

APPROVED

HAROLD GARY
Chairman
RAYMOND COTE
Vice-Chair

BOARD MEMBERS

EMMA KOUNINE
CARL GREENWOOD
JOHN MOLLOY
JAMES MEYER
ANTHONY GIANNICO

TOWN OF CARMEL PLANNING BOARD



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

MICHAEL CARNAZZA
*Director of Codes
Enforcement*

RONALD J. GAINER, P.E.
Town Engineer

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

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES **MAY 22, 2013**

PRESENT: CHAIRMAN, HAROLD GARY, VICE-CHAIR, RAYMOND COTE, EMMA KOUNINE,
CARL GREENWOOD, JOHN MOLLOY, ANTHONY GIANNICO, JAMES MEYER

<u>APPLICANT</u>	<u>TAX MAP #</u>	<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TYPE</u>	<u>ACTION OF THE BOARD</u>
Szysh, Ronald & Carol	43.-1-15,16	1	Subdivision	Public Hearing Scheduled.
Sosa Subdivision	86.12-1-34	1-2	Subdivision	No Board Action.
Putnam Comm. Foundation/ Putnam Hospital Center	66.2-57 & 58	2	Extension	6 Month Extension Granted.
Old Forge Estates	75.15-1-19-40	2	Extension	6 Month Extension Granted.
McDonald's USA, LLC.	55.11-1-41	3	Public Hearing	Public Hearing Closed. Planner to Prepare Resolution.
Carmel Centre Senior Housing (Pulte Homes) – Lots #3 & 5	55.14-1-11.1 55.14-1-11.3	3-10	Public Hearing	Public Hearing Left Open.
Minutes – 4/10/2013		10		Approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rose Trombetta

SZYSH, RONALD & CAROL – 54 CAROLAN ROAD E. – TM – 43.-1-15,16 – SKETCH PLAN

Mr. Carnazza stated all the necessary variances were granted and are noted on the plat.

Mr. Gainer had no comments.

Mr. Cleary stated the plan was revised at the direction of the planning board. Variances were granted from the ZBA. The next step in this process is the public hearing.

Mr. Gary said to schedule a public hearing.

SOSA SUBDIVISION – GLENACOM ROAD – TM – 86.12-1-34 – SKETCH PLAN

Mr. Carnazza read his memo which stated the applicant proposes a two lot subdivision (1 additional lot) off Glenacom Rd. in Mahopac. 40 ft. rear yard is required. The zoning table says 50 ft. The lots comply but the table should be corrected.

Mr. Gainer read his memo which stated a Town of Carmel Highway Department work permit will be required for any new driveways proposed. Various drainage improvements may be required at the frontage of the property as part of any such permit issued. Further, the on-site facilities must not impede any existing roadway run-off which may enter the tract. The plans should by notation identify the extent of proposed impervious and disturbed areas, and incorporate a “limits of disturbance” line. This will then establish the required extent of stormwater management facilities required in order to comply with all applicable SWPPP requirements. As the subdivision plans are refined, all missing elements mandated by §131-13 (“Preliminary Plat”) of the Town’s Subdivision Ordinance should be incorporated into the drawings. The following referrals would appear to be warranted: Putnam County Department of Planning (GML 239n referral; proximity to County boundary). Town Highway Department (driveway access). Should any public improvements be deemed necessary as part development of the tract, a performance bond and associated engineering fee must eventually be established for the work.

Mr. Cleary read his memo which stated aside from the layout of the originally proposed three lots, and the extensive on-site wetlands, the Board also expressed concern over the potential need for a cul-de-sac at the end of Glenacom Road.

The following comments are offered:

- The sketch plan remains difficult to understand. It is recommended that a second (or third) sheet be created to address utilities and natural features.
- The boundary of the Glenacom right-of-way remains difficult to decipher.
- The question of whether a cul-de-sac is required must be addressed.
- It remains unclear if Lot 2 has the required 100’ of street frontage (§156-10G).

- The applicant has submitted an updated wetland map, prepared by Kayler Geoscience, dated February 10, 2013.

Mr. Chris Caralyus of American Design Consultants addressed the board and asked if the next step could be preliminary approval.

Ms. Kounine commented that the Planner's comments and the maps should be cleared up first before we move ahead.

Mr. Caralyus replied that's fine.

