

APPROVED

HAROLD GARY
Chairman

CRAIG PAEPRER
Vice-Chair

BOARD MEMBERS
ANTHONY GIANNICO
DAVE FURFARO
CARL STONE
KIM KUGLER
RAYMOND COTE

TOWN OF CARMEL PLANNING BOARD



60 McAlpin Avenue
Mahopac, New York 10541
Tel. (845) 628-1500 – Ext.190
www.ci.carmelny.ny.us

MICHAEL CARNAZZA
*Director of Code
Enforcement*

RICHARD FRANZETTI, P.E.
Town Engineer

PATRICK CLEARY
*AICP, CEP, PP, LEED AP
Town Planner*

VINCENT FRANZE
Architectural Consultant

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

SEPTEMBER 13, 2017

PRESENT: CHAIRMAN, HAROLD GARY, VICE-CHAIR, CRAIG PAEPRER, ANTHONY GIANNICO,
CARL STONE, DAVE FURFARO, RAYMOND COTE

ABSENT: KIM KUGLER

<u>APPLICANT</u>	<u>TAX MAP #</u>	<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TYPE</u>	<u>ACTION OF THE BOARD</u>
Sansevera, John	55.5-1-4	1	Resolution	Resolution Adopted.
Hilltop Manor Realty	76.22-1-5	1	Site Plan	Public Hearing Scheduled and Planner to be Prepare Resolution.
NY Fuel Distributors (Coco Farms)	55.11-1-40	1-4	A. Site Plan	Public Hearing Scheduled.
New York SMSA Limited Partnership-d/b/a Verizon Wireless	65.9-1-24	4-7	A. Site Plan	No Board Action.
Infantino, Thomas & Lori	64.12-1-56	8-9	Sketch Plan	No Board Action.
McDonald's USA, LLC	55.11-1-41	9	Bond Return	Applicant Did Not Show Up.
Town Board Referral – Proposed Ordinance Regarding Wireless Telecommunications		9-13		Discussion.
Minutes – 07/26/17 & 08/16/17		13		Approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:16 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rose Trombetta

JOHN SANSEVERA – 47 GLENEIDA RIDGE ROAD – TM – 55.5-1-4 – RESOLUTION

Mr. Carnazza stated all zoning comments have been addressed.

Mr. Franzetti stated all engineering comments have been addressed.

Mr. Cleary stated all planning comments have been addressed and you have a resolution for approval of a regrading plan before you tonight.

Mr. Cote moved to adopt Resolution #17-14, dated September 13 2017; Tax Map #55.5-1-4 entitled Sansevera Regrading Plan Approval. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Paepre with all in favor.

HILLTOP MANOR REALTY – 164 EAST LAKE BLVD – TM – 76.22-1-5 – SITE PLAN

Mr. Carnazza read his memo which stated provide a north point and how are the two posts that are not on proposed footings being supported by. The chairman asked for the structural information on the “Boathouse”.

Mr. Franzetti had no engineering comments.

Mr. Cleary had no planning issues and the ECB granted their approval in August.

Mr. Joel Greenberg of Architectural Visions, representing the applicant stated with regards to the comment that Mr. Carnazza made, I have a letter from the structural engineer which was given to the consultants.

Mr. Franzetti said the letter needs to be signed and sealed by the structural engineer.

Chairman Gary said we will schedule a public hearing.

Mr. Greenberg asked if he could have a resolution also.

Chairman Gary said goodnight.

NY FUEL DISTRIBUTORS (COCO FARMS) – 1923 ROUTE 6 – TM – 55.11-1-40 – AMENDED SITE PLAN

Mr. Carnazza said there were no new submissions except for a new letter that was sent out later today regarding the DOT.

Mr. Franzetti said the only thing that was provided to us tonight was the letter from the NYSDOT which conditionally approved the suggested turning area.

Mr. Cleary stated he had no comments. We were waiting for the formal response from the NYSDOT which you now have.

Mr. Leo Napior addressed the board and stated as per this board's request we had a field meeting with the DOT in August. There was a discussion about allowing left turns into the site at the eastern curb cut on Route 6. We submitted a revised plan to the DOT showing a widen curb cut that would allow for that access. There were a series of discussions with the DOT which ultimately culminated with the letter be issued today which conditionally granted the approval on the condition that they will monitor the two way access and to the extent it presents an issue in the future they may rescind or restrict left turns into the site. He said they had some other minor comments in the letter all of which we have no issues complying with. One is they suggested a crosswalk in an uncertain location to us which we will have to follow up with the DOT.

