

# Planning Board Meeting Minutes – January 13, 2025

---

A meeting of the Town of Yorktown Planning Board was held on Monday, January 13, 2025, at 7:00 p.m. in the Town Hall Boardroom.

Chairman Rich Fon called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. with the following Board members present:

Rob Garrigan  
Bill Lascala  
Bob Waterhouse

Also present were:

John Tegeder, Director of Planning  
Robyn Steinberg, Town Planner  
Ian Richey, Assistant Planner  
Nancy Calicchia, Secretary  
David Chen, Esq.  
Councilman Sergio Esposito, Town Board Liaison

---

## Correspondence

The Board had no comments.

## Motion to Approve Meeting Minutes of December 23, 2024

Upon a motion by Bill Lascala, and seconded by Bob Waterhouse, and with all those present voting “aye”, the Board approved the meeting minutes of December 23, 2024.

## Motion to open Regular Session

Upon a motion by Chairman Fon, and with all those present voting “aye”, the Board opened the Regular Session.

## REGULAR SESSION

### Garden Lane Subdivision

Discussion: Decision Statement  
Location: 35.08-1-27; Old Crompond Road  
Contact: Garden Lane Development LLC  
Description: Discussion to begin clearing pursuant to approved site plan by Resolution #23-16 dated 8/14/23.

Discussion:

Anthony Pili, principal of Garden Lane Development, was present. Pili stated that he is here as a follow up to the 12/23/24. At that time, they requested to begin work at the site as they await for the sign-off from the County to connect to the Peekskill Sewer District. Fon asked the Board, Counsel, and Planning Department if there were any comments. Tegeder stated that an excavation permit will be required pursuant to the proposed work. There were no other comments.

*Upon a motion by Bill Lascala, and seconded by Rob Garrigan, and with all those present voting “aye”, the Board approved the resolution approving stormwater pollution prevention plan and tree permit for the Garden Lane Apartments.*

### Guiding Eyes for the Blind – Crompond

Discussion: Decision Statement  
Location: 36.06-2-72; 3241 Crompond Road  
Contact: Site Design Consultants  
Description: Approved guide dog training facility/kennel/veterinary hospital and office space on 12.24 acres in the interchange zone by Planning Board Resolution #23-21 dated 12/4/2023.

Comments:

David Steinmetz, Esq.; Joseph Riina, Project Engineer of Site Design Consultants; Tom Panek and Bill Ma of Guiding Eyes for the Blind, were present. Steinmetz stated that he is here this evening as a follow-up to the 12/23/24 meeting. At that time his partner, Jody Cross, explained their situation with the Army Corp. They are requesting permission to

begin work at the site as they await for the Army Corp to issue their nationwide permit and they are accepting responsibility to proceed and remediate the site should that permit not be granted. They are confident that they will receive the permit and are nearing the end. They have been working with Counsel on language for the proposed draft resolution. Fon asked the Board, Counsel, and Planning Department if there were any issues. Tegeder stated that an excavation permit will be required pursuant to the proposed work. There were no other comments. Fon asked Steinmetz if he reviewed the resolution. Steinmetz responded that they did and had no issues.

*Upon a motion by Bill Lascala, and seconded by Rob Garrigan, and with all those present voting “aye”, the Board approved the stormwater pollution prevention plan, wetland permit, and tree permit for the Guiding Eyes for the Blind Canine Health and Wellness center.*

#### Colangelo Major Subdivision

Discussion: Request for Reapproval

Location: 35.16-1-4; 1805 Jacob Road

Contact: Site Design Consultants

Description: Approved 6-lot subdivision in the R1-160 zone by Resolution #21-01, dated 2/8/21.

Comments:

Joseph Riina, Project Engineer of Site Design Consultants was present. A letter was submitted by the applicant’s attorney, Hocherman, Tortorella & Wekstein, LLP on 12/23/25 requesting a reapproval of the subdivision. The legal instruments associated with the subdivision continue to be with the Town Attorney for review. In addition, Freestone Renewables is still interested in installing a solar array on a portion of the property so the applicant does not want to file the plat at this time. Fon asked the Board, Planning Department and Counsel if there were any comments. Tegeder stated that a SEQRA update may be required for the next reapproval. There were no other comments.

