for their storm water management. He added that the infrastructure stays similar to what was approved but there are a number of things that need to be reviewed in terms of the new layout and new configuration. Also, under MS4 there are new storm water regulations and new requirements for the applicant. He said that is probably the biggest issue. Chairman Gerver asked K. Naughton if this would need another referral for GML. K. Naughton said it probably should be referred. She added that back in 1995 it came back as a local determination, but she felt it should be referred again. She said it was likely that it would come back with the same determination. She said this also requires a public hearing so there is time for this to occur.

At this point Chairman Gerver asked the applicant if they wanted to go over what has changed or discuss the comments from the consultants. John Locke said that he could discuss them very briefly. He noted that he just got the comments from D. Lindsay this evening and he also received comments from S. Turner. He said he did not have any issues with 99% of what was said, and that it was a good checklist of what they needed to address. He said there were one or two issues that he would like to meet with the engineer to discuss in more detail how to make certain things work with the storm water because they have an issue with storm water coming in from off-site.

Chairman Gerver said that he had a conversation with the Water and Sewer Superintendent who told him that there is no sewer or water capacity in this area to service the new subdivision. D. Lindsay said he would speak to the Water and Sewer Superintendent. He added that the Village is attempting to find more water.

WOODVIEW HEIGHTS/39M LLC – TAX MAP 204-1-34.2 (cont.)

D. Lindsay asked if there was any intent for an HOA in this subdivision, or would the improvements be dedicated to the municipality. Mr. Myrow said that he did not believe an HOA would be required here and that he assumed that the water and sewer facilities would be privately owned. He asked the engineer to address this. D. Lindsay said that he would assume that the water and sewer would be dedicated to the town, but he was not sure about the storm water facilities. Mr. Locke said he has not looked to see how they are designed right now but if they could be accommodated privately he said his guess is that is what they would do.

Chairman Gerver asked the Board members for their questions and comments. R. Anzalone cited D. Lindsay's memo where he mentioned a chemical feed system that he was not sure of the purpose of. He asked if this system was in relation to the water or the generator.

D. Lindsay said he thought the chemical feed was in relation to the waste water. He said there is a waste water pump station there with chemical treatment.

J. Buglino had a question about storm water pre and post development. He noted that Mr. Locke said he was concerned about runoff from another property. Mr. Locke said he would like to speak to D. Lindsay in this regard, but in any event, the post development runoff will not exceed what is there now.

S. Capriglione had a question on D. Lindsay's memo regarding the variance that was granted. K. Naughton noted the ZBA did grant the variance, which expires 90 days from their decision, so it has already expired. However, she said she doesn't think any subdivision ever gets approved within 90 days. She also said that variances are not effective until the SWPPP is approved by the Town Engineer so, arguably, the variances aren't even effective yet to start the clock because the SWPPP has not been submitted let alone approved. She added that she made a note to reach out to the ZBA attorney to talk to him about this so the dates don't conflict. Mr. Myrow then pointed out that the ZBA had changed the rule so that if you require Planning Board approval for our variance, your time doesn't start to run until after you get your denial or approval from the Planning Board.

S. Capriglione then asked about the placement of the houses that was shown on the map and the bulk area requirements for the houses. Mr. Locke said they were just showing generic placement at this time. This will be refined on future submissions. He also said that the houses were placed close to the road to shorten the driveways and have less disturbance around the site. D. Lindsay said that in the past the Board has used its discretion to allow applicants five or ten feet in any direction to move the placement of the house. He said the Board can decide whether they think that is reasonable in this application. Chairman Gerver asked if this would be a condition of the resolution of the site plan. D. Lindsay said that if they put it on the plan as a note and the Board approves the plan, it would be the same thing.

R. Cataggio noted that D. Lindsay's memo said that no ARB had yet been submitted. He asked if the Board would see the ARB prior to the issuance of building permits.

WOODVIEW HEIGHTS/39M LLC – TAX MAP 204-1-34.2 (cont.)