Chairman Gary said I think it was very smart on their part to issue the condition.

Vice Chairman Paepre asked what happens with the crosswalk they mentioned. What's the next step?

Mr. Napior stated they mentioned the PARC facility, which seems to be further down the road. He said I'm not sure exactly where the crosswalk should go.

Chairman Gary asked if they mentioned putting a crosswalk on Route 6.

Vice Chairman Paepre replied yes. It says a crosswalk on Route 6 would improve safety for the users of the PARC facility.

Mr. Napior said it's about 1500 to 2000 feet away from the site. It's some distance away.

Chairman Gary said what they are trying to do is get a crosswalk in there, which is absolutely necessary, but they don't want to do.

Mr. Cote stated the question is where do they want it. He said that's not made clear from here.

Chairman Gary said it's up to you if you want to answer them (DOT), and suggest where it should be. He said be mindful, if you suggest something, you will have to do it.

Mr. Napior said unfortunately the letter came in very late, and we weren't able to circle back to DOT to gain clarity. In theory, we don't have an issue with installing a crosswalk somewhere; it's just a matter of what the DOT is looking for us to do.

At which time, the board members and applicant continued to discuss the possible location for the crosswalk.

Mr. Napior stated we will clarify with the DOT; we would have liked to have done that before we came here this evening, but we didn't know that was going to be a suggestion until we got the letter. He said we would still like to have a public hearing scheduled with your board tonight, and then find out through DOT and put on our site plan in advance of the hearing and submitted to your board.

Chairman Gary said I'm not looking to slow the project down in any way, but it is up to the board if they want to get involved with the crosswalk. He said what has happened is the DOT has approved a lot of projects there and they realize that there are some missing items that should have been there long ago.

Mr. Furfaro said from my understanding the crosswalk would be basically painted lines across Route 6.

Mr. Frank Filliciotti said he will call Greg Bentley from NYSDOT to clarify what exactly they are looking for and work out the best solution. He said it caught us by surprise as well.

Mr. Stone asked if their site improvements include the extension of the sidewalk in front of the property.

Mr. Napior replied no.

Vice Chairman Paepre stated I think we all like the concept of the crosswalk, we just need to know more about it.

Mr. Stone asked do we need to know that before we have a public hearing?

Mr. Cleary said I don't think so, because that is an offsite improvement it would not affect the site plan in any way as long as the applicants agree to continue to work towards that issue. I think you could certainly hold the public hearing.

Chairman Gary said it's great that we are discussing that crosswalk, but we all know it is the DOT's responsibility. He said if you want to continue with it, I think it's a great idea. He said you would have to do more than just paint lines on the road. He said it will involve a lot more than that.

Mr. Napior replied I understand.

At which time, a discussion ensued with regards to moving forward with the public hearing.

Mr. Giannico asked the applicant if they could provide a line by line response to the DOT's letter.

Mr. Filliciotti replied no problem.

Mr. Furfaro stated we could always open a public hearing and not close it pending the crosswalk is worked out.

Chairman Gary said to schedule a public hearing.

NEW YORK SMSA LIMITED PARTNERSHIP – D/B/A VERIZON WIRELESS – 954 ROUTE 6 – AMENDED SITE PLAN

Mr. Carnazza read his memo which stated the applicant(s) propose to add a rooftop cellular antenna array at the above mentioned address. Provide a list of all variances granted by the ZBA for this site. The “Existing Nonconformity” note does not work. All necessary variances must be obtained (unless already granted with other previous submissions). Variance is required from section § 156-37B. “Such uses shall be located on a lot of not less than the minimum area and shall adhere to the yard, lot coverage, building height and other relevant requirements of the zone in which it is located.” Lot area is deficient, 40,000 s.f. required, 11,761 s.f. provided, 28,239 s.f. variance needed. Two off-street parking spaces are required. The parking spaces are on the adjacent lot. Variance required. This project needs to be referred to the ECB for comments.

Mr. Franzetti read his memo which stated the application involves installation of cellular antennas on the roof of an existing building. The site is located at 954 Route 6, Mahopac, NY (Ramiro’s Restaurant). As no new site improvements are planned, the Engineering Department has no technical concerns on this application. This application should be referred to Town of Carmel Environmental Conservation Board, the Mahopac Fire Department and the Putnam County Health Department for review and recommendation per §156-37E of the Town Code.