*Upon a motion by Bob Waterhouse, and seconded by Bill Lascala, and with all those present voting “aye”, the Board approved the request for reapproval for the Colangelo subdivision.*

#### Motion to close Regular Session and open Work Session

Upon a motion by Chairman Fon, and with all those present voting “aye”, the Board closed the Regular Session and opened the Work Session.

### WORK SESSION

#### Envirogreen Associates

Discussion: Site Plan

Location: 15.16-1-30 & 31; 1833-1875 East Main Street

Contact: Site Design Consultants

Description: Proposed amendment to site plan previously approved by Resolution #21-22 dated September 27, 2022. Applicant is proposing two smaller buildings, one being 6,284 sq. ft and the second being 4,100 sq. ft in place of the approved 13,278 sq. ft building.

Comments:

Joseph Riina, Project Engineer of Site Design Consultants; and Rick Cipriani, property owner, were present. Riina stated that the applicant is proposing to amend the approved site plan by splitting the approved single building into two smaller buildings. A plan was presented to the Board at an earlier meeting and the Planning Department suggested flipping the buildings which they have done. The smaller building to the right is proposed to be a two unit building that is to be occupied with a drive-thru Dunkin and a hair salon and is phase 1 of the project. The larger building to the left will be occupied by yet to be determined multiple tenants and is considered phase 2 of the project. The plan shown has a better alignment to the entrance which is already approved by the DOT. There is enough stacking for the Dunkin drive-thru. The applicant is seeking to amend the site plan approval.

Fon noted the past history of this project and felt that the proposed amendment seems to work nicely and the Board agreed. Tegeder stated that this plan will need to be added to the set and a hearing may be required. Cipriani asked if a hearing was still required as the site plan was already approved and noted that they are not doing anything different besides the building structure, all else on the site remains the same. Tegeder stated that generally the law requires a hearing for an amended site plan however the Board can vote to waive the hearing. The Board agreed to move forward with a public hearing for the February 10<sup>th</sup> meeting.

### Walgreens fka CVS

Discussion: Site Plan

Location: 26.18-1-23, 25, 26; 3320 Crompond Road

Contact: Cuddy & Feder

Description: Proposed changes to site plan previously approved by Resolution #23-11 dated 7/17/23.

Comments:

No representative was present. Tegeder informed the Board of field changes observed during their site visit that includes the treatment of the entrance way which was originally striping without hardscape. They added hardscape and shifted some of the parking down; four parking spaces were lost but they were providing nine more than what the code requires so they are still above the requirement. The as-built will be re-done as the Town Engineer had some other requirements. In their opinion, they feel that the changes made are improvements to the site and should be accepted.

Councilman Esposito stated that there was a question about the trees and their expected height maximum. Fon noted that there was concern about blocking the two businesses behind from view. Tegeder stated that currently the view isn't blocked but noted that there are things that were not there before; both buildings can still be seen from most of the vantage points along the roadway. The concern is what happens when the trees mature so they will look at this. Tegeder noted that they did request a certificate of occupancy and in his discussion with the Town Engineer a bond of about \$35,000 was secured to ensure that all is completed. Waterhouse asked if all of the roadwork was completed by Stony Street. Tegeder said most of it was completed but there may be some punchlist items. The Board had no issues with the changes. The Planning Department will prepare a memo for the file documenting the changes.

### Par 3 Golf Course

Discussion: Amended Site Plan

Location: 16.07-1-38; 795 Route 6

Contact: Matthew Behrens Architect

Description: Proposed amendments to site plan previously approved by Resolution #21-30 dated 12/6/21.

Comments:

Matt Behrens, Architect; and Carmine DeMeglio, business owner, were present. Behrens stated that the proposal is for various amendments to the approved site plan. They have been working with the Planning Department and submitted plans for review. They also provided information with respect to parking and lighting. The lower left corner of the plan also shows a maintenance yard that has been fenced off. Ciarcia, Town Engineer, informed the Board that he received plans from the site engineer, Site Design Consultants, for the sewer design.

