City of Auburn Planning Board

Tuesday May 5, 2020 6:30 pm

Memorial City Hall

Present (by videoconference): Andy Tehan, Crystal Cosentino (Chair), Tina Tomasso, Elizabeth Koenig, Theresa Walsh

Excused: None

Staff: Stephen Selvek, Office of Planning and Economic Development; Holly Glor, Secretary; Brian Hicks, Code Enforcement; Nate Garland, Corporation Counsel (by videoconference)

**Agenda Items:**

1. Approval of the March 3, 2020 Planning Board Meeting Minutes

2. Application for Site Plan Review to construct a +/- 10,000 SF building and associated site improvements at 4200 Tech Park Blvd. Applicant: Geoff Blackwell for Northern Mast Climbers.

3. Application for a Special Use Permit to convert the existing building into an 8 apartment multiple family dwelling at 70 South Street. Applicant: Robin Casper

Items Approved: Agenda Items 1 & 2

Applications Denied: None

Applications Tabled: Agenda Item 3

**Steve Selvek** 00:06

Okay, Crystal, I guess if you want to call the meeting to order, it's to you now.

**Crystal Cosentino** 00:14

All right, so we'll call the roll.

**Holly Glor** 00:26

Andy Tehan.

**Andy Tehan** 00:28

Here.

**Holly Glor** 00:29

Elizabeth Koenig. Elizabeth.

**Steve Selvek** 00:37

Elizabeth appears to be muted. I just unmuted Elizabeth. Okay. She just re muted. Oh, you can try that again.

**Holly Glor** 00:47

Elizabeth Koenig.

**Elizabeth Koenig** 00:56

Can you hear me?

**Holly Glor** 00:57

Yes, perfect. Okay, she's here.

**Elizabeth Koenig** 00:59

Okay. Thank you. Sorry.

**Holly Glor** 01:01

Tina Tomasso

**Tina Tomasso** 01:03

Here.

**Holly Glor** 01:04

Theresa Walsh.

**Theresa Walsh** 01:06

Here.

**Holly Glor** 01:07

And Crystal Cosentino

**Crystal Cosentino** 01:10

Here. The first item on the agenda is the approval of meeting minutes of March 3, 2020 Planning Board Meeting, is there a motion to approve the Meeting Minutes?

**Elizabeth Koenig** 01:25

I approve.

**Theresa Walsh** 01:28

Second.

**Crystal Cosentino** 01:30

All in favor?

**Andy Tehan** 01:32

Aye.

**Elizabeth Koenig** 01:32

Aye.

**Theresa Walsh** 01:33

Aye.

**Tina Tomaso** 01:34

Aye.

**Crystal Cosentino** 01:35

Any opposed? The motion carries.

**Steve Selvek** 01:40

Can we confirm who the second was.

**Theresa Walsh** 01:46

Theresa.

**Elizabeth Koenig** 01:48

There we go again.

**Steve Selvek** 01:54

It was Elizabeth and Theresa

**Crystal Cosentino** 01:58

The second item on the list is an application for site plan review to construct a new building at 4200 Tech Park Boulevard. Our applicant Jeff Blackwell or their math or climbers, sorry. Can we have staff comments?