D. Lindsay said that before a building permit can be issued, ARB approval is required by the Planning Board. R. Cataggio asked when the Board would get to see the sizes of the homes in terms of square footage. D. Lindsay said that is also done during ARB. S. Turner pointed out that the applicant will be obligated to provide this information under the ridge preservation section of the code. R. Cataggio was concerned about encroachment into the setback areas. D. Lindsay suggested that the applicant could give the Board some kind of maximum/minimum range of the proposed homes. R. Cataggio hoped this could be done somewhere in the next two meetings.

There were no further questions or comments. Chairman Gerver noted that the applicant had some “homework” to do and asked if they could submit smaller size plans to the Board members. Mr. Myrow said he would check with M. Rubio to see how many of each size he should submit.

HARTMAN/ARB – TAX MAP 255-1-7

Chairperson Gerver explained that this was to be a review of an ARB for a proposed single-family dwelling within the development known as Woodbury Villas. The property is located at 7 Alleghany Cross.

Larry Hartman appeared as the applicant with his wife Leena. He said they were here to get approval for their single-family home because it is located within the ridge preservation area and they need to get approval of anything that is different than an existing model. He then showed the Board an elevation photo of the home they were considering. He said the existing models were mostly Colonials and he wanted to do a split -level ranch style house as he has elderly relatives and they don't want to walk up and down stairs. He explained the colors and the fact that he knows the Board does not like a solid black roof so they came up with a multi-colored roof in shades of black and gray. He further explained that this lot is located on an off- street, not a main street. Basically only the front of the house will be visible. He said one of the reasons they picked this street was because it was one of the few that still had the original trees. He said they spoke to their neighbors on each side, who agreed to leave any trees that were within ten feet of the two side yards. The rear of his yard is in the area which has been designated “forever green”. He said the house was designed as a single-family home with an attached garage with dormers on top so that it would not look too tall. Chairman Gerver then asked D. Lindsay for his comments.

D. Lindsay explained that the Board's authority to review this application falls under the ridge preservation code, as well as Architectural Review Board. Some of the requirements for these reviews overlap. But, as far as ridge preservation, the property is supposed to sit into the ridge. The Board is supposed to look at how it sits in this area. He was not sure whether the photo showed the actual topography or just how the house would look from the street. Mr. Hartman said that the topography is exactly how it is shown on the site plan. He said they brought up the ground so they would not have to have a lot of stairs. There are only two or three steps.

HARTMAN/ARB – TAX MAP 255-1-7 (cont.)

D. Lindsay said that if the photo shows exactly the way it is set into the surroundings then that is one of the obligations under the code, to make sure that it sets in the area in an appropriate fashion. As far as the building design, structure and shape, that is something the Board will also be reviewing to make sure that it fits in. Earth-tone colors are required, and the applicant has provided the Board with some information on what colors they are going to use and the roof materials. He said the structure is supposed to fit within the property below the tree line. He noted that they are intending to maintain some of the trees but, obviously, some of the front trees along the road were cut back.

D. Lindsay noted that another subject under ARB is stone walls. There was a stone wall that looks like it extended through the property. Some of it has been removed due to the road construction and grading in that area, but there is a wall in the back that continues back through the woods. He said it is shown on the survey and if it is still preserved, there is a requirement that the Board had under the WP3 original action saying to preserve those wherever they could be preserved. He suggested that the Board speak to the applicant to see whether this wall can be preserved in terms of their development plan. If so, the Board may want to include a condition on this. As far as the use of deciduous trees and evergreen trees to preserve natural vegetation, that is something he said he would defer to S. Turner as to whether anything would be required here.

As far as ARB building height, the requirement is for a maximum of 35'. The way you determine the height is based on the roof and he said this is a complicated roof design so he thought the Board should get some information on the roof height in compliance with the code. He added that if a building was submitted to the Building Department that did not comply with the height requirement, regardless of the action taken by this Board, it would not be approved by the Building Department. With regard to the building size, he said he attached a copy of his summary of prior approvals showing that the homes that were approved thus far ranged from 1574 square feet to 2108 square feet in the active adult community, and 1298 square feet to 3700 square feet in the non-age restricted area. This home is proposed at 5984 square feet, so it is larger than the homes that have been approved to date. The Board should consider the home to see if it fits into the setting, which is part of their obligation under ARB review. Also, he noted that lately the Board has been reviewing cubical content or the bulk of the house because some of the applications that have been received lately have large unfinished areas so the square footage doesn't really match up with the size of the structure. He said the Board might want to receive some information from the applicant as to whether all of the areas up above are finished space and whether the square footage reflects all the space that is being finished so the Board can compare this to the other structures they reviewed.