Tegeder stated that they need to be clear with parking on the site. The applicant is proposing 116 interior seats but there are some outdoor areas as well. Fon stated that the business appears to be very successful and noted that during the evening the road on Old Route 6 becomes a parking lot and questioned if it was a state right-of-way. Tegeder responded that it was state property. Fon asked about the parking requirements. Tegeder responded that using restaurant parking requirements, one space for every 50SF of patron area is required. They would need to figure out what the outdoor seating areas are to know the parking count. The resolution will acknowledge that the overage will be utilizing the street parking. There may need to be discussion on the operation as well as control factors along the service road so that no one is blocked from potentially getting in or out. Behrens stated that the parking calculation was updated per the requirement for the golf course and restaurant specific to the interior seating. He noted that he didn't see anything specific to outdoor dining areas and can include a seat count for the outdoor areas. Tegeder said there was nothing specific but it would be the same. He noted that often patrons prefer to be outside during nice weather creating varying usage. This is a practical determination that would be made by the Board as part of the site's operating schedule.

Fon stated that they heard about venue events at night with respect to lighting and asked if they planned to continue with this moving forward. DeMeglio stated that the lighting is temporary generator based and they plan to continue just on the weekends. Fon stated that they want to see the business succeed but they also want to ensure it is done right and advised the applicant to prepare a business plan of their operation for review by the Town Attorney. He added that the sewer connection seems to be underway and now they need to review the parking plan. Waterhouse stated that he would like to see signage on the service road with respect to parking rules; and emergency equipment access if needed. Councilman Esposito stated that there was discussion at the Town Board level with respect to the access as this was a concern and his understanding is that the Fire Commission was consulted and they didn't see an issue with this as they

could operate from beyond the guardrail on Route 6 to get to the site. Councilman Esposito suggested leaving an open space at the entranceway to the service road to help with the turn and to possibly incorporate signage such as “*no parking from here to corner*”.

Fon asked Counsel if the existing agreement with the town needs to be amended. Counsel responded that he would look into it. Fon informed the applicant that as the tenant of the property it is important that they demonstrate their vision of the site’s operation to the town. Fon advised the applicant to work with the Planning and Engineering Departments.

#### Town Board Referral - Foothill Street Subdivision

Location: 15.07-1-7; 3850 Foothill Street

Contact: Peder Scott, P.E., R.A.

Description: Requested rezone of a 16.8-acre lot in the R1-40 zone to facilitate the development of a 20-unit multi-family rental property.

#### Comments:

Peder Scott, P.E.; and Anthony Genovese, were present. Scott stated that they presented this application to the Board a while back. The property is currently zoned R1-40 allowing for a 7-lot residential subdivision. The applicant is proposing to rezone the property to allow for a 20-unit multi-family rental property. A comparative analysis of both development options with respect to grading, stormwater management, and architectural was submitted to the Planning Department for review and discussion.

The multi-family rental property would consist of four buildings (*Buildings A & B with six-units each; and Buildings C & D with four-units each*) totaling 20 two-bedroom units as shown on the plan. The residential subdivision would consist of 7 four-bedroom homes as shown on the plan. The driveway length for the multi-family is 660LF and the residential subdivision is 650LF. The impervious area for the residential subdivision is 50,470SF compared to the multi-family of 49,700SF. With respect to the open space, they have 5.62 acres of disturbance with the residential subdivision compared to 4.67 acres of disturbance for the multi-family of which .4 acres are proposed planted buffers. There is more open space with the multi-family proposal. With respect to lighting, the residential project has residential lighting only and the multi-family has street lights. With respect to the septic capacity, there is more water usage with the multi-family. For the septic system to function the residential subdivision will require multiple systems in adequate areas compared to just one pump station for the multi-family. In terms of town liabilities, the residential subdivision would have a town road requiring maintenance compared to the multi-family with no town liabilities as it would be self-maintained. The setbacks for the multi-family for the rear are 145FT and the sideyard is 268FT. The multi-family development is compressed on the site. The stormwater management is pretty much equivalent in terms of detention basins and discharge rates. The multi-family would have more treatment because they are able to include treatment swales and infiltrator systems compared to the residential subdivision with a bio-retention basin.

Fon asked if a similar type of stormwater practice could be placed in the residential subdivision. Scott responded that it could be done but didn’t make sense economically. Fon asked who would maintain the pump station. Scott responded that the residential project would require a waiver from the Westchester Department of Health and would then be maintained by the town as compared to the multi-family which would be maintained by the homeowner’s association.

Scott added that with respect to the multi-family they have the capacity of installing buffers of dense plantings between the development and the street for screening. An emergency access way with two access points is also proposed.