**Steve Selvek** 02:19

On the, with this particular project and I'm assuming everyone can see the screen that I shared? Well, yes, started back previously, at the March meeting, and there was a presentation and public to be heard. There were some comments from both the members of the public as well as on staff with respect to clarifying and a few items within the plans themselves. The plans were revised and resubmitted. Changes to the plans included the driveway being paved. The chain link fence being filled with slats so that it created a barrier around the gravel lot and the trees added to both Commerce Way and Tech Park Boulevard. Also, a note about tilting mounted, mounted activated LED lights. I want to bring the revised site plan up for everyone so they have it before them, over here somewhere, so, as noted the driveway being paved. That means the additional of the commerce way driveway as well as the driveway for the parking area being paved, and then the fence being extended or, the fence existed, but the fence being filled with slats so that it hid the inside of the parking lot being taken care of. I hate to do this but I gotta find out, let me hold on. Got it, think I got it and the trees being planted along both Technology Park Boulevard and Commerce Way and ultimately the building mounted lights as well. So, that took care of any of the comments that City staff had with respect to the plans. Staff has prepared for you and provided to you in your packets, let's see, both the draft SEQRA forms and the resolutions for your consideration. Going through the draft SEQRA forms and I'll see if I can bring these up a little bit. In its own. Part two of the environmental impact I've indicated for the board's consideration, no to either smaller or moderate impact for all the various items under the SEQRA requirements. Please note that I went ahead and I reviewed the New York State Environmental Resource Mapper, the National Wetlands Inventory, the FEMA firm, the New York State DEC Environmental Site Remediation Database and the full swip which was prepared. In reviewing part 113-A was checked, yes, indicating that there was a, a wetland within proximity to the site itself. In this particular case, it's a wetland that's on the opposite side of Tech Park Boulevard and the construction is not on or adjacent to the identified wetland. And then, under question 20 also being checked with regards to potential sites that exist on the remediation database, it's referring to the City of Auburn Landfill and in that case, the New York State DEC classifies it that is for meaning that the site has been properly closed and just requires monitoring. With that said, there's no anticipated and significant environmental impacts so staff has prepared a resolution for your consideration. And ultimately having just discussed the site plan as well, staff prepared a resolution for your consideration under that too. Let me come down to that second resolution. Got lots of plans in here. I need a page down feature. I've got too much other stuff. There we go. Ultimately, what you're being asked to approve tonight is specifically the revised site plan that was shown and then the grading utility plan that was part of the documents that was discussed previously showing the stormwater management. If there's questions or discussion from the board, I'll turn that back to Crystal, and we can, I can try to answer any of those questions. I do have here this evening, the applicant, architect, that I can get online as well to speak to any questions that I might not be able to answer. So, Crystal, I'll turn it back to you.

**Crystal Cosentino** 08:30

Alright, thanks. Are there any board questions or any points of discussion for Steve or for that project?

**Theresa Walsh** 08:47

I don't have any questions.

**Elizabeth Koenig** 08:49

I don't have any questions.

**Crystal Cosentino** 08:54

All right. I don't I don't either. I guess we'll move forward. Is there a motion to adopt the SEQRA Resolution regarding the negative declaration?

**Theresa Walsh** 09:06

So moved

**Crystal Cosentino** 09:07

Motion made by Theresa, second by

**Elizabeth Koenig** 09:10

Elizabeth.

**Crystal Cosentino** 09:12

Elizabeth. Can I get the Secretary to call the roll?

**Holly Glor** 09:19

Andy Tehan.

**Andy Tehan** 09:23

Aye.

**Holly Glor** 09:24

Elizabeth Koenig.

**Elizabeth Koenig** 09:26

Yes.

**Holly Glor** 09:27

Tina Tomasso

**Tina Tomasso** 09:29

Yes.

**Holly Glor** 09:31

Theresa Walsh.

**Theresa Walsh** 09:33

Yes.

**Holly Glor** 09:34

And Crystal Cosentino?

**Crystal Cosentino** 09:39

Yes. Motion carries. Is there a motion to adopt the Resolution approving the site plan?

**Tina Tomasso** 09:53

Yes.

**Crystal Cosentino** 09:54

Made by Tina second by.

**Theresa Walsh** 09:58

Second.

**Crystal Cosentino** 09:59

Theresa

**Theresa Walsh** 10:00

Yep.

**Crystal Cosentino** 10:02

Can I ask the Secretary please call the roll?

**Holly Glor** 10:05

Andy Tehan?

**Andy Tehan** 10:11

Yes.

