

Town of Monroe
Planning Board Minutes
Tuesday, November 18, 2025
www.townofmonroeny.gov

Generated by Norinne McSweeney

Members Present

Dylan Penn, Louis Rivera, Robert Garstak, Jeff Manson, Bonnie Franson

Members Absent:

Planning Board Consultants:

Ashley Torre, Esq.

Matthew Sickler, PE

Welcome

Roll Call

Point Out Fire Exits

Pledge of Allegiance

Returning Projects

Henry Farm (0201-2022) SBL # 29-1-2.52

Lakes Road and Camp Monroe

Monroe, NY

Applicant Representative:

Vince Pietrzak - Pietrzak & Pfau

Jon Dahlgren - Tim Allen Associates

Chairwoman Franson inquired about Mr. Barone and if he would be attending the meeting. Since the last meeting, there have been a couple of letters back and forth between our attorney, Ms. Torre, and Mr. Barone regarding the application.

Mr. Dahlgren there were no new submission, no additional updates regarding Planning documents and the Consistency Analysis since the October comment letters. Mr. Pietrzak provided new plans that he can review with the board.

Mr. Pietrzak - the real issue with the consistency analysis is the water testing for quality. We always agreed to do the water retesting per the DOH requirements. It is our opinion that the original testing is sufficient to show that the stipulation project is within and consisting with the prior SEQRA analysis and findings. We believe that just adding an appendix of quality testing at the end of the consistency analysis doesn't benefit the SEQRA document. Any contamination that might come up will be removed as part of the DOH review and

approval. The DOH concurs that we have a community water supply, we have a federal ID number for that, and the DEC watertaking permit is still valid. This is a special project, it's been before the courts and we have a stipulation from the courts and it was to be reviewed a certain way. The consultants for the Town were not instructed properly regarding the review process. Many of their comments were looking at this project as a new project and a new review in regards to SEQRA. That sums up where we stand on this project, and we would like the board to finalize the consistency statement and schedule a public hearing.

Mr. Sickler comments:

- Previous comments from October 9th on the analysis of the summary of the revised storm water analysis in regard to the discharge rate have been provided as an attachment. The applicant will incorporate into the consistency analysis.
- Comment #1 of the OCDPW letter of 23 May 2025 addressed the reconfiguration of Camp Monroe Road. The Applicant has indicated that they will address this comment as part of the OCDPW permitting process, which appears to be consistent with the traffic mitigation measures contained in the 2004 Findings Statement.
- Concerned with regard to the fire protection flow, the applicant has currently demonstrated minimum required fire flows. The applicant has agreed to review whether increasing the size of the 8" water main from the storage tank to the main loop to 10" to 12" will significantly improve available flow.

Chairwoman Franson - discussed a communication letter from Ms. Torre, our attorney, to Mr. Barone. Ms. Torre gave a fairly lengthy response getting into the SEQRA consistency review as Mr. Barone was asserting that this is almost a brand new review. Ms. Torre explained to him her perspective in regards to what the stipulation indicated, what was required for consistency review and how from her perspective that's how we will be proceeding. There was additional correspondence. There was a question about water testing and her response is that the water testing is part of the SEQRA process and the applicant should coordinate with Mr. Getchel. So from our consultant, from our attorney's perspective with regard to the settlement and the consistency review and the agreement, she's indicating that the water quality has to be done at this time. I don't know how the Planning Board feels whether we should diverge from that opinion or not. You've requested to do that, but at a different time, it's not attached to SEQRA and our attorney is saying that's part of SEQRA. We didn't receive anything from Mr. Barone that would provide us with his alternative view.

Mr. Pietrzak - did you get the letter from Mr. Barone?

Chairwoman Franson - that is the letter that Ms. Torre was responding to.

Mr. Dahlgren - I don't know the date of that letter, but that was kind of our formal response from Mr. Barone to Ms. Torre about the process and how the water testing fits into that.

Chairwoman Franson - Ms. Torre responded on November 11, 2025 to Mr. Barone. She runs through the consistency analysis, the agreement, the stipulation. Sounds like Mr.