Garrigan asked if the grade was steep between Buildings A and B on the multi-family plan. Scott responded that it was and they are proposing two stacked walls behind the buildings; they are cutting the grades at a 2 to 1 slope leading down to the double walls. Garrigan asked how they were treating run-off. Scott responded that all the impervious will be collected through piping to a large distribution splitter box. Garrigan asked what was at the bottom of the grade. Scott responded that the site sits between a solar farm and rising up a hillside to existing ¼ acre residential lots across the hillside. He added that they are proposing huge buffers in that hillside area and noted that there are 10 acres of open space around the perimeter of the property. Garrigan asked if the multi-family were rentals. Scott replied that they were and showed the proposed renderings for the multi-family units as well as renderings from a similar project that was built in New Fairfield, Connecticut. The units proposed are around 1,100SF with two bedrooms; some units could have walk-out basements or they can have finished basements as well; they are not installing garages so as to create

extra parking. He added that the gravity affects the stormwater management so they will have to install 3FT deep dry detention basins down by the street that will be fenced in with plantings around the perimeter of the basins.

Scott felt that the proposed multi-family is a good compromise for the town because there is a give back with the open space as well as the maintenance aspect. Scott stated that there is a DEC wetland to the right of the property and noted that their wetlands consultant has been trying to meet with the DEC for the past three months but each time their meetings have been canceled due to various reasons. The plan also shows a circled area to the right side of the property with an old abandoned dam that has a hole in it which they could turn into a water structure as an amenity. Throughout that whole area to the right there are old roads and improvements from the past with a pond of which they don't have any information on. Scott stated that past Building B to the north there is an open area of relatively flat grades that could potentially be turned into a park like setting.

Fon thought that the multi-family proposal seemed to have less impacts and may be in keeping with the surrounding neighborhood. Fon asked Tegeder if the Town Board was asking for guidance on the rezone request. Tegeder responded that this was correct but the Board also needs to determine as to whether this proposal fits in with the general development of the town, the area, and the neighborhood according to the Comprehensive Plan. Tegeder noted that with respect to the rezone process, the Town Board is typically the Lead Agency for the SEQRA review, the Planning Board needs to determine to what extent they are able to review the site plan once referred.

Tegeder pointed out the septic systems for lots 6 and 7 of the residential subdivision and questioned whether they would work. He informed the Board that if one or more of the systems don't work the comparison situation would be different. He also questioned the cut and fill for the multi-family and whether it is balanced. He requested for the applicant show the extent of the grading and actual grades for the multi-family as done with the residential subdivision for comparison. Scott responded that he would provide this information.

Tegeder suggested that the Planning Department schedule a site visit with the Board and the applicant in later February or early March when the weather is nicer to get a sense of the site and the topography. The Board agreed. Scott stated that he will stake out the proposed driveway center line and will provide site sections, grades and profiles.

#### Underhill Farm

Discussion: Minor Subdivision

Location: 48.06-1-30; 370 Underhill Avenue

Contact: Site Design Consultants

Description: Proposed minor subdivision of site plan approved by Resolution #24-13 dated 7/15/24.

Comments:

Mark Blanchard, Esq.; and Joseph Riina, Project Engineer of Site Design Consultants, were present. Blanchard reviewed the four easements as a follow-up to the previous meeting. The first three are straight forward and consist of the open space easement which is a requirement of the site plan approval with regard to public access; the utility easement granting permission to the town to step in and repair the water and sewer system if necessary; and the emergency access easement with Beaver Ridge of which the town is not a party to. These three easements were reviewed by the Town Attorney and shown to be in compliance with what was required under the site plan approval and are being held in escrow by the Town Attorney; he believes that the Town Board will have an authorization vote at their meeting tomorrow. The fourth easement deals with the proposed minor subdivision of the parcel. The applicant is proposing to subdivide the parcel into two lots creating a "condo, townhome" portion and "commercial, rental" portion. Both of these entities will be part of a Property Owner's Association (POA) of which each entity will be 50% members. The POA is formed under the New York State not for profit corporation law. This would be approved and then submitted to the NYS Attorney General along with other pertinent documents for approval. The POA would be responsible for the entirety of the site and function as one site meaning that all the roads will be maintained by one company. It will be a private action between the two entities forming one Board; if one entity defaults the other steps in meaning that these two entities will have a 50% obligation across each other. The POA contains covenants, conditions, restrictions, declarations, by-laws, easements and everything that the town would approve to ensure that the site adheres to the site plan and subdivision approval. Blanchard noted that there are mechanisms under the law that can form out of the POA subject to Board approval to create enforceability; references could be placed on the plat for the recorded easements, site plan, and subdivision approvals. Councilman Esposito asked what would happen if the POA went under. Blanchard responded that it would be unlikely as there are two entities with a 50% obligation which creates a double layer of