Mr. Cleary stated Mr. Carnazza touched on the zoning issues with this application. There are number of existing non-conformities on that property which is the restaurant across from Lake Plaza Shopping Center. He said it exists on a small site, the number of setback requirements are pre-existing, non-conforming conditions. They need to sort that out. He said if there are variances for that they need to obtain them at this point. Mr. Carnazza also needs to verify the height of the proposed improvement on top of the building. The applicant has provided data with respect to that, but Mr. Carnazza has to take a close look at that. He said with regards to the parking variance there was some confusion with the materials that were submitted in the zoning compliance table. It needs to be clarified. He said the big issue with respect to this application is the experience we have had with prior application with the installation of roof antennas. He said they have given you a visual simulation of creating an enclosure around antennas. He said we have had a bad experience with a similar type of approach on Route 6. He said from the visual simulation it appears to be a better facility. He said all we have is the visual simulation, we don’t have details. He said additional documentation of the enclosures’ materials, colors and finishes is requested. The installation of a temporary “mock-up” depicting the actual size and shape

of the enclosure, may serve to clarify some of the questions regarding the efficacy of the enclosure. He stated the architectural consultant should be brought in on this application.

Mr. Jordan Fry of Snyder & Snyder, representing the applicant addressed the board and stated the application consists of only two antennas on the rooftop of 954 Route 6 in Mahopac. He said the antennas are proposed in an enclosure that's designed to match the building. He said I understand the board's concern and I will speak to my client about a possible mock up as suggested by Mr. Cleary. He said the visual simulations that were submitted are an accurate depiction of what is going to be installed and we could provide samples of the materials. He stated we would be happy to do a site visit with the building department to make sure the colors match. He said with regards to the non-conformities, it's the applicant's position that we are not changing the non-conformities at all. All we are doing is installing antennas on the rooftop. He said regarding the parking spaces, we have permission from the adjacent property owner who is affiliated with this property to use two parking spaces that would be available. He said it's the applicant's position that this is not changing or expanding any non-conformities and we do not believe any variances are required. In addition, we would like this board to refer us to the ECB.

Mr. Carnazza stated you could put parking on an adjacent lot under special application and Zoning Board can grant the approval but they do not have to, so you do need Zoning Board approval.

Mr. Cleary said by using two spaces on the adjacent property you may be rendering that property non-compliant.

Mr. Charbonneau stated the document I saw that would memorialize that is far short of what we would need to make sure there is a permanent use for those parking spaces.

Mr. Cleary said that condition needs to be permanently associated with that use.

Mr. Fry said it's an agreement to use two spaces what would you be looking for.

Mr. Cleary said it needs to say it would run with the length of the antenna expiration on that building.

Mr. Fry replied it does.

Mr. Charbonneau stated he will take a look at it.

Mr. Cote stated before sending this to another board, I want to be comfortable with what you propose to do and we have a good understanding of what it would look like. I'm not remotely close to suggesting that we should schedule a public hearing or refer you to another board until I'm satisfied. He said I know what happened to the other building in town is the past, but it taught us a lesson and we need to be more careful when we approve these applications.

Mr. Fry asked have you seen the visual simulation report that was submitted.

Mr. Cote replied I have not.

Chairman Gary asked Mr. Cleary who was at the meeting the night of the Town Board meeting. He asked if some of the board members were also there.

Mr. Cleary stated I don't think there were other board members there.

Mr. Charbonneau asked are you referring to meeting that I was at?

Chairman Gary replied yes.

Mr. Charbonneau stated it was myself, Mr. Cleary, Vincent Franze and Chairman Gary.

Chairman Gary stated at that meeting it was discussed when any cell tower applications come in it goes to the architect.

Mr. Carnazza stated it doesn't go until to the architect until after the first planning board meeting. He said we discuss the application and your board authorizes sending it to the architect. He said we can't just send them to the architect without an initial review with this board.

Chairman Gary stated from my understanding, when an application is submitted, it starts with the architect first and then comes to our board.

Mr. Charbonneau suggested to the board to simply refer it to the PB architect at this point and set up the necessary escrows. He said you are not in a position to do anything at this point other than listen.

Vice Chairman Paepre asked to speak about the site selection. He stated this property already has a lot variances on it, why here and not somewhere else where it may be more suitable. He said why add more variances to this property.