Barone's letter was dated October 17, 2025. So she indicates clearly stated that further well testing may be necessary. Specifically Weston and Sampson's memorandum of March 7th, 2023 stated that its proposed scope of work includes the following, assess the adequacy of the previously provided well testing and evaluations relative to hydrogeologic based acceptable practices under the current requirements for public community water supplies regarding the capacity yield and portability as established by the New York State DEC. She then underlines, in the event that our assessment indicates that the previously completed pumping test and/or hydrogeologic evaluations do not allow for an adequate assessment of hydrogeologic and water quality impacts and do not meet current requirements as specified by either the DEC, DOH or Orange County DOH or the town, we will notify the Planning Board of additional efforts that we recommend be taken to address the corresponding deficiencies. The original well testing was conducted over 20 years ago. The applicants' prior DOH permitting has been declared null and void. There have been changes in the applicable testing parameters as explained in Weston and Sampson's August 13th memo. Off-site land use changes have been occurring since 2005 along with the possible addition of nearby private water supply wells and domestic wastewater disposal facilities. Wells one and two should be adequately addressed by the testing and data evaluations being proposed by the applicant and relayed to the Town as part of the development approval process. There was some email correspondence today that Mr. Sickler was copied on which indicated pump testing is part of SEQRA.

Mr. Pietrzak - requested the Chairwoman to take an informal poll regarding scheduling a public hearing and finalizing the consistency statement.

Chairwoman Franson - first I will poll as to whether the water quality testing and pump test has to be done as part of SEQRA, because if that has to be done then you know we can't do the public hearing. So I will do an informal poll this isn't a vote, but just to get a sense of where the board stands on this. I'll start first I don't want to stray from what our attorney has recommended this project has been subject to litigation and she has recommended and indicated that the water quality testing and reporting is part of the SEQRA process.

Informal Poll:

Chairwoman Franson - don't believe that we should go against that opinion

Member Garstak agrees with Chairwoman Franson and Ms. Torre

Member Rivera - our attorney has recommended and we're going to have to as a board or myself, I'm definitely going to take her advice. It is part of SEQRA, and it has to be done. It's been 20 years. Anything can happen in 20 years.

Member Manson - it is appropriate, and I agree with the attorney's recommendation.

Member Penn - I am aligned with our attorney.

Chairwoman Franson not sure if we need to issue a negative declaration or a reaffirmation which is unclear as SERQA was done so long ago, but that is an outstanding item that is needed prior to the public hearing. I don't know what is left in the way as a lot of the work has occurred at this point and I don't know that many will come out for the public hearing either, just because of where the location is but we won't know until we get there right, but if you're still of the opinion that you want it to go in a different direction then I don't know

what to tell you, but that's how the Planing Board feels at this time.

Mr. Pietrzak - we'd like to request the board schedule us for a public hearing for the wetlands permit, which I believe is supposed to be scheduled within 90 days of submission. Chairwoman Franson - I can't speak to that because I haven't looked at it. We haven't been asked to do that. Normally, we would hold all of these public hearings concurrently. So, we would do the wetland permit and the subdivision and whatever else we need just to make it more efficient and not to have separate public hearings going on and closing and opening. I don't know that we would want to open the wetland permit part of it if we haven't finished SEQRA consistency. I can ask our attorney to advise us whether that's possible. I wouldn't be able to respond without checking with the attorney first.

Member Manson - curious what is the benefit of taking care of this part of the public hearing separately?

Mr. Pietrzak - Town code says it should be scheduled within 90 days of submission so we are just trying to follow the rules.

Chairwoman Franson - we will check with Ms. Torre and see what steps we can or can't proceed with.

Owen Drive (0207-2022) SBL # 3-1-9.1

20 Owen Drive

Monroe, NY 10950

Applicant Representative:
Vince Pietrzak - Pietrzak & Pfau

Chairwoman Franson - there are 2 comment letters one is regarding the SWPPP and the other is the overall tech review. Asked MHE to look into the storm water element as it's a shame to put in major basins in locations when we could be preserving trees and not disturbing things.

Mr. Pietrzak - Mr. Sickler and I discussed the concerns and we will be looking at things and addressing his concerns regarding the SWPPP.

Chairwoman Franson - Mr. Sickler and I just had a premeeting discussion about where things are. In looking at the site plan the layout there are three homes up by the road which are proposed to connect to Smith Farm and below it are these major storm water basins to capture the storm water runoff. As much as we have to do that, they're different technologies, so I was wondering whether there was a different technology where we didn't have to cut down a bunch of trees and grade out a bunch of area to capture storm water.