protection to the town, however, if this were to happen the bank would then step in. Fon felt that this was a legal discussion to be had between the attorneys and the Town Board. Chen, Planning Board Counsel, stated that it made sense conceptually and will work with the applicant.

Garrigan asked about the boundary for the public access and if they considered signage to prevent the public from going beyond the allowed access of the pond and paths to the pool area for example. Blanchard said that they called this area out to show the public access.

Riina stated that the proposed changes to the site plan include relocating the two townhome units back to the originally approved site plan; relocation of parking spaces lost from the apartment building as a result of column spacing; and removal of the wooden footbridge and installation of two culverts allow the water to flow through and create a consistent same surface path. Fon asked Tegeder if there were any issues with the site plan amendments. Tegeder responded that the site plan amendments are minor and separate from the subdivision and felt that they could continue on from them in order to get it to completion. The Board had no issues and advised the applicant to work with the Legal Department on the fourth easement.

#### ZBA Referral #39/24 - Panbar Realty

Location: 16.17-4-20, 22; 3301 & 3307 Lookout Street

Contact: Panbar Realty

Description: Request to combine two lots to create one single lot requiring a variance for a total amount lot area of 10,000 sq. ft where 20,000 sq. ft is required.

#### Comments:

No representative was present. The proposal is to combine two lots to create one single lot that will require a variance for a total lot area of 10,000SF where 20,000SF is required per the Zoning Code. Tegeder informed the Board that there are two lots with existing homes, 3301 & 3307 Lookout Street, that own additional lots behind each property on which their septic systems are located. The applicant is proposing to remove the two rear septic systems and connect to the town sewer system and then combine those two rear lots to create a new lot on Hollywood Street in order to build a single-family home. Currently each existing home has 15,000SF for their arrangement with their septic lots. If the septic lots are removed, they will then be increasing their existing non-comformity of 5,000SF below the requirement to 10,000SF below the requirement. Additionally, the new proposed lot will be 10,000SF thereby creating another non-conforming lot that is 50% reduced in a required area. After discussion, the Board requested for the Planning Department to schedule a site visit. The Board requested that the Planning Department submit a memo to the ZBA requesting more time.

#### ZBA Referral #41/24 - Teatown Campus Renovation

Location: 69.14-1-5, 7; 1600 Spring Valley Road

Contact: DTS Provident

Description: Variance request regarding mandatory sprinkler system requirements for a proposed one-story, 5,920 sq. ft education building to be located north of the Teatown Nature Center.

#### Comments:

Alan Sorkin of Teatown; Mark Gratz, P.E., and Amanda Morgan, Architect, were present. Sorkin informed the Board that they applied to the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) to request a variance from the town code's mandatory sprinkler system requirement for the proposed education building. They met with the Fire Commission prior to this evening's meeting and it is their understanding that the Commission intends to support the variance request acknowledging that the construction materials, egress, and safety measures put in place meet or exceed the intent and requirements to safeguard the life, safety and health of the inhabitants of the building; the Commission intends to send a memo to the ZBA. A site visit is scheduled with the ZBA for January 18<sup>th</sup>; and the ZBA public hearing is scheduled for January 23<sup>rd</sup>. Additionally, Teatown has agreed to install a dry hydrant in a location to be approved by the Fire Commission that will serve not only the protection of Teatown but that of the local community as well. The dry hydrant will go directly into Teatown lake and is proposed to be situated somewhere along Spring Valley Road.

Tegeder asked if the dry hydrant will pump water from the lake and Sorkin responded that this was correct. Sorkin continued that it was his understanding that it will also require DEC approval so they will work on this concurrently.