**Holly Glor** 10:13

Elizabeth Koenig

**Elizabeth Koenig** 10:14

Yes.

**Holly Glor** 10:16

Tina Tomasso

**Tina Tomasso** 10:18

Yes.

**Holly Glor** 10:19

Theresa Walsh.

**Theresa Walsh** 10:21

Yes.

**Holly Glor** 10:22

Crystal Cosentino.

**Crystal Cosentino** 10:25

Yes. Motion carried. The third item on the agenda tonight is an application for special use permit to use the existing building at 70 South Street for an 8 unit dwelling. The applicant is Robin, or I'm sorry, Robin Kasper. Yes, we could get staff comments?

**Steve Selvek** 10:51

In your packets, as was provided to the board I outlined a variety of comments and considerations for the special use application before you this evening indicating that the attached, included in your packets was the application itself, the proposed building layout, the conceptual site plan, and the draft resolution for the reuse of 70 South Street as an eight unit, multi family dwelling unit. We're, we're asking to move forward on this tonight because of the timeframes associated with the special use permit. So, I anticipate that the board want to have some discussion over the concerns that have been raised regarding the application itself. But to clarify for the board and the members of the public, again as a special use permit, the request for more than five units is an allowable use by special use permit, it basically gives the opportunity for the City and specifically the Planning Board to look at a set of criteria and determine whether or not the application complies with those criteria. The the five criteria as mentioned in the the memorandum include that the proposed use would not generate traffic beyond the capacity of the road serving the site or contribute to traffic congestion or pose a hazard to pedestrians. That noise, smoke. dust noxious matter, heat, glare and vibrations emitting from the proposed use will not exceed those customarily associated with the neighborhood. That the storage and waste, storage and waste material will be screened from general public view. The fourth one is that the general appearance of the use will be compatible with the predominant scale and physical character of the neighborhood and that all the requirements for the chapter are met ultimately meaning the the specific zoning requirements. Within the application I included right within the memorandum I included for the board, a staff review of, the staff review of the zoning information itself indicating that the the proposal complies with that last specific criteria, meeting the requirements of the chapter. Further than that, I went on to look at other sections of the code which were of concern regarding conversions and whether or not, whether or not there was a concern with the, the conversion side of it, as I noted that this particular section doesn't necessarily clearly apply, however, I felt that it was a good basis for the board to look at and assist in making their determination. And again, the the requirements of the proposal or the the application do comply with those various requirements, including square footage of the apartments, the minimum building size, the lot square footage, and then compliance with the parking requirements. With that said on that side, I know I've also forwarded to the board five subsequent letters that were received in the past several days regarding neighbors' concerns with respect to the the application itself, and these were neighbors that had spoken initially at the public hearing in March and number one reiterated their concerns and kind of expressed their concerns as it relates to the five criteria that exists for the board's consideration. The letters that I received are from Alex Vanderpool and Amy Vanderpool at 3 Elizabeth Street. Paul Dungy at 5 Elizabeth Street. Richard and Elaine Otterson, I don't have their address here, but I'm pretty confident that they were 1 Elizabeth Street. Kim Dungey at 5 Elizabeth Street, as well as, Karen Walter who resides that 15 Case Ave. The letters were provided to each of the members of the board if you have specific questions that are within those, please let me know. To summarize the the concerns raised by the neighborhood, includes the worrying concern of vehicular traffic and its potential to backup traffic on South Street with turning movements in and out of the driveway. It is a narrow driveway in that location. There's concerns with the way that trash could be managed. There was concerns with the stormwater management pond, or, I should say area not necessarily a pond but an area that's required as part of the parking area. The noise associated with the eight units and the parking lot itself. One of the specific concerns that came up regarding parking is while the application complies with the requirements for the minimum number of parking spaces as shown here, where eight, eight are required and nine are provided. There is a concern regarding whether or not in fact, that amount of parking is adequate for eight units. It's it's unlikely that every unit would be limited to one vehicle. So that is a concern that was raised by the the neighbors themselves. And what I guess I'll do is I will turn it over to the Chair and any members of the Board for any questions or further discussion that they may have with respect to the proposal as it's been presented.