Mr. Sickler - within the Smith Farm project the road that was being utilized to access these

three lots was considered in a portion of that project as emergency access. What we were looking at was whether some of that road was previously considered impervious area and therefore considered as part of the Smith Farms in which case this project would only need to look at increases associated with that. So we just went through that prior to the meeting and that's something we will be checking to make sure that we're not oversizing the features that are needed here.

Chairwoman Franson - potentially when Smith Farm was looked at the road was accounted for in the drainage portion of it. So that might minimize what we need to do specifically for Owen Dr. Referring to the plans up on the screen, if you look here at the bottom you have lot two and lot three. There's all this grading being done to accommodate the storm water basin and in the best of all worlds we'd like to limit that if possible.

Mr. Sickler continues:

- previous comments that the intent of the road to access the 3 lots is going to be owned and maintained by an HOA associated with Smith Farm.
- Smith Farm Road is a separate tax parcel. On the subdivision plan it would be good to indicate that this parcel will be consolidated with the existing Smith Farm Road parcel instead of creating additional smaller lots.

Mr. Pietrzak - we'll show that on the map to be filed with the county to create the three lots. We'll show that as a lot line change with the adjacent road.

Chairwoman Franson - 20 Owen Drive is the parcel that has a right of way on it that you attempted to have them get access from the new road and they declined?

Mr. Pietrzak - correct. All of the parcels have access easements across from their driveways.

Chairwoman Franson - there is a parcel that was created for Smith Farm and it is the plan to attach the new parcel to the adjoining road as Smith Farm HOA will be responsible for it. Is the Village or Town maintaining this part of the road?

Mr. Pietrzak - it is a private road it shows up on the Smith Farm site plans.

Chairwoman Franson - The segment of Owen Drive was part of the signed filed map for Smith Farm and it indicates this emergency access to benefit the HOA, the Town and the Village for a second access to the development.

Mr. Sickler continues:

- the next comment pertains to snow storage around the emergency access gate. On the Owen Drive there is a spot that has been cleared and identified for that. If you could clarify coming in from the Devit Road in front of the gate, the driveway for lot one pulls off. Is it possible to push snow opposite driveway for lot 1?
- reminder your ordinance requires demonstrating well capacity, I believe it is proposed to test the existing well for the house that is there using those results to show there's suitable capacity for the project.
- not sure of the SEQRA status - something to be followed up on.
- a tree survey and tree plan was included and has been forwarded to land scape consultant for review

- make sure the plans have the updated approval box on them

Chairwoman Franson - we need more understanding of building height calculations. The Town regulates both stories and height. In the definitions in the Zoning Code it defines for purposes of Zoning a cellar and a basement. A cellar is your typical mostly underground and the basement as not mostly underground. On one of the plan sheets it states basement, first floor and second floor which is considered 3 stories and we are allowed 2.5 stories. Mr. Sickler and I discussed about maybe showing the corners A,B,C & D or somehow diagrammatically show us where these measurements were taken from.

Member Manson - in relation to the conversation about the storm water. So I understand the point about if the road was already included in the calculations for Smith Farm, then the storm water retention may not need to be as great. But between what's existing on the property and what's proposed on the grading, It seems like it's still be significantly downhill, I am kind of curious about what's going to ultimately be needed to protect the properties down below. Assuming that this road was already considered as part of the Smith Farm, how much of a reduction of the storm water do you know off the top of your head?

Mr. Pietrzak - I couldn't even begin to estimate. Honestly, if they didn't take into account the road there may be other things that they didn't take into account like the existing structure that's there. It may have just been a quick clean drainage calculation to get it sized and designed. I'll go through those calculations and I'll have a better idea.

Mr. Pietrzak is it possible to schedule the public hearing at the next meeting.

Chairwoman Franson - that is something we need to check with our attorney. Need to verify about the negative declaration. Plus we need to verify information if we need to reach out to the Village of Monroe on this portion as well.

Mr. Pietrzak - should I make a submission to the Village when I do the next submission here like CC them on the submission so they see what you are looking at.

Chairwoman Franson - that would be a good idea and cc their attorney as well.