No board action.

PUTNAM COMMUNITY FOUNDATION/PUTNAM HOSPITAL CENTER – STONELEIGH AVE – TM – 66.-2-57 & 58 – EXTENSION OF SUBDIVISION APPROVAL

The consultants had no objection to the extension.

Mr. Molloy asked Mr. Charbonneau about a comment that he read that this will have no effect or impact on the Article 78. He asked if he agreed with that.

Mr. Charbonneau replied I do.

Mr. Cote moved to grant a 6 month extension of final subdivision approval. The motion was seconded by Ms. Kounine with all in favor.

OLD FORGE ESTATES – BALDWIN PLACE ROAD – TM 75.15-1-19 THRU 40 – EXTENSION OF SUBDIVISION APPROVAL

Mr. Carnazza had no objection to the extension.

Mr. Gainer read his memo which stated we offer no objection to the extension being sought. However, a revised Performance Bond amount and associated Engineering fee should be set, given the period which has transpired since the original approval was granted. Based upon a quantity take-off of all public improvements specified on the approved plans which was provided by the design engineer, it is recommended that these fees be increased to the following: Performance Bond of \$688,000.00 and the Engineering Fee of \$34,400.00.

Mr. Paul Lynch of Putnam Engineering, representing the applicant stated they accept the increases.

Mr. Cleary had no objection to the extension.

Mr. Greenwood moved to grant a 6 month extension of final subdivision approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Meyer with all in favor.

MCDONALD'S USA, LLC – 1931 ROUTE 6 – TM – 55.11-1-41 – PUBLIC HEARING

Mr. Carnazza had no comments.

Mr. Cleary read Mr. Gainer's memo which stated All prior technical concerns have been addressed, and the SWPPP documents provided have been deemed acceptable. Based upon our review of these latest plans, the following matters remain to be resolved either prior to, or as a condition of, the Board's action on the application:

1. Documentation of the receipt of all permits as were specified in our prior memoranda.
2. To assure that the applicant recognizes and commits to all routine maintenance specified for the stormwater and sanitary sewage treatment devices proposed (including the Storm Filter, trench drain, catch basins/drain inlets, grease trap, etc), these maintenance responsibilities should be specified directly on the plans submitted for the Chairman's endorsement.
3. Similarly, and as specified in §156-85, to assure long-term maintenance of these treatment devices the Applicant will also be required to execute and file with the Putnam County Clerk a "Stormwater Control Facility Maintenance Agreement".
4. The Engineer must submit a proposed quantity take-off of all site improvements specified on the construction plans, so that a Performance Bond and Engineering Fee may be established for the project.

Mr. Cleary stated all planning issues have been addressed.

Mr. Gary asked if anyone in the audience wished to be heard.

Hearing no comments from the audience, Mr. Greenwood moved to close the public hearing. The motion was seconded by Mr. Meyer with all in favor.

Mr. Gary asked the Planner to prepare a resolution.

CARMEL CENTRE SENIOR HOUSING (PULTE HOMES) – LOTS 3 & 5 – TERRACE DR. – TM – 55.14-1-11.1&11.3 – PUBLIC HEARING

Mr. Carnazza had no comments.

Mr. Gainer read his memo which stated technical comments to be resolved are presented below:

1. Project Landscaping –
 - a. Various concerns have been raised to date over buffer plantings removed during construction within these sites, as well as the intent of the landscaping concept presented. The site plans should acknowledge and specify the restoration of all buffer plantings damaged or removed, and the prior intrusions into any "conservation areas" impacted by development.