**Crystal Cosentino** 17:55

Do any of the board members have any any questions? I did have a pretty lengthy conversation with Steve, trying to get some clarification on some of the questions many members of the public want to ask, some of these issues at the public hearing we had two months ago and then of course, get their concerns again, through the letters that you received Before I just reiterate and go through questions that I had with Steve and get some clarification, does anybody else have any questions?

**Andy Tehan** 18:45

Crystal?

**Steve Selvek** 18:47

Go ahead Andy.

**Andy Tehan** 18:49

Hi. I had a question regarding the drainage pool in the backyard. Steve could you elaborate on what that would actually look like. There seem to be some concerns from the neighbors there's going to be like a swamp like structure.

**Steve Selvek** 19:09

Yeah, that area in the excuse me that area in the rear there is identified as a stormwater management area or a rain garden. In that case, it typically is a, a shallow depression that is planted with water loving plants in order to help mitigate any potential stormwater runoff. I can go ahead and with the chairs permission, try to bring up the the applicants representative and see if they're able to better explain what that would entail. Let's see here.

**Crystal Cosentino** 19:56

Sure if that's possible, that probably would help, several people have brought that question up.

**Steve Selvek** 20:09

Now if this fails miserably then we'll figure something out. But hey, there's my attendees. Ed, Can you hear us at this point and speak? If not, forget it. Ed, are you with us? We will note that is one question that we have to come back to.

**Crystal Cosentino** 21:24

Okay. Does anybody else have any other other questions besides the stormwater?

**Tina Tomasso** 21:39

Is there any I mean traffic was one that was brought up in several of the letters too. Is this anything like a traffic in advance? I'm not guessing study or anything but is there anything involved with this is really going to have this big of an impact when people have to make left hand turns on Elizabeth and South Street all day long.

**Steve Selvek** 22:02

Yeah, I did speak with our traffic officer Greg Gilfus prior to tonight's meeting just to get his opinion as to whether or not he had any concerns with traffic for either tonight's projects. He had no concerns he did note that South Street itself is a busier street. It's not uncommon for vehicles to have to wait to make left hand turns into the businesses or residential properties up and down there. He did not have specific concerns with respect to the the capacity of South Street being able to absorb the additional residential units in this location.

**Elizabeth Koenig** 22:57

I have a question.

**Steve Selvek** 22:59

Certainly, Elizabeth Okay.

**Elizabeth Koenig** 23:02

Can you hear me? Okay, um, so my question is regarding regarding the driveway was that looked at is that is that pretty standard that width the driveway?

**Steve Selvek** 23:20

The driveway that exists there which was raised as a concern is narrow. There's no two ways about that, it's not uncommon for driveways along South Street, whether they serve residential properties or commercial businesses to be that narrow. It's it's not ideal, but it's not against code either. And again, I mean, the more traffic that you have the more units that you have generating larger trips in and out of there the more potential you have for conflict on any of those driveways or if it's a different commercial use within that.

**Elizabeth Koenig** 24:24

I do realize that there is no shortage of rental property. Living on South Street for so long I have always seen for rent signs. So, I don't understand. If it's not assessed or zoned for eight apartments, it is for four, is that correct?

**Steve Selvek** 24:48

Well, it it is, it is zoned for, quite frankly, it's zoned for any number of apartments.

**Elizabeth Koenig** 24:55

Okay.

**Steve Selvek** 24:57

The as of right use is up to four units in that location. So, if it was four units or less, and all honesty he could come and pull his building permit and be on his way. Five and more units requires a special use permit. So, these are uses which are permitted within the zoning district, but subject to the review and quite honestly the discussion that we are having this evening.