Chairman Gerver noted that the ARB code requires the Planning Board to look at houses within 300' of this one to determine similarity or dissimilarity. He also noted that in the original WP3 approval there were restrictions on the removal of trees over a certain diameter. He felt that some research needed to be done with the ARB approvals for WP3. He also said he checked with the Building Department, and the smallest house within a 300' radius is 2381 square feet and the largest house with a CO is 4897 square feet. He said the largest house in the whole development is 4920 square feet and it has 4 bedrooms, 3 baths and 2 half baths.

HARTMAN/ARB – TAX MAP 255-1-7 (cont.)

Chairman Gerver also said that he posed a question to K. Naughton today regarding the fact that under the Conservation Cluster district, the Planning Board does have the authority to set the largest size home that is permitted in that zoning district. He said the Board should look into this and he knew that K. Naughton didn't have time to research it as he just sprung it on her today. He was not sure if this was on the final site plan. K. Naughton said she did look at the final site plan but she also said there were a number of amended resolutions. So the final site plan did not have a maximum building size, but there were a number of ARB approvals and there may have been size limits on them. She said she had not had time to chart this out for the Board but she and D. Lindsay were working on it.

Chairman Gerver also noted that homes within 300' of each other cannot use the same color palette. D. Lindsay said this relates to similarities. It would be up to the discretion of the Board to determine whether the colors were too similar. He also noted that they attached the full language from the ARB regulations to his memo.

At this time S. Turner wanted to comment regarding the removal of trees. He noted that at one time when WP3 began, someone from his office would go to the property prior to building permits to make sure that tree areas hadn't been cleared where they weren't supposed to be cleared. Along the street line there was a requirement for one tree every forty feet. He said they were going out and doing that as the development was occurring. It hasn't happened that way in awhile. He suggested that, going forward, the Board may want to look more closely at the tree clearing plan and the building permit requests that are coming in and maybe someone should be going out and looking at the condition of the site.

D. Lindsay agreed with S. Turner but said that, in this particular case, the roadway in front of the property was a 12' fill so there wasn't any opportunity to save trees. However, the concept of going out and taking a look at lots to try to preserve trees and work with the land the best you can was a very good one that the Board had. He said it would be good to have S. Turner's office do that.

K. Naughton noted that this is a Type Two action under SEQRA. Based on the location of the lot no GML referral is required to the Orange County Planning Department. A public hearing is required under the ARB regulations also.

R. Anzalone asked the applicant to provide the Board with an elevation of the back of the house. Mr. Hartman said he would provide this.

J. Buglino noted that the house was 1,000 square foot larger than the largest house. He asked if the applicant could provide a floor plan. Mr. Hartman said he could get one.

S. Capriglione cited the house on Hudson Pointe that recently came to the Board. K. Naughton said they did not get an approval. S. Capriglione said they took their plan to the Building Department and got a building permit and the house is almost done. Her point was that the Board had done a site visit of that property and she said it helped. After some discussion

HARTMAN/ARB – TAX MAP 255-1-7 (cont.)

it was decided that the Board would do a site visit on Thursday, August 1st at 6:30 p.m.

R. Cataggio asked if the Board could get copies of the final resolution of the Planning Board for WP3 for their review. He was concerned with the amenities that were supposed to be completed prior to the last CO's. D. Lindsay said he could get the Board copies.

Chairman Gerver discussed with the applicant the items that he should submit prior to a public hearing. He said he did not think the Board was ready to schedule a public hearing at this time. K. Naughton agreed and said it would be beneficial to get all the information.