New Projects

Shorte and Sweet (0245-2025) SBL # 38-9-1.1 150 West Mombasha Road Monroe, NY 10950

Applicant Representative:

Dave Niemotko - Niemotko Architects

We are back with a new tenant for 150 West Mombasha, the former tenant Foreign Objects Beer is no longer there and the new tenant would like to operate a bakery out of there to make cupcakes and pastries, things of that nature. Not only for the neighborhood but to attract new vendors. The applicant wrote a short summary of the business that I would like to share with the board to help better understand what she is looking for.

Short and Sweet is a 2year-old Hudson Valley based commissary bakery specializing in award winning small batch handcrafted cupcakes and other sweet treats. We are passionate about crafting high quality baked goods using locally sourced ingredients, traditional methods, and innovative techniques. Not only do our cupcakes look good and taste good, they do good, too. A portion of proceeds from every cupcake sold is donated to a local food pantry that feeds hot meals and provides groceries to hundreds of food insecure families monthly. We intend to use the space at 150 West Mombasia Road in Monroe as a haven for anyone with a sweet tooth. Beyond a simple pickup spot, we would like to create a cozy and welcoming environment where you can sit down and savor our freshly baked goods and sweet treats. We envision the space to be a one-stop destination for all things party related. Curating a delightful selection of party goods from candles and balloons to unique gifts crafted by local vendors. This allows our customers to effortlessly find everything they need for a special occasion in a single convenient space while supporting the community. For the convenience of the community, we would also carry basic pantry essentials such as milk, bread, and eggs. Beyond our core purpose, we also envision this space as a vibrant hub for the community. Our goal is to create more than just a business. We want to build a welcoming gathering space where neighbors can connect, learn, and celebrate. We plan to host a variety of events that enrich the neighborhood, such as local artisan workshops, seasonal holiday gatherings, a daily food truck, and collaborative popups with other small businesses. By opening our doors for these occasions, we hope to foster stronger connections and contribute to the lively spirit of the community. I think we get approval based on that description alone.

I want to bring the board's attention to just a few other items. We're not proposing any change to the footprint of the building. So, no additions, no renovations on the exterior. The improvements that were conditioned on Foreign Objects, the previous tenant have been performed. They're on site. We're not proposing any changes to those improvements; the trees in the back, the parking, the ADA accessibility and things of that nature. The new use is consistent with the previous use. So, we feel that that requirement under the zoning code for restaurants or retail is similar, and the parking requirements would remain the same. Based on those criteria, the project is seamless in its transition and perhaps would qualify for a type two action by the board. We don't feel like an enhanced SEQRA process would be necessary.

Mr. Sickler comments:

- with my review I wasn't sure what the proposed use was, or what the intent of the building use was but the description that was just given explained enough to get a general idea.
- the cover letter referenced an outdoor space for events, nothing noted on the plans for that. What kind of events and what would they entail?

Mr. Niemotko - in the back of the property there is approximately 3,000 square feet of grass area. The tenant would like to use the space as it's currently used for intimate settings.

There are park benches and tables that they would use for special events for a vendor to serve their goods. Limit the occupants that would be able to occupy the space. Looking at approximately 30-60 people on an occasion. Looking to hosting special events during a 6 month period about once a month. The 13 parking spaces that are provided are not enough to accommodate that number of people, but that is something that is not mandatory. It's more important that she open up and start activities.

Ms. Shorte - that's the reason why I wanted to have a possible food vendor outside because it really isn't going to be a space for people to come and sit in because I'd like to have other vendors with their items on the shelves for people to kind of walk around and shop. Yes and no I may have a table, but I'm still trying to figure out the space and what would be allowed based on what the Planning Board says.

Mr. Sickler continues:

- the space for outdoor vendor is 5'x10' which seems small applicant needs to confirm size and type of vendor proposed
- right-of-way width and location needs to be confirmed with OCDPW to verify not within the right-of-way
- setbacks shall be measured from the street line according to the zoning code
- need to clarify what the outdoor vendor you were proposing.
- food vending is covered under the code in Chapter 35 - you will need to review those requirements with the building inspector.
- it looks like the outdoor or the vending usage shown in the front would be located within the front and side yards. Just review that and make sure that's not an issue.

Mr. Niemotko - it would be a food truck vendor associated with the business or an associated business similar to what Shorte & Sweet is proposing cupcakes, pastries, breakfast items. What the applicant is proposing is a 10'x10' tent with a food vendor underneath to attract business.