**Elizabeth Koenig** 25:27

I guess my concern is changing the characteristic of South Street there has becoming more apartments every time somebody buys a building or historic building, they put it into apartments. Um, I don't know no, I have a problem with that, I guess. We already have Kings and Queens, and, etc.

**Steve Selvek** 25:47

Understood.

**Crystal Cosentino** 25:49

So, Elizabeth, if I can just piggyback on on that comment and sort of ask a question of Steve, one of the things he and I spoke about earlier today was about the appearance and scale issue as it relates to that building in particular, and its location in the district it is in as it's in a commercial district, but it's on the outlying area of it. So, Steve if you could speak to how we can look at appearance and scale as to how we can make a determination on this special use permit, thinking about the eight units and how it does impact a single family household, single family residential neighborhood, on Elizabeth.

**Steve Selvek** 26:43

And into that, what, what I want to turn back to is the, the couple criteria for the board's review and two of those criteria with regards to the noise and then the other one being the general appearance, and the compatibility with the predominant scale within the neighborhood. Both of those criteria are based upon looking at the neighborhood in which the subject property exists and not solely at the, the, the zoning district in which it's in. In this particular case, this property is on the boundary of the specialized commercial zoning district, and it shares that boundary with the R1 zoning district. So for instance, a property that was located squarely within the specialized commercial district may have different considerations than one that is located at the boundary of it, because the neighborhood in which it's located, does change, we don't have a definition of exactly what a neighborhood is. So, each Board Member really is looking at what they see that particular neighborhood to be, and the mixture of uses and ultimately the scale of what happens there. And part of the scale question that had come up is with regards to what's appropriate for the scale of a parking lot in one neighborhood versus the scale of that parking lot within another neighborhood.

**Crystal Cosentino** 28:38

One of the other items that I talked to Steve about earlier was related to parking and what kind of buffering we might be able to suggest as a condition of this special use permit, because there currently is no fencing as it relates to the parking and I think there's only reference to a couple of landscaping items as to whether or not, because we all know that in an eight unit rental building, there's not just going to be nine parking spots used or a need for nine, there's going to be a need for a lot more. I mean, if you just think about it right now, we're all working from home. If it's a single person, certainly there's one vehicle but in my parking, my driveway, there's two, many people cohabitate, whether it's a roommate, or a significant other, so, um, you know, with eight units, it's hard to imagine that you would only see eight parking spots needed, or, maybe nine. So, that certainly would impact the adjacent neighborhood, for sure. So, when we're thinking again about the scale and the appearance, I think that there's a concern there, but then also Steve about the parking in and of itself. There might be room for nine but the question really is, is nine the only amount of parking that's going to be needed for that building?

**Steve Selvek** 30:12

And that's, that's, of course a valid question, the nine complies with code and code was set up so it's such that we don't end up with situations of exorbitant parking created in any any location. But to meet the the absolute minimums necessary associated with any particular use. That's definitely something for the board I think to consider in their discussion and whether or not they feel that in reality, it's it's sufficient to allow eight parking spaces when there is an availability of on street parking as well. Regarding the discussion around the buffers, and fencing, and things of that nature, the board does have the option to, to include restrictions or conditions on a special use permit. So, while a fence around the parking or the property perimeter or something that nature is not required under code, the board can look at it very specifically and say, hey, it's going to help mitigate and buffer between apartment building and the neighboring properties. The, so, if the board's gonna discuss the, the, the desire for any conditions, I would want to touch base with the applicant to see what, I mean quite honestly, whether or not he's amenable to those particular conditions and I do have my screen here that shows the applicant I think is available as well, if the board has questions for him, I couldn't get the project architect on but I do see him available. So, if there's questions about adjustments or conditions or requirements, we can have that conversation as well.

**Crystal Cosentino** 32:27

Does anybody else have any other questions? Steve, are you do you have the ability to unmute Andy, it looks like he's asking a question.

