

Telephone 1
(914) 277-5366₂

FAX
(914) 277-4093

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

TOWN HOUSE
335 ROUTE 202
SOMERS, NY 10589

Town of Somers

WESTCHESTER COUNTY, N.Y.



John Currie, *Chairman*
Fedora DeLucia
Christopher Foley
Vicky Gannon
Nancy Gerbino
Eugene Goldenberg
John Keane

3

**SOMERS PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
JULY 10, 2013**

4

5

6

7 **ROLL:**

8

9 **PLANNING BOARD**

10 **MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Chair Currie, Mrs. DeLucia, Mr. Keane,
Ms. Gerbino, Mr. Goldenberg, and Mr. Foley

11

12

13 **ALSO PRESENT:**

Director of Planning Syrette Dym
Consultant Engineer Joseph Barbagallo
Town Attorney Joseph Eriole
Planning Board Secretary Marilyn Murphy

14

15

16

17

18 **ABSENT:**

Ms. Gannon

19

20 The meeting commenced at 7:30 p.m. Planning Board Secretary Marilyn
21 Murphy called the roll and noted that a required quorum of four members
22 was present in order to conduct the business of the Board.

23

24 **APPROVAL OF DRAFT MINUTES FOR MEETINGS HELD ON**
25 **FEBRUARY 13, 2013, MARCH 13, 2013, AND APRIL 10, 2013**

26

27 Chairman Currie noted that Planning Board Secretary Marilyn Murphy
28 prepared and submitted for the Board's consideration approval of the draft
29 minutes of Planning Board meetings held on February 13, 2013,
30 March 13, 2013 and April 10, 2013.

31

1 The Chair asked if there were any comments or corrections from the Board
2 on the February 13, 2013 Planning Board minutes and no one replied.
3 He explained that the reason for the delay in approving the minutes was
4 that the Board was waiting for corrections from Frederick P. Clark
5 Associates, the consultant on The Green at Somers and Granite Pointe.
6

7 Mrs. DeLucia asked if Planning Board Secretary Murphy listened to the
8 tape and if F. P. Clark's changes were exactly what was said at the
9 meeting.

10
11 The Planning Board Secretary explained that F.P. Clark's corrections were
12 mostly changes in language.

13
14 On motion by Chair Currie, seconded by Mr. Foley, and unanimously
15 carried, the draft minutes of February 13, 2013, as amended, were
16 approved.

17
18 The Chair asked if there were any comments or corrections from the Board
19 on the draft minutes of March 13, 2013 and no one replied.

20
21 On motion by Chair Currie, seconded by Mr. Goldenberg, and unanimously
22 carried, the draft minutes of March 13, 2013, as amended, were approved.

23
24 The Chair asked if there were any comments or corrections from the Board
25 on the draft minutes of April 10, 2013.

26
27 Ms. Gerbino commented that before the meeting commenced, Linda
28 Whitehead, attorney for The Green at Somers, sent an e-mail to the Board
29 that related to the minutes specifically the billing for The Green at Somers.
30 Ms. Gerbino read: *How can there be a bill for F. P. Clark for all that time for*
31 *April and May when the project has not been on an agenda since March*
32 *14, and she was told in the beginning of April that it was dead. There*
33 *seems to be time for memos and preparing for an April meeting, but it was*
34 *never on an April agenda. We also should not get billed for Joanne's time*
35 *to review minutes, including minutes for a meeting she was not at.*

36
37 On motion by Chair Currie, seconded by Mr. Goldenberg, and unanimously
38 carried, the draft minutes of April 10, 2013, as amended, were approved.

39

1 Mr. Goldenberg opined that consultants making changes to the minutes is
2 inappropriate.

3
4 Planning Board Secretary Murphy clarified that Frederick P. Clark
5 Associates only reviews minutes that they are consultants on. Town
6 Attorney Eriole advised that the purpose of changing minutes is
7 not to alter and not to make things that were said sound better. He stated
8 that clarifying the minutes to accurately reflect what was said is
9 appropriate. Town Attorney Eriole noted that the adoption of minutes is an
10 act of the Planning Board. He said that because the Town employs
11 consultants it may not be inappropriate to monitor the project and review
12 minutes to make sure they are up to date on the project and should be
13 analyzed on a case by case basis.

14
15 The DVD of the Planning Board meetings held on February 13, 2013,
16 March 13, 2013 and April 10, 2013 is made a part of the approved minutes
17 and is available for public viewing at the Somers Public Library. The text of
18 the approved minutes is also on the Town's website www.somersny.com
19 and is available for public review at the Planning & Engineering office at the
20 Town House.