Chairman Gerver made a motion to declare this a Type Two action under SEQRA. S. Capriglione seconded the motion. The vote was as follows:

- C. Gerver – In Favor
- R. Anzalone – In Favor
- J. Buglino – In Favor
- S. Capriglione – In Favor
- R. Cataggio – In Favor

HOMELAND TOWERS – TAX MAP 226-1-38

Chairman Gerver explained that this was to be a review and discussion of a site plan submitted for a propose wireless telecommunications facility to include a 110' monopole with a 2,584 square foot multi-carrier equipment compound at the base. The property is located at 11 Abrams Road in Central Valley.

David Kenny, an attorney with Snyder & Snyder appeared on behalf of the applicant, Homeland Towers LLC. He explained that the application is for a telecommunications facility at 11 Abrams Road. The facility would consist of a 110' monopole with approximately a 2,500 square foot compound at the base thereof to locate the ground equipment. The application has been submitted, and there was a pre-application meeting before the Planning Board in early March. On June 4th they submitted a full application for site plan approval. The application includes an RF compliance report and RF certification report as well as an alternative analysis. So he said they did locate the facility in the only location on the property that would meet the needs for the carrier of this facility. The carrier is Verizon Wireless. This location will provide the necessary coverage that Verizon is trying to achieve in this area. The 110' monopole complies with the Village code requirement for the height of the monopole. Also, the facility has been located on the property such that it meets all the required setbacks in the underlying zoning district and the particular setbacks in the Village code for a monopole. Mr. Kenny said that the site is to be set back the height of the monopole from the monopole to all the property lines. He added that they submitted a resource assessment to show the balloon test results. Also, they received the consultants reports from D.Lindsay and M. Musso, the wireless consultant for the Village. He said he believed that most of the items in the consultant's reports were "punch list" items that can be hashed out during the review of the application. Most of them will be responded to in

HOMELAND TOWERS – TAX MAP 226-1-38 (cont.)

their next submission, the main ones being that there are wetlands located near the property, so they will do their best to locate the utilities along the already cleared areas so as not to disturb the wetlands. Mr. Kenny noted that this is an existing office building and the area where they are being located is already a paved area. It will be a little bit off the disturbed area and there will be two trees that will be removed as part of this project, but they are doing their best to preserve all the trees that they can on the site. He said they would be happy to answer any questions and would like to entertain the scheduling of a public hearing for maybe the second meeting in August so they can get the public input on this application.

Chairman Gerver then asked M. Musso for his comments. M. Musso said that he did submit an update memo. He said this was the first full submittal for site plan and special permit. He said that what is being proposed is quite similar to an existing cell site on the northbound lane of the Thruway in Sloatsburg, just north of the 87/287 confluence. He said it is not a very tall tower, it's set low to the ground and there is one anchor tenant on top and three antenna arrays below. He said that what they received and are reviewing is a pretty comprehensive application. He noted that there is a lot of technical information he will be reviewing and asking for clarification on. He noted that this is really an offload or a capacity application. There is a little bit of new coverage. He said that between Woodbury Common and the Thruway they are intense call traffic areas. He added that the two sites they refer to are called Harriman – which is up on Arden House Road, and Woodbury Common, which is actually by the BMW dealership. These two towers are noted by Verizon to have increased service problems.

M. Musso said that another thing that is interesting is that what is being proposed now is a very standard galvanized monopole. He mentioned a recent application where the Board looked at a stealth tree option. He said he will be asking the applicant for a little more information as the time comes. He said there was an alternate site analysis that he will definitely have questions on. He was hoping to ask a lot of his questions and put out a supplemental memo next week for clarification. M. Musso also noted that there is an access gate to the Thruway in the proposed location of the compound. He was curious if the Thruway had been contacted about this.

Chairman Gerver explained that there is a crash gate further up on Abrams Road that the Woodbury Police and Fire have access to and have keys for it. This access is also cleared when it snows.

M. Musso asked the applicant if they had heard anything from the State Historic Preservation Office. Mr. Kenny said they have a response from them and it should have been included with the first submission. He will make sure the Board gets this response. M. Musso also pointed out that, because of the height of this tower, no special lighting or strobing will be required. Mr. Kenny noted that there was an FAA opinion letter submitted with this application.