Chairwoman Franson - questioned type of vendor the applicant is considering for the proposed food vendors. Is this for outdoor space or inside space?

Ms. Shorte - thinking along the lines of a food truck that does coffee and breakfast sandwiches in the morning that people can grab on their way to work. The vendors within the space would be people with homemade goods example candies, honey, candles, lotions. The vendors won't be there they will be renting shelves and stocking those with their goods. I will be baking on the premises.

Member Rivera - what is your intention for the outdoor space you are speaking of? Will you have music, what type of events? Everybody needs clarification on what you are planning for the 3,000 s/f in the back.

Ms. Shorte - what I am thinking is small intimate baby or bridal shower someone would rent out the space, or one of the inside vendors might want to hold a special event showcasing more products. People could come and shop the different vendors. In regards to the daily vendor that would be outside, it would be someone who's selling like coffee or breakfast sandwiches in the morning and then a separate vendor in the afternoon who would be

selling like savory foods.

Chairwoman Franson - I brought up the Foreign Objects Beer resolution because we've specifically previously said no outdoor seating, outdoor events, or other use of outdoor space is approved. And if it were to be expanded, it required an amended site plan approval. There's two aspects one, you're in a neighborhood, a residential neighborhood the people around were concerned about the noise and who's going to be hanging out there at the time that it was proposed. Reviewed the location of the property and it is located in neighborhood business zone.

Member Rivera touched back on his concerns in regards to whether the business was allowed there, the amount of people the will be there and what the hours of operations are. Everything is very general at this point we need more information on what is actually going to happen in this space. Will there be table and chairs? Will there be music outside? I am looking for clarity on the outside operations, as the inside is confined and that already exists and your taking over the current space. What is legal outside? Can it be done without disturbing the neighborhood?

Mr. Niemotko - Lets get more specific. On the site plan we show an outdoor vendor space that she would like to have. I don't believe it is in the right-of-way, it is within the setbacks. We need to get a building department determination on locating the vendor within the front and side yard setbacks. Have a vendor in the morning catering to breakfast needs and then a different vendor in the afternoon for other kinds of foods. The inside vendors would be selling homemade goods whether it be food or candles, lotions and that type of goods by renting space inside to hold their products. Again, the outside space would be one vendor underneath a tent in front of the building.

Chairwoman Franson - agrees that it is a good idea to speak with the Building Inspector as there are operating permits associated with it and regulations which are very detailed as to who can operate. In addition to Chapter 35 peddling and solicitation and then it is under the Town Code building section Chapter 23 in regards to operating permits. Also, states for mobile food preparation vehicles you have to meet requirements of fire code of NY State.

Chairwoman Franson - asked the applicant if she has to have outside vendor?

Ms. Shorte - these are just ideas that I have come up with for the space. I want to know what is actually allowed. These are things that I have envisioned for the space. Don't want to take away from the neighborhood but to add to the neighborhood. The events that I am planning the neighborhood would be invited to attend as well vendor events and things of that nature.

Chairwoman Franson - the previous tenant was not allowed outside events because of the neighborhood. There is definite concern on how this affects the neighborhood. It would definitely be useful to get the determination from the Building Inspector. It would be useful to know how the inside space will be used for example 50% or 70% of the area for the

bakery? Are you baking for just on site consumption, are you going to be packing things for delivery to other places as that would be a different form of operation. We need more information and understanding what you envision will be needed here.

Ms. Shorte - my cupcakes are small batch and handcrafted so this won't be a large operation. Currently, I go to vendor events as a vendor and sell my cupcakes whatever fits in my vehicle. I will continue on with the small batch product.

Chairwoman Franson - I am envisioning tables and chairs there by the previous tenant.

Ms. Shorte - there are no tables and chairs, it is just open space. There can be, but that is not what I am envisioning at this point. I am thinking of an upscale Party City where you pick up cupcakes, balloons, greeting cards made by a local vendor, maybe some candles, a small shopping store. Supporting local vendors.

Chairwoman Franson - besides baking the cupcakes will there be any other baking or cooking on the premises? Or is it just purely you'll be baking on the premises and other goods will be brought in already made elsewhere?