- b. Further, to assist the Board in understanding the visual aesthetics of all overall plantings, both that planned along the project roadways as well as that in the areas of the new residences proposed, a layout schematic should be provided to illustrate the groupings of vegetation planned, as well as the number and sizes of all landscaping proposed.
 - c. The Board should determine whether the landscaping proposed within any “common” areas should be sprinklered to assure their long-term survival. If so mandated, this should be noted on plan. Further, such a sprinkler system should be fed by a private well, so that the Carmel Water District No. 2 supply is not utilized for this purpose. Further, the landscaping plan should note that the developer is responsible to replace any dead or dying landscaping which may occur subsequent to their initial installation.
 2. Stormwater Management impacts – The design engineer should once more confirm for the record that the extent of overall site disturbance, and impervious surfaces to be created under these amended Site Plans, fall within that originally approved, to assure that no modifications to the stormwater management facilities now in place is necessary.
 3. SWPPP – The Site Plans should incorporate all necessary technical information required by DEC and Town requirements. Once finalized, NOI and SWPPP acceptance forms must be filed (if not previously done).
 4. Site Amenities – various improvements (“pocket park”, walking trail, gazebo, benches, etc.) are identified by notation only. Construction details of all such amenities should be provided on plan so the Board may understand just what is to be provided for the resident’s use.
 5. Bonding and Engineering Fees – Fees for both lots were posted in 2006, at the time the original Site Plans were approved by the Planning Board. These figures should be subject to further review at this time, given the period which has transpired since the bonds were posted, in order to assure that sufficient financial security is held by the Town to cover the present value of the public improvements planned.

Mr. Cleary stated he had no comments and the public hearing is scheduled for tonight.

Mr. Gary stated before we open the public hearing there are some issues that Mr. Gainer had said that have not been on any site plans. He asked if it has been discussed with the applicant.

Mr. Cleary replied yes it has been discussed and the applicant is waiting to respond to the comments that come out of tonight’s public hearing to finalize the landscaping plan.

Mr. Gary stated he was referring to the sprinkler system.

Mr. Cleary said the sprinkler system has not been discussed yet and has not been addressed.

Mr. Paul Lynch of Putnam Engineering, representing the applicant stated he will incorporate a sprinkler plan for lots 3 & 5 for the board to review.

Mr. Gary asked if it is on the plans now.

Mr. Lynch replied no it is not and said he could offer the board now is with lot 4 Pulte did install a sprinkler system and it was not at the time part of the lot 4 site plan drawings. He said we will be happy to incorporate a sprinkler system into these drawings for the board to review. He said you could make it a condition of approval.

Mr. Greenwood said it should not be a condition. It should be looked at and reviewed by the consultants, no different than anything else we require on a map.

Mr. Molloy said it should be something we could see now and then it could be subject to changes in the field. He said there should be something on the site plan.

Mr. Lynch addressed the board and audience and stated back in 2008 for lot 3 there was an approval for 147 units. The present 2013 submittal calls for 81 units, a reduction of 66 units. He said with lot 5 in 2008 56 units were approved. The present submittal calls for 23 units with a further reduction of 33 units, making it a grand total of 99 units on both lots 3 & 5. He said the larger buildings were part of the 2008 approval on lot 3 with five buildings. The present plan calls for the construction of 1 building reducing it by 4 and we will introduce the added cottages which picked up 42 units with a net loss of 66 units. He said with regards to lot 5 we had 2 big units and they were totally eliminated and replaced with cottage homes. We worked within the framework of the original approval. He said we have talked to the board over the last several months about landscaping and we have worked out a mitigation plan for areas that have been disturbed during the course of construction. He said there is landscaping proposed for those areas that were disturbed and also for additional new landscaping around the actual proposed construction.

Mr. Mike Caruso, Attorney for the applicant made one more point to board and said the amendments to the site plan also bring the units into compliance with the code; therefore, we do not need area variances due to the elimination of the large structures.

At which time, Mr. Gary addressed the audience and stated this is an open public hearing and asked if anyone wishes to be heard.

Mr. Spencer Tassler, a resident at the Retreat for 4½ years addressed the board and consultants and thanked them for all of their help over the last couple of years. He wants to make sure all the issues they have on lot 4 does not occur or carry over to lots 3 & 5. He stated we are asking that every detail that is not on this plan be looked at very carefully and closely and not to allow a similar issue that they have experienced over the past 3½ years. He said the reason he is saying this, is because every time we bring up an issue to Pulte, their classic answer is, the planning board approved it. He wants the board to consider their safety first and foremost. He commented that the grass swales on lot 4 are very dangerous and unsafe. At which time, he presented pictures of the swales to the board. He continued to speak about the amenities and the concerns are listed below:

- The 3 hole pitch and putt is unusable.
- The bocce court is not level.
- There is a crease down the middle of the putting green.
- The pool was poorly constructed and the HOA paid \$10,000 towards fixing it. Pulte should have been responsible for it.