M. Musso also noted that there is a generator proposed on the ground which will run on propane. They are drafting a technical memo about this.

HOMELAND TOWERS – TAX MAP 226-1-38 (cont.)

M. Musso said there are a few technical questions that need to be answered. One of them is the balance of co-location. He said that 110' is not very high above the tree line so what about other carriers that might be interested in this location? He said that if Verizon is having issues then T-Mobile or Sprint may also be having similar issues. The idea of 110' accommodating co-locations is a key question. Mr. Kenny said they could build the tower to be extendable if there is a need and another carrier comes along. He said the reason for the height is that is what is in the Town code. M. Musso said the extension was a good point and that their structural engineer has certified that this tower will be able to accommodate two co-locations. He said he would be asking the applicant for more information on this.

Chairman Gerver asked K. Naughton when the FCC regulation or the "shot clock" starts. K. Naughton said it was 30 days which actually expired on July 4th. She said she did reach out to them on the 5th, but the application was not complete so that hasn't started yet. She said M. Musso's technical memo in the next week or so will list out whatever else is missing for the Board's consideration. She said she wanted to touch on things that the Board could do tonight for this application. She said she did not think the Board could schedule a public hearing tonight because under SEQRA, the notice of intent has a 30-day time frame. That 30 days will not have expired by that public hearing. She said the Board could make a motion to declare its intent to be Lead Agency and can type this as an Unlisted Action. Her office will prepare a Part Two EAF and send copies to the applicant. She said this does require 239 referral which she thought was sent out but nothing has been received yet.

D. Lindsay informed the Board that he spoke to M. Rubio about this and the requirements for advertising this are more difficult and more time consuming than they are for a typical public hearing. So, she could not possibly list it for the next meeting. He said if there are only two weeks between meetings it will have to be listed for a month out. If there are three weeks in between it may be able to be done for the following meeting. He will check with M. Rubio.

Mr. Kenny asked what other agencies would be involved in a coordinated review of this application. K. Naughton said that the DEC would be involved because of the trees and potentially the Army Corps because of potential disturbance of the wetlands. Mr. Kenny said there will be no disturbance in the wetland. They made sure that the whole fenced in area is outside of not only the wetlands, but the wetlands buffer. The only potential disturbance within the buffer is the trenching from an existing utility pole on site to this site. D. Lindsay questioned whether this was a DEC wetland. The applicant said that the wetlands that this was a buffer to was a local wetland, but he said he could confirm that. D. Lindsay said local would be Army Corps but they don't require a buffer. However, locally, there is an adjacent area permit so they would need to get a local permit for wetlands. This permit is issued by the Building Department. The review authority is with the Planning Board. K. Naughton said that this Freshwater Wetlands permit also requires a public hearing. Once this is submitted, she will make sure both public hearings are held at the same time. She will also confirm whether or not this should go to the Army Corps.

HOMELAND TOWERS – TAX MAP 226-1-38 (cont.)

Chairman Gerver asked if the Thruway needed to be notified. K. Naughton said there would be no disturbance near the Thruway. D. Lindsay said that they will get a notice of the public hearing as an adjacent property owner.

Mr. Kenny asked, if they get all their materials in before August 7th, could they be placed on that agenda for the Board to consider scheduling a public hearing for September. K. Naughton suggested waiting to see when the materials are actually received.

D. Lindsay suggested that this should be referred to the ESO's for their comments. Chairman Gerver asked D. Lindsay if his office could notify the ESO's.

S. Capriglione had some questions. She noted that the name on the application was Adria Hill, which is nowhere near this site. The applicant explained that they were supposed to get the name changed. He said this had to do with Verizon's internal budgeting where they assign the site a name and if it moves to a different location, the name goes with it. He said the name was irrelevant and he was sorry that it was causing confusion. He said the color-coded maps will show the coverage area. S. Capriglione said she did not like the placement of this tower in a residential area. She wondered if they had considered placing the antennas on the high tension power lines at the top of Estrada Road. Mr. Kenny said this would be a really difficult contracting and leasing process. He said a lot of projects that try to go that route die in the approval process so they are usually unfeasible locations. He said they could look into it more.