**Steve Selvek** 32:50

I do here

**Andy Tehan** 32:54

can hear me?

**Steve Selvek** 32:55

Yeah, we can hear you Andy.

**Andy Tehan** 32:59

I did lose audio for just a couple minutes and I didn't know did we talk about the possibility if the application will be amended to less than eight families at some point? Is that a possibility?

**Steve Selvek** 33:14

We can present that to him? I would just ask for the chairs Permission to invite him to speak on that.

**Crystal Cosentino** 33:30

That would be great.

**Steve Selvek** 33:42

Robin, are you able to hear us and can we hear you? Clearly, the not fun-ness of this particular application. So, given some of the difficulties that we are having this evening, although I would like the board to move forward in the required 62-day schedule, I'm a little, I know that the board has a couple questions that have come up at this point regarding the potential to amend the application, as well as, some clarification on the storm water area. And, I would be reluctant to recommend the board take action if their questions have not been satisfactorily answered at this point.

**Crystal Cosentino** 34:52

It appears he can hear us through chat.

**Steve Selvek** 34:55

 He can hear us through chat but I can't give him permission to speak which isn't.

**Crystal Cosentino** 35:08

So, Steve, is the board do we have to act within 62 days or by taking it off are we acting even if we can't make a decision?

**Steve Selvek** 35:18

The requirement per the, the and Nate can always jump in and yell at me if I'm wrong. But the requirement per the general city law is that, it's a 62-day decision period, from the time that the public hearing is held to the time that the application is made, that can be extended by mutual agreement of the applicant and the board. In the absence of that, it does provide the opportunity for the applicant to bring, and again, this is me not being the lawyer person, to bring suit against the board for not making that determination. I don't know that that would be, I don't know the likeliness of that happening because the board would likely pick this back up at the next meeting anyways. I don't know.

**Nate Garland** 36:13

Steve that was a succinct explanation Steve, I agree.

**Steve Selvek** 36:18

Thank you, Nate. So I'll leave it to the board. Given the, which I'm a little confused by only because I was able to do it for Elizabeth, without any issues and it's not letting me do it for other members of the public at this point for whatever reason, which isn't really cool.

**Crystal Cosentino** 36:50

Well, I mean, it does appear that there would be some conditions that the board would be looking and potentially propose and if we can't talk with the applicant and the representative then I'm not sure we would be able to move forward either way. I mean, I don't want to propose something that it's defeated, it would almost make more sense, and again, I don't know the proper procedures but it would almost make more sense to table it to be able to hopefully meet in person in June or workout some of these glitches before our June meeting.

**Steve Selvek** 37:30

So, with that said, before we, before we move to table the application, I just want to confirm with the the board the questions that I'm that I'm hearing specifically around the, the proposal as shown and one was with regards to detailing the the storm water area and having a better understanding of what that actually entails and what it would look like things of that nature. The other question was regard to the potential for adding a requirement for solid fencing or something of that nature to provide additional buffering and separation between the properties. And the final one, make sure I'm making my notes here, is whether or not the applicant would be amenable to considering a reduced number of units as part of the special use permit.

**Elizabeth Koenig** 38:28

Yeah, I agree.

**Crystal Cosentino** 38:29

Yes.

**Elizabeth Koenig** 38:30

Yes.

**Andy Tehan** 38:34

Yes, I agree with that.

**Steve Selvek** 38:42

These are gonna be questions regardless. Were there any other questions?

**Elizabeth Koenig** 38:53

Steve, I just have a question. Who, say we grant the eight apartments at 70 South? I, what would prevent from the rest of the houses being in the historic district from going residential to apartments, apartments apartments? No.