Mr. Tassler stated the plantings and shrubs were improperly installed. He said they would like to see a financial analysis to show the impact of the decreased amount of condos (99 units) by this new plan and how the changes would affect the current residents HOA fees. He asked what the performance bond was for the 3 lots and will the bond cover the roads, the amenities, maintenance and the construction of the detention ponds. He said maybe we should increase the bond. He asked if any new wetland impacts were being created. He said the sidewalks were poorly constructed and are cracked. He asked if lots 3 & 5 have their own wells and what is their capacity. He asked about the handicapped accessibility and sidewalk capacity for lots 3 & 5.

Ms. Sheila Simon who resides at Langdon Grove addressed the board and asked if the recreational building on lot 3 and the clubhouse on lot will have restrooms, water and electricity. She stated most of recreational amenities are walking paths, pocket parks and picnic areas and inquired about getting active recreational amenities such as another tennis court. She said it is hard to walk up and down the hill to the walking trails or tennis court because there are no parking areas.

Ms. Jan Carnow who resides at Blair Heights presented the board with pictures of a plan that was dated January 29th which shows trees and shrubs of the proposed new homes. She said all the shrubs on the original approved plan are no longer shown on the drawing. She said the conservation areas need to be restored. She said there is another version of the landscaping plan for lot 3 dated January 29th and wanted to know which plan the board will be working with, the one that was submitted to the board or the one that was submitted to HOA.

Ms. Margo Turano who resides at Langdon Grove addressed the board and reiterated what Ms. Simon had said. She said you have to walk a 16% slope to the tennis court and there is no parking. She asked what defines a pocket park and picnic area. She said there is no shade in any of these areas. She said Pulte should be required to be extremely descriptive in all aspects of the submitted plans. She asked what constitutes an amenity. She said the walking path on lot 5 goes through a preservation area, which means more trees will be taken down. At which time, she presented a landscaping plan to the board members. She said there is a significant difference between what Pulte claims exists and what actually exists in the field. The wildlife corridor has been destroyed and must be re-established. She said there should be a strict compliance on lot 3 which requires all screening to be complete within 60 days of planning board approval. She asked what will be in the recreational building and clubhouse. She asked the board to continue with the public hearing until Pulte submits a plan that addresses all of the issues that we have previously raised and will raise this evening and we may have the opportunity to review the plans before the closing of the public hearing. She said the north side of the hill looks like monopoly homes and we hope the planning board does not allow this to happen to the south side of the hill. She said the financial questions and concerns on lots 3 & 5 also effect lot 4. She said we will have fewer amenities to maintain but more landscaping and snow plowing to pay for. She said HOA money was used to pay for maintenance, landscaping, plowing, etc. on Terrace Drive. It was a Pulte responsibility not a HOA responsibility. She said there isn't enough money in our reserve funds to address potential problems we may face when Pulte leaves. Also, there is no money reserved for the transition period. She hoped that the board would follow up with their request to have Pulte submit a financial analysis so that we could find out what their projected condo fees are for lots 3, 4 & 5.

Ms. Barbara Soukas who resides at Blair Heights addressed the board and verbally reviewed the offering plan with regards to the parking facility. She said as of today there are 4 parking spaces on lot 4 and asked the board to make sure that the 97 parking spaces that were in the offering plan and are not shown on either plans for lots 3 & 5 be fulfilled. She said the environmental impact statement review indicated that 26 acres of woodland, 17 acres of meadow and 20 feet of vegetation buffer was set forth and requested that the board request that the applicant strictly comply with these conditions.

Mr. Michael Leff who resides at Blair Heights addressed the board and stated the horse chestnut trees along the roadsides should not be used because they are susceptible to diseases making them unattractive and undesirable and should be eliminated.

Mr. Steve Bernstein who resides at Blair Heights addressed the board and stated he was not only speaking for the people that currently reside at the Retreat, but also for the people that will be living on lots 3 & 5. He continued to speak about the amenities. He said we originally had two tennis courts and now we are down to one. The green house has been eliminated. The tennis court is undersized. He asked if there will be lighting and benches. He said with lots 3 & 5 the sidewalks along Terrace Drive requires completion and occupancy permits should not be granted until completed. There should be strict compliance and enforced. He said we request that no occupancy permits or temporary occupancy permits be granted until the required recreational amenities are complete and usable. There should be no waivers whatsoever. He also stated there is no access to the bus on Mechanic Street.