Mr. Fry stated we are not expanding a non-conforming at all and if the board has an opportunity to look at the visual simulation, I think it is an excellent design. He said we will get samples and we could also do a site visit with the board and show the samples against the building. He said the antennas will not be seen. It's designed to match the building façade and trim.

Mr. Carnazza stated the code for this section says the installation shall be on a lot of the required area and this lot is not. He said the map should state what variances were granted and we will need to discuss further if the variances are good, because now we are putting in a cell tower. He said we need a list of all the variances that were granted in the past.

Mr. Cleary stated you submitted the radiation report from Pinnacle, but you didn't include the propagation report that shows there is a gap in service and this is filling that gap which will address Mr. Paepre's point.

Mr. Fry stated we could provide that.

Mr. Stone stated if we accept an application on a sub-standard lot, does that mean the next time they come for one on a postage stamp we have to.....

Mr. Cleary stated the town has been consistent throughout with respect to pre-existing, non-conforming conditions. He said there is either a record of the variance or this application is causing the variance to be created. He said either Mr. Fry will deliver valid variances for this or he will have to obtain those variances for this application.

Mr. Fry stated he had an expert go out to the site and he is going to prepare samples to match the color of the building.

Mr. Stone asked if there is another place the antennas could go with a larger lot nearby.

Mr. Fry stated we will submit a report regarding the need in the area of the site.

Mr. Furfaro stated we need to see good details before we moved forward. He asked Mr. Carnazza if there is going to be a height issue.

Mr. Carnazza stated they are one foot below.

Mr. Fry stated the plan is to match the actual the architectural design of the building. He said we are open to the architect's comments.

Mr. Stone asked once the site is established others could put in antennas and does that open the door for more of that building to have height.....

Mr. Carnazza stated if they were going to build more building, in my opinion they would come back to this board, meaning if they were going to build another box. He said if it was within that box then possibly.

Mr. Cleary stated right now we have no provisions for collocation. He said whatever they would do on the building they would have to come back here for a modified site plan.

Mr. Furfaro said if they put another antenna inside that box they would have to come back, correct?

Mr. Carnazza replied that's correct.

Chairman Gary stated we are sending this application back to the architect and set up a meeting with the secretary to meet at the site.

INFANTINO, THOMAS & LORI – 453 NORTH LAKE BLVD – TM – 64.12-1-56 – SKETCH PLAN

Mr. Carnazza read his memo which stated the applicant(s) propose to subdivide a lot on North Lake Blvd and Split Rock Rd. All necessary variances were granted by the ZBA and are noted on the plat. The extension and cul-de-sac on Split Rock Road were not yet dedicated to the Town of Carmel. Without this being completed, the Subdivision cannot move forward, Lot 2 does not have any frontage on a Town, County or State Road.

Mr. Cleary said he doesn't have any new comments.

Chairman Gary asked Mr. Cleary to review the application with the board members.

Mr. Cleary stated the land backs up to Wixon Pond, there is an existing home to the left and the proposal is to create a very odd shape lot, which would be accessed from the cul-de-sac that has been addressed before. He said the reason the lot is unusually shaped is because they are trying to maintain a connection to Wixon Pond and the neighbor's property juts into the middle of this land, so they have been forced to go around that neighbor in order to maintain a physical connection to Wixon Pond. The balance of the property to the left (lot #1) is a larger site that will remain unchanged. He said the problem is the cul-de-sac up at the top.

Mr. Willie Besharat of Rayex Designs, representing the applicant stated that's the section that apparently has not been dedicated to the Town. He said we are in the process right now of doing it.

Chairman Gary asked what are you working on?

Mr. Besharat replied we are working on dedicating the road to the Town, so the lots will have frontage to Split Rock Road.

Vice Chairman Paepre asked if the only access is from North Lake Blvd.

Mr. Cleary said no, there is access on Split Rock Road also.

Mr. Carnazza said there is one driveway that comes off of the circle and everything branches off that one driveway.

Vice Chairman Paepre asked so from that circle is where the other access is?

Mr. Besharat points to map and stated this is the access that services these houses and there is already an easement in place.

Mr. Carnazza said the whole piece of land just below the shaded part of the cul-de-sac is a large rock out drop, so that's why he is trying to go around it.

Mr. Besharat said if you look at it this way (points to map), this is the cul-de-sac and this is where the easement and driveway will come through. We do have the frontage on the cul-de-sac, but it's much easier to enter through this way (points to map), where there will be no disturbance.