M. Musso added that the public service commission is not allowing access to right-of- ways and he is not seeing co-location on transmission towers. He said he hasn't seen any in ten years.

S. Capriglione said she would like to see it looked at just to take it out of the residential area. She also asked about the propane generator and how often it would run. The applicant said it would run once a month, but not for a very long period of time. M. Musso said a condition could be put in the resolution that it would only be run once a week for 15 or 30 minutes.

S. Capriglione asked if someone could liken the noise level to something familiar. M. Musso said it would probably be as loud as he is speaking now. S. Capriglione asked about the RF emissions. M. Musso said that there was an emissions report that was done that accounted for the Verizon equipment and three other carriers. The emissions were more than 20 times below what is permissible. He said it is compliant and he is comfortable with these levels. Mr. Kenny wanted to point out that RF emission levels are a preemptive topic by the telecommunications act so by certifying that they meet the FCC rules and regulations, the Planning Board is actually prevented from basing its decision on that topic. M. Musso said the Board could still ask questions. Mr. Kenny said they will continue to answer the questions, but he just wanted to point that out.

M. Musso noted for the Board that he would be interfacing with Homeland Towers. He just wanted to let the Board know.

HOMELAND TOWERS – TAX MAP 226-1 -38 (cont.)

Chairman Gerver asked for a motion to declare this an Unlisted Action under SEQRA and declare the Planning Board’s intent to be Lead Agency for this application. R. Anzalone made the motion. R. Cataggio seconded the motion. The vote was as follows:

- C. Gerver – In Favor
- R. Anzalone – In Favor
- J. Buglino – In Favor
- S. Capriglione – In Favor
- R. Cataggio – In Favor

GENCO – TAX MAP 231-3-6.1 & 6.2

Chairman Gerver explained that this was to be a review of a previously approved Site Plan, Special Permit and ARB for a proposed 7- unit residential complex on vacant property, which has expired. Property is located in the HB Zoning District at 6 and 8 Falkirk Avenue in Central Valley.

At this point Vito Scalia from Genco introduced himself. He said they are looking to renew their previously approved site plan. Chairman Gerver asked K. Naughton if the Board could reaffirm SEQRA for this application. She said the Board could reaffirm its Negative Declaration, but under the code this still requires a public hearing, there’s no waiver for that. She also suggested that the Board re-refer this to the County for 239 review. Chairman Gerver asked if the Board could schedule a public hearing before the 239 comes back. K. Naughton said that the Board could schedule a public hearing and authorize her to draft a resolution. She said that since the County has already weighed in on this application they may just ask if anything has changed.

Chairman Gerver asked D. Lindsay for his comments. D. Lindsay said that the only comment he had was that the plans that came in shortly after their approval were not signed. He asked that the engineer certify that those are the same plans that this Board is being asked to approve and that there are no changes other than those that were required to satisfy the resolution. The only change to be made to the plans now would be the revision date so they know that they are the proper plans that this Board is going to act on.

At this point S. Capriglione made a motion to reaffirm SEQRA with the Negative Declaration of significance. J. Buglino seconded the motion. The vote was as follows:

- C. Gerver – In Favor
- R. Anzalone – In Favor
- J. Buglino – In Favor
- S. Capriglione – In Favor
- R. Cataggio – In Favor

GENCO – TAX MAP 231-3-6.1 & 6.2 (cont.)

Chairman Gerver made a motion to schedule a public hearing on this application for August 7. S. Capriglione seconded the motion. The vote was as follows:

C. Gerver – In Favor
R. Anzalone – In Favor
J. Buglino – In Favor
S. Capriglione – In Favor
R. Cataggio – In Favor

Chairman Gerver then made a motion to authorize counsel to draft a resolution of approval. S. Capriglione seconded the motion. The vote was as follows:

C. Gerver – In Favor
R. Anzalone – In Favor
J. Buglino – In Favor
S. Capriglione – In Favor
R. Cataggio – In Favor

There was no further business for the Board to conduct, so R. Cataggio made a motion to adjourn the meeting. S. Capriglione seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous and the meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Gale A. Naugle
Planning Board Secretary