**Steve Selvek** 39:17

Ultimately that that depends upon which zoning district you are within the, within the historic district. The historic district is an overlay district up and down South Street, as well as, the side streets there, and it has a series of different zoning districts underneath that, some of those been R1, if I believe I'm not mistaken, R2, as well as, specialized commercial. Actually, also, I think the downtown district may extend into the historic district as well. So, ultimately it would be the underlying zoning that that controls whether or not apartment units are created or allowed to be created within the historic district,

**Elizabeth Koenig** 40:06

But this is also in a residential, isn't it?

**Steve Selvek** 40:09

This actually is within the specialized commercial district. This particular property that we're discussing. It's adjacent to, it's adjacent to both the R1 and R2 zoning districts.

**Elizabeth Koenig** 40:28

So, it's not a C4?

**Steve Selvek** 40:30

Well, it's the former C4.

**Elizabeth Koenig** 40:33

Okay,

**Steve Selvek** 40:34

Which is now called specialized commercial.

**Elizabeth Koenig** 40:41

Thank you.

**Crystal Cosentino** 40:52

So how should we move forward?

**Steve Selvek** 40:55

If there's no other questions that the board has ultimately for the, the applicant, what I would do at this time is make a recommendation that you, you do table the application until next month so that we can get some additional detail for the board's consideration.

**Crystal Cosentino** 41:21

Does the board, members of the board have any other questions that we want to put forth to get answers to for now?

**Tina Tomasso** 41:37

I think those three are about it for me.

**Elizabeth Koenig** 41:41

So, I'd just like to just ask one more question, sorry. So, you have nine vehicles going in and out of the driveway and that's all the residential, their backyards, that’s about, so, when you have cars and lights going up or down? What is that? What can they do to buffer that even more? Like especially the lights, you know, headlights?

**Steve Selvek** 42:07

And certainly, and that's something that I think we can, we can ask them for some additional buffering and I think the recommendation by the board at this point may be looking specifically at a fence. But right now, the the plan does indicate as required specifically by the the zoning code for the additional landscaped beds that are around the parking area itself. But we can also look at what the potential is to require, again, some type of fence some type of hard structure to prevent versus minimize the the light shining into neighboring properties. Well, I mean, I will I will note that in this particular plan, the the driveway is opposite the existing carriage barn which in and of itself helps to separate those two things but it only does it for a certain portion of the parking lot itself.

**Crystal Cosentino** 43:22

All right, so is there a motion by a member of the board to table the application? For more clarification and questions answered.

**Elizabeth Koenig** 43:35

I propose to table this.

**Crystal Cosentino** 43:37

Made by Elizabeth, second by?

**Theresa Walsh** 43:41

Second.

**Crystal Cosentino** 43:43

By Theresa. All in favor?

**All Attendees** 43:47

Aye.

**Crystal Cosentino** 43:48

Any opposed? Motion carried.

**Steve Selvek** 43:56

Okay. So what I will do is I will follow up with the applicant offline regarding those specific items and come back to the board next month. Hopefully, quite frankly, while we're sitting around here, but who knows?

**Crystal Cosentino** 44:21

Alright, so the meeting for the next one is June 2 at 6:30 and like Steve says, hopefully, we can all be together. I appreciate everybody participating tonight and this unique way of hosting a Planning Board meeting. Thanks to staff, Steve and Holly, for being back at council chambers and holding down the fort. Really appreciate you pulling us together and for Nate, being our trusty attorney there for, you know, any people needs that we have so, I guess that's all for tonight. Is there a motion to adjourn?

**Theresa Walsh** 45:04

Yes.

**Crystal Cosentino** 45:07

By Theresa, is there a second?

**Tina Tomasso** 45:10

By Tina.

**Crystal Cosentino** 45:12

 Made by Tina. All in favor?

**All Attendees** 45:15

Aye.

**Steve Selvek** 45:24

I think we're breaking up.

**Crystal Cosentino** 45:26

Carried, we'll see you in June, hope everybody stays safe.

**Steve Selvek** 45:32

Thank you.

Respectively submitted by Holly Glor