Mr. Furfaro asked where is the big piece of ledge?

Mr. Carnazza stated at the bottom of the cul-de-sac.

Mr. Besharat stated where the driveway is proposed it is very flat with a very gentle slope.

Mr. Giannico asked if the fire department looked at that proposal.

Mr. Besharat stated we have been trying to reach the fire department. We have left messages with no avail.

Mr. Carnazza said to come to his office and they will call tomorrow.

Mr. Besharat stated the major issue right now is to have that portion of the road dedicated to the town and we are in the process of working on that.

Chairman Gary asked where do we go from here.

Mr. Cleary said we can't go much further until the road is dedicated. We can't do anything until he has that legal frontage.

Chairman Gary stated do not come back until you also have an answer from the fire department.

MCDONALD'S USA, LLC – 1931 ROUTE 6 – TM – 55.11-1-41 – BOND RETURN

The applicant did not show up.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE REGARDING WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATIONS – TOWN BOARD REFERRAL - DISCUSSION

Mr. Cleary addressed the board and stated in response to the funeral home application, I prepared an ordinance regulating wireless telecommunications facilities. Mr. Carnazza and Mr. Franzetti had a hand in revising it. He said it was sent to the Town Board and they have referred it to your board. He said right now, our ordinance regulates these facilities as a public utility. That public utility provision never envisioned wireless telecommunications facilities. It was probably put in the code in 1963, long before cell phones ever existed. It really related with public utilities such as Con Edison. So the regulations we have don't fit. He said we have tried to manipulate them to address these types of facilities. He said this

ordinance is based on a draft model ordinance that the Department of State has issued. It's been tailored based on my experience in doing a number of these applications in many communities. He said the problem we have with wireless telecommunications facilities is that they are heavily regulated by the federal government and they get benefits as a result of that. He said we can't create zoning in our communities saying we only want them here or there, or in this zone or that zone. They are licensed public utilities and they have an obligation under that license to provide what's called seamless wireless communications throughout their license range. So if they find a gap in service when your phone call drops, they have an obligation to fill that gap and if the only place they could put an antenna is on that restaurant to fill that gap we can't say no. So what I asked the Verizon Wireless applicant tonight was the propagation study, which you may have seen before, they are the concentric circles around gaps and they show where the holes are in the communities where service needs to be provided and that's where they figure out where to put these facilities. He said what they look for is something tall, and if there is something tall they will go that and get a lease to be on a tall building and if there is nothing tall they will build an antenna. They have to do that to meet their obligations as a public utility. Secondly, all the issues associated with radiation and the environmental concerns about these have been preempted by the FCC, so we can't say it's going to be unsafe as long as they submit that report that was submitted to you that shows they are below the federal government's (FCC) radiation threshold, there's nothing we could do about it. He said most recently, the federal government imposed something called a shot clock. He said because communities have monkeyed around with these applications so egregiously over the years, the wireless communities have basically challenged this and have gone to the FCC and the FCC has imposed the shot clock which means we have 60 days to approve these and if we don't do it within 60 days, they are automatically approved from when we accept the application as complete.....

Mr. Furfaro asked accepting it as complete is when they have all their variances and so on.

Mr. Carnazza said when you set the public hearing the application is complete.

Mr. Cleary said the shot clock is being litigated all over, how you interpret it, what does it mean and so forth.

Mr. Charbonneau stated for our purposes, once the board has set a public hearing is a fair barometer of when the shot clock would start. He said what we have now is way short of that with respect to this application before us tonight.

Mr. Cleary stated it has been my experience that if you diligently process these applications, the carriers would give you another meeting or another 30 days. He said it's more of a hassle to sue you then it is to give you another 30 days.