Mr. Neil Carnow who resides at Blair Heights addressed the board and stated the main concern are the issues that they are facing on lot 4 which is the lack of specificity on the plans. He said if there is no specificity to the performance requirements and material requirements on those drawings, there is no way to enforce anything. He asked the board to require the applicant that each of the amenity areas be drawn and engineered so that we understand the implications of the grading, access, usage and elements inside the buildings. He said they will be running out of space inside the meeting room, clubhouse and pool area. He said the board needs to look at the amenity package and understand fully and completely what is actually being done.

Mr. Adrian Dessi who resides at Langdon Grove addressed the board and stated we have been residents of the Town of Carmel for the past 34 years. He commented on how amazed he was with other big companies in the area because they have a feeling for the environment and the visual integrity of the community. He praised the integrity of the corporate executives. He said our land; lots 4 & 5 have real true value to the corporation as much as it does to us. He said there is not one condo or community that has the value of this one. Pulte is lucky to be dealing with use. He said Pulte has a community in Oxford, Connecticut that is beautifully landscaped and managed, why can't they do that here? He said there is an issue with that community though; they are far away from most conveniences. Unlike here, we are a stone's throw from major hospital and retail stores. This property is worth a lot of money for Pulte and what should that do for us, they should comply. He said this community is unbelievable for what we could offer and it is so disappointing that we don't appreciate that value and insist that we get the value in return.

Ms. Ann Fanizzi, Chairperson for Coalition to Preserve Open Space addressed the audience and apologized for not being successful in their court suit against the planning board,

Town and Paul Camarda, because they demonstrated to us that they did not care about the integrity of this community. She said we care about the environment and hopes this board has learned its lesson and will exceed to their demands.

Mr. Christopher Burt who resides at Balla Drive addressed the board and stated his home abuts lot 3 and the buffer trees were cut down last fall. He asked the board to require the applicant to put back the trees that they destroyed.

Mr. Tom Soukas who resides at Blair Heights addressed the board and stated what we have here is corporate greed. He said we are living with the quarterly corporate profit first, then comes the community and then the homeowners. He said there is only one way to stop the corporate greed and the planning board has the power to diminish that.

Ms. Lori Kemp who resides at Mechanic Street addressed the audience and also apologized to them. She said you are not alone; there are websites with complaints against Pulte. She asked the board why wasn't the FEIS adhered to. She said other Towns have used this project as a poster child for bad development. She said Pulte has encroached on her property, landscaping that was promised was never installed and trees were cut down. She said for the past seven years she has been exposed to dust, noise and diesel fumes. My home has been damaged from the blasting and wetlands have been destroyed. The detention basins do not work. She said seven years later and there is still no landscaping, dust control, and no adequate compensation for the destruction of my property.

Mr. Tassler addressed the board again and suggested to put a retaining wall on Lot 3 instead of trees where the mountain was cut off. He said the tennis court should have lighting. He asked what the size of the gazebo was and does it have lighting. He said a dollar value should be presented to the board of the tree preservation areas that were taken down. He said 60% of the amenities on lots 3 & 5 are walking trails. He said that is the inexpensive way to give us amenities. That needs to be changed. In conclusion, he suggested to the board to make the residents of the lots 3 & 5 planning process. He said I'm sure Pulte wants to see a great product.

Ms. Kemp addressed the board again and asked what happened to the conditions established by the ZBA? Also, she doesn't want landscaping with prickles or west Nile near her house.

Mr. Gary addressed the audience and stated we have heard what you had to say and one of the main concerns is the original drawings and if they were on the map. He said he met with Mr. Mullen and a concern I had at that time was he had a map that the planning board has never seen. He stated our consultants will look at past plans and along with the comments that have been made tonight, and will see if anything has been intentionally omitted by the applicant or maybe it was never there. He said some of the concerns that have been discussed tonight may not have been on the drawing. He said all of your concerns are valuable, but we only deal with what is presented to us by the applicant and is reviewed the consultants and then commented to the board through a long process. The applicant has been here a long time. We want to make sure he leaves behind a commodity that is worthy of his presence. He said there are things that lax in lots 3, 4 & 5 that should have been taken care of by the applicant. Is he at fault with some of the amenities? That is what the board will look at. We will look at everything that was said tonight to come up with what is just for you and the applicant as we proceed forward. He

said I will not ask the consultants to answer any questions tonight, because there are a lot of them and need to be searched in depth.