Member Manson - looking in the zoning table, you're basing the calculation of parking spaces and basically saying it's a continuation of the previous use. It doesn't sound so much restaurant tavern to me and that's what the population was based on. So again, I think it's important to clarify with Mr. Maldonado the use and then make sure that we have the parking that is required to support that. I also see there's an asterisk note upgrade and improvement of the existing parking layout. And I'm just wondering, Mr. Niemotko, it's been a while since we looked at Foreign Objects, if you could just mention where the upgrades and improvements are that we're seeing on the new plan. Your not changing the number of spaces just making them more distinct.

Mr. Niemotko - It was along the front, the striping of the spaces and the designation of the ADA parking and the striping of the ADA sign. The neighborhood business zone has permitted uses associated with this and the closest one is restaurant and based on the calculation we satisfy the parking requirement.

Member Manson - I would like to see that clarified with the building inspector that based on the narrative that he continues to view this as restaurant tavern and that the parking calculation will be based on the same. I thought you mentioned in your overview that there are some tables or benches indoor benches out back currently. Clearly they never came back to us for that approval and it was part of the original approval that they would need to do that.

Mr. Niemotko Yes, there are some picnic tables and benches in the back. Apparently they did use them. There were events that were held in the back.

Chairwoman Franson - Do you have to use the outside to make it work for you or could you start indoors. So that's not something that would have to be done immediately. I'm just trying to understand your business model to see what you absolutely need first and what are again the basic activities that you're going to do there as part of the use.

Member Rivera - It's a bakery that's going to offer some limited grocery items to a degree.

Member Penn - no comments but I wish you success. This sounds like a great concept.

Chairwoman Franson - get a more narrative in terms of how the space is going to be used

internally. List the percent for each location, is there going seating or strictly retail.

Administrative

Chapter 53-54 Revision

Mr. Sickler reviewed the 2 chapters in questions. Chapter 53 has the water rules and regulations and then Chapter 54 which contains water systems of communal use. Also in the subdivision ordinance there is a section 11 that talks about communal water systems as well. There has been some confusion on previous projects as there's some overlap between Chapters 53 & 54. The revisions that have been prepared I discussed with the Town Board, the Town Attorney they tried to separate those chapters and eliminate some of the overlap. Basically, Chapter 53 as presented now deals with water system itself and then the specifics for it. For example, there's an article in there that pertains to fire hydrants, what they're to consist of, the town water department their regulation of those and then a section on the water distribution system that gives the specifications for what those materials and what it's made out of what that needs to consist of what's allowable in a water system that's intended to be dedicated and provided to the Town and then what's allowable in a water system that's intended to be privately owned and maintained by example an HOA or developer. So those are the primary revisions to those. Then Chapter 54 on the communal water systems has been updated to include some references about potential future dedication to the Town, how long that time frame would take and what that involves. and again clarifies that you know the town is not under any obligation to take it at any point of the division the revisions to it clarifications to try to clean up some overlap to it.

Chairwoman Franson - is reviewing the subdivision regulations. So there's a section A65-31 dealing with water systems. The whole intent as you're saying is we already have chapters dealing with our water infrastructure. Whether it's private or public, then we also have these standards in the subdivision regulations. The idea is to take them out of the subdivision regulations and put them in the chapters that deal with water infrastructure so there isn't any inconsistency. My one suggestion was don't get rid of the section dealing with water systems and also a separate section for sewers, leave that little section in the subdivision regulations and just say for water systems, you have to adhere to the regulations in Chapter 53 or 54. There's a different chapter that we have to look at still when it comes to subdivisions that come in that may have infrastructure. I wanted to make sure that it was again that there was a reference so we don't forget where the standards are.

Minutes

June 13, 2024

August 14, 2025

August 19, 2025

September 16, 2025

October 9, 2025

November 5, 2025

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion to approve the November 5, 2025 minutes.

On a motion by Planning Board Member Manson, seconded by Planning Board Member Penn

Ayes: Planning Board Member Penn, Planning Board Member Manson, Planning Board Chairperson Franson

Nays: None

Abstain: Planning Board Alternate Member #2 Louis Rivera, Planning Board Member Robert Garstak

Adjournment

Adjournment of Meeting

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion to adjourn tonight's meeting.

On a motion by Planning Board Chairperson Franson, seconded by Planning Board Member Garstak

Ayes: Planning Board Member Penn, Planning Board Alternate Member #2 Rivera, Planning Board Member Garstak, Planning Board Member Manson, Planning Board Chairperson Franson

Nays: None

Abstain: None