Fon asked if a NYS variance was also required and Sorkin responded that it was not; only a local variance is required. He added that they meet all of the NYS codes for fire safety standards. Lascala asked why they didn't want to install a sprinkler system. Sorkin responded that logistically it would be very difficult for them to do so as it would require trenching down a very steep hillside through a healthy stand of trees and ledge rock to get to the lake. It would also require the installation of an 8,000 gallon water tank and pumping system with diesel storage to a green sustainable building. There are no fossil fuels planned for the building in order to limit the presence of combustible materials. He added that they have been working with the Fire Commission over the past few months to secure a safe environment for the students and staff and have articulated all of the building materials incorporated into the design of the building that meets or exceeds the NYS code requirement. The Fire Commission also agrees that they have done what they could and meet the intent of the variance in which all alternative measures proposed satisfy what the sprinkler system itself was intended to do. The design shows that all three classrooms open up to the environment; each room will have a fire extinguisher and extensive training measures will be provided to the staff and students.

Fon asked about the building and if it was combustible. Morgan explained that the building proposed is a 5,920 single story, non-combustible steel and concrete structure, type IIB. All exposed materials to be used are class A fire resistant. Per NYS code they are required to make class C but they are exceeding that requirement. All rooms have a direct means of exterior egress in addition to the two main entrances at the opposite sides of the building with the exception of the restroom, mechanical room, office/storage area. An operable egress window was added to the office/storage area per the Fire Commission for egress. Fon asked if it was a LEED-certified building. Morgan responded that it was not but they have a lot of green initiatives in place and are class A. Fon asked what the maximum occupancy for the classroom was. Morgan responded it was between 25 and 30 students for each classroom; the total occupancy for the building is 185. Fon asked if there was an area around the building for the fire emergency apparatus. Morgan stated that a fire truck could pull up directly adjacent to the building from the new Blinn Road access that comes up to the bus drop-off loop that has a pedestrian path extending from that loop with a reinforced shoulder. Fon asked if the property is served by well and the response was yes. Fon asked about the potential location and distance of the proposed dry hydrant. Sorkin responded that they are still working on this with the Fire Commission but it is proposed to be along Spring Valley Road. Gratz responded that the proposed hydrant may be about ¼ mile from Spring Valley Road. He noted that in the event of a fire, the intent is for the trucks to come fully loaded, the hydrant will provide the opportunity to refill their tankers if they had to get into a sequencing operation with multiple trucks. As mentioned earlier, the dry hydrant would benefit not only Teatown but the community at large.

Fon asked if there were any thoughts on providing a sprinkler system with the paths of egress or some other type of fire prevention system. Morgan responded that they have not looked into a partial sprinkler system and noted that although they are not LEED-certified one of their primary goals was to remove the use of fossil fuels. They are depending on a geo-thermal system and the introduction of a pump would introduce a combustible fuel. Morgan stated that they could look into a partial sprinkler and electric pump but noted that the way the building is designed there are no egress corridors as everything is direct access so it may be challenging. All the wall assemblies between the classrooms meet a two hour fire resistance rating. Garrigan asked what type of fire detection system is installed. Morgan responded that they have a new fire alarm system that alerts both the occupants and the local fire department; horns and strobes in every space, fire extinguishers in every space; regular training for the staff and students; and a contract for safety checks.

Tegeer asked about the fire access detail. Gratz said that the fire access would come in off of Blinn Road and make a left turn in to what is now the existing lakeside parking lot and would then come up the proposed new bus loop. That road is designed to meet all fire access road requirements with a 20FT width and continues to approximately the mid-point of the building so a fire truck can pull up alongside the building. Tegeer asked if the extent of the access was a straight one-way run to the mid-point of the building with no access around all sides and Gratz responded that this was correct.

Fon felt that the Board should wait to hear back from the Fire Commission before making any decisions and advised the applicant to work with the Planning Department with respect to the fire apparatus access. Tegeer stated that whatever their determination ends up being, the Planning Board should be clear in their response as to how the emergency fire access will be provided; that the path proposed is enough to fight a fire; and that the Fire Commission is satisfied with the proposed fire access plan. They need correspondence pursuant to a plan that they accept and endorse.

Town Board Referral - Chapter 280 – Water

Description: Proposed local law to amend Chapter 280 entitled “Water.”

Comments:

The Board had no planning issues with the proposed amendment. The Planning Department will submit a memo to the Town Board.

Meeting Closed

Upon a motion by Bill Lascaia, and seconded by Rob Garrigan, and with all those present voting “aye”, the meeting closed at 8:51PM.