Mr. Meyer said the message I heard loud and clear tonight is the residents want details on the plans and we need to focus on that.

Mr. Cote stated none of us could sit here and answer you tonight. We have to rely on our consultants and ask them if the plans that are before us have the level of detail that was discussed tonight. We need to look at it a little deeper.

Mr. Gary addressed the audience and clarified that there are issues that have been brought up tonight and would like to see on the plan. If it wasn't originally there when it went through the planning process we can't arbitrarily go back and demand that the applicant put them there. What we can do is try to get the applicant to enhance it to make it better.

Mr. Molloy stated given the depth of the complaints and comments we heard tonight we should keep the public hearing open.

Mr. Greenwood agreed with Mr. Molloy especially with regards to the financials and how the reduction of units would affect the current residents.

Mr. Giannico also agreed to keep the public hearing open.

Ms. Kounine stated she has been at all of the public hearing for this development since the beginning and has 50 pages of notes that have not been addressed. She said landscaping is the most minimal expense for this project and nothing was ever done. She said she will do whatever she can to get the best for the residents. She stated I hope the homeowners appreciate that the planning board does pay attention and we are trying to work within the legal means that we have.

Mr. Lynch stated there were a few items that were brought up tonight and would like to clarify. He said lots 3 & 5 will not have any grass swales. There will be curbs and sidewalks. He said they did not show plantings on the plan behind the upper buildings on lot 3 because they would not have a backyard behind the units. He said the wildlife buffer on lot 3 will be intact. We will provide a sprinkler system plan. For lots 3 & 5 we will eliminate all of the horse chestnuts along the tree line. The recreational buildings will have bathrooms, water, electricity and heat.

Mr. Meyer raised the issue about the parking near the tennis court.

Mr. Jim Mullen of Pulte Homes stated there is a parking area near the tennis court.

Mr. Molloy asked if it exists now or is it on the plan.

Mr. Mullen responded it's on the plan, nothing on the plan exists. We are asking for permission to build this. Right now, there is no tennis court; it's on the plan only.

Mr. Gary asked Mr. Mullen if more parking could be provided near the tennis court.

Mr. Greenwood said there are things you could do to, for example, putting back the second tennis court that will provide a much more viable recreation rather than walking paths.

Mr. Mullen stated we are providing a variety of amenities, such as the clubhouse, swimming pool, pitch and putt, tennis court, pocket parks and gazebos all over the site.

Mr. Gary asked Mr. Mullen if he would consider taking another look at Mr. Greenwood's idea with regards to another tennis court and also look at putting additional parking at the tennis court.

Mr. Mullen responded yes we will.

Mr. Gary asked if they could also take a look at the pitch and putt and how it could be improved.

Mr. Mullen responded that's fine.

Mr. Mullen raised the issue of the financials and stated he had sent a copy to Mr. Spencer and Mr. Cleary.

Mr. Gary stated we need to sit down to discuss all the issues and come to an agreement and get what is due the residents completed. He said we will have a separate meeting to discuss what's missing and then meet with the residents. And at the next public hearing we want to have all of the issues resolved.

Mr. Carnow approached the board and stated there have been a few sub-surface modifications done on lot 4 and we do not have any record of the changes. He said we are requesting a record of the changes.

Ms. Soukas approached the board and stated they need to come back with an amenity that will be useful to the community.

Mr. Caruso addressed the board and stated there have a number of meetings outside the planning context. He said I think there is a little bit of a discord between the constituents who are representing the homeowners when they are communicating with Pulte and bringing these issues up in advance of the meetings. He said sometimes there is a discord between what is coming up at the meetings versus what was discussed privately. He said if the meetings go forward, we will like an assurance that most of the homeowners are represented at those meetings.

Mr. Gary stated we will not discuss anything that has not been presented to this board in the past. We will only discuss the issues that have come before the board and have not been done.

No board action taken.

MINUTES - 4/10/2013

Mr. Molloy moved to adopt the minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Greenwood with all in favor.

Mr. Greenwood moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:35 p.m. The motion was seconded by Mr. Giannico with all in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Rose Trombetta