Mr. Cleary continued and stated what this ordinance does is it sets forth definitions and criteria so we know what we are talking about and it puts in place a process that gives us the ability to manage these applications better than we did in the past. He said most importantly, it creates a hierarchy. He said the site selection guys come to every community

with these maps showing the gaps, saying I have a gap on Route 6, how do I get this approved, how do I get this done. He said what this ordinance does, rather than regulate these as a typical zoning ordinance would, permitted here or prohibited there, it establishes a hierarchy that we prefer them to be in non-residential areas on existing collocated facilities. He said it's a series of five or six criteria and what they have to do, if they can't meet our highest priority, they have to give us a report why they go to the next priority level. He said at least we now have a record that demonstrates why they have justified a site as opposed to another site. It becomes more important when they get into the residential areas, so another side to this, they are using more and more data and as a result of that they need more and more antennas to deal with the volume of what's going on. Once, they get into a community and say everything is working, as soon as we start downloading more podcasts, they need more antennas, so they are going to keep coming back to our communities over and over again to split the cells to create micro cells. He said what we don't want to happen is to see these in residential neighborhoods, we don't want see them areas that are inappropriate such as parks, etc. We want to see them in collocated in areas that have been found to be acceptable on signal towers and existing tall building. Collocation is the objective. He said most importantly and because of what happened with the funeral home is the new aesthetics impact section of this code. He said the one thing you have total authority is aesthetics. You could deny an application based on an adverse visual impact. That's the one area you have total control. He said now we will require a "mockup" to be constructed.

Chairman Gary stated in the beginning you said they have a right to put these up and they determine when they're safe. He asked when did that come about?

Mr. Cleary replied a while ago. He said those antennas that you see on these buildings generate a very low emission of radiation. He said what's happened in the past, towns have said we are terrified of this, we are all going to get cancer and they would hold up these applications for years. The FCC has said the radiation that is generated is less than your toaster. The FCC superceded the local communities and adopted this regulation and if you are below that number you can't do anything about it.

Chairman Gary asked Mr. Cleary if he agrees with it.

Mr. Cleary responded whether I agree or not doesn't matter.

Chairman Gary replied yes it does. At which time, Chairman Gary discussed an application that was in front of the board some time ago that was denied because it was too dangerous.

Mr. Cleary stated rules have changed since then.

At which time, a discussion ensued with regards to radiation levels.

Chairman Gary said what if we know that it is unsafe.

Mr. Charbonneau stated if you have an expert that will say that, we will at least have a colorful defense, but absent that you will have to take the face value of the FCC report.

Mr. Cleary said what most communities do is they will hire an independent electro-magnetic engineer to review that report and say yes it is 100 times below the federal standards and it meets that requirements.

Mr. Furfaro stated we could treat that like an architectural review and they would have to pay for that.

Mr. Cleary said and they would be happy to do that.

Mr. Charbonneau addressed the board and stated we are a little late in getting a copy of this proposed legislation. He said I spoke to the town attorney with respect to this and we have until September 30th to give comments to the town counsel so that when the Town Board revisits this proposed ordinance they could incorporate that. He said my suggestion would be is after you have had an opportunity to read through the ordinance and if you have a suggestion or comment to filter it through Mr. Cleary and he will then turn those to the Town Board.

Mr. Cleary reiterated this is from a defensible model from the Department of State. It's a good basis.

Mr. Furfaro asked about a pre-existing, non-conforming lot. Can we say it has to be on a conforming lot?

Mr. Cleary stated none of that stuff can work. If they could demonstrate that there is a gap in their service.....

Mr. Furfaro said they have to be in that spot.

Mr. Carnazza said if they go to the zoning board and they get the variance, they are no longer non-conforming. He said we are not allowed to say you can't go for a variance of our code.

Mr. Cote stated right across the street from Ramiero's restaurant is Kmart, which is set back more and to me that would be a more appropriate venue for it, because it's not right on the main road.

Mr. Cleary said what will happen is they will come to you and say they negotiated a lease with Ramiero's and it's favorable to me and that's why I want to be there. He said but their propagation area is a half mile in diameter or whatever it is. He said we have the ability to say we don't care about your lease, from an aesthetics perspective it would be better somewhere else. He said you do have the ability to do that, but if he says it has to be within a certain area, it has to be within that area.

Mr. Charbonneau again stated you have a copy of the proposed legislation and you have specific comments or changes or amendments to the proposed law you will need to let Mr. Cleary know.

Mr. Cleary said to read through it and send any comments to me.

Mr. Furfaro stated he would be in favor of an independent expert to come in and review applications.

Mr. Cleary said to put everything in writing and filter it through the secretary.

MINUTES – 07/26/17 & 08/16/17

Mr. Giannico moved to accept the July 26, 2017 minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Furfaro with all in favor.

Mr. Cote moved to accept the August 16, 2017 minutes. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Paepre with all in favor.

Vice Chairman Paepre moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:16 p.m. The motion was seconded by Mr. Furfaro with all in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Rose Trombetta