21
22 **TIME-EXTENSION**

23
24 **WRIGHT'S COURT SITE PLAN SITE "A"**
25 **AMENDED SITE PLAN APPROVAL AND STORMWATER**
26 **MANAGEMENT AND EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL PERMIT**
27 **[TM: 17.11-1-18]**

28
29 Chairman Currie stated that this is a request for a one year time-extension
30 for Wright's Court Amended Site Plan Site "A" and Stormwater
31 Management and Erosion and Sediment Control Permit from July 18, 2013
32 to and including July 18, 2014 in accordance with §170-114K and 93-20 of
33 the Code of the Town of Somers.

34
35 Chair Currie acknowledged receipt of a letter dated June 20, 2013 from
36 applicant's attorney Adam Wekstein requesting the time-extension.

37
38 The Chair asked the applicant's representative to give the reasons for the
39 time-extension.

40

1 Adam Wekstein, the applicant's attorney, said simply he is requesting a
2 one year time-extension for the Amended Site Plan and Stormwater
3 Management and Erosion and Sediment Control Permit as it relates to Site
4 "A" at Wright's Court. He explained that he came before the Board in April
5 to request a time-extension to the Stormwater Management and Erosion
6 and Sediment Control Permit so that it corresponds to the expiration date of
7 the Amended Site Plan and now he is requesting that they both be
8 extended for an additional year.

9

10 Ms. Gerbino indicated that she is nervous about this project because it is in
11 the B-HP District and both sites were reviewed together. She explained
12 that the two sites are now under different ownership and she is nervous
13 because of the requested changes in Site "B" that is impacting the work the
14 Board worked on for the approvals. Ms. Gerbino asked for assurances that
15 it is alright to approve the time-extension and address her concerns.

16

17 Town Attorney Eriole advised that the Board can look at it as the applicant
18 is entitled to the extension and if the Board finds that facts and situations
19 have not changed so significantly that the Board can continue granting the
20 extension. He explained that if the Board is worried and there is merit for
21 further review and without that review it is within the Board's power to not
22 grant a time-extension this is maybe something the applicant should
23 address.

24

25 Mrs. DeLucia asked Attorney Wekstein if he was requesting that a motion
26 be made for a time-extension for Site "A" only.

27

28 Mr. Keane said that the Board can extend both Site "A" and Site "B".

29

30 Mr. Goldenberg noted that the owner of Site "B" submitted a letter stating
31 that he consents to the request for a time-extension.

32

33 Attorney Wekstein said that the Board can say that the time to apply for
34 Building Permits on Site "A" is extended for a year. He indicated that there
35 is a Building Permit on Site "B".

36

37 Tim Allen, representing Site "B" of Wright's Court, noted that there are two
38 tax lots.

39

1 Consultant Engineer Barbagallo asked what the Site “B” Building Permit
2 was on.

3
4 Engineer Allen said that the Building Permit on Site “B” was taken out on
5 the approved Site Plan. He explained that there is an application pending
6 that is a modification of the approved Site Plan.

7
8 Attorney Wekstein explained that once the Site Plan is signed the applicant
9 has one year to build and apply for a Building Permit. He indicated that
10 after one year the applicant can ask the Board for a time-extension to the
11 Site Plan. He advised that if the Board approves the modification to the
12 Site Plan for Site “B” the Board may want to have a Site Plan for just Site
13 “B”.

14
15 Town Attorney Eriole advised that if the Board grants an extension it is on
16 the Site Plan for Site “A” and “B”.

17
18 On motion by Chair Currie, seconded by Mr. Goldenberg, and unanimously
19 carried, the Board moved to grant a one year time-extension to Wright’s
20 Court Site “A” and Site “B” for Amended Site Plan Approval and
21 Stormwater Management and Erosion and Sediment Control Permit from
22 July 18, 2013 to and including July 18, 2014 in accordance with Somers
23 Town Code §170-114.K. and 93-20.

24
25 **PROJECT REVIEW**

26
27 **NEW CINGULAR WIRELESS PCS, LLC (AT&T)**
28 **APPLICATION TO RENEW SITE PLAN APPROVAL AND WETLAND**
29 **PERMIT TO CO-LOCATE ON EXISTING T-MOBILE WIRELESS**
30 **FACILITY LOCATED AT 80 ROUTE 6, SOMERS COMMONS SHOPPING**
31 **CENTER [TM: 4.20-1-11]**

32
33 Chairman Currie mentioned that this is the application of New Cingular
34 Wireless for renewal of a Special Use Permit for an existing approved
35 AT&T Tower and Related Wireless Facility located at 80 Route 6 at the
36 Somers Commons Shopping Center.

37
38 Chair Currie asked the applicant’s representative to update the Board on
39 the application.

40

1 Neil Alexander, the applicant's attorney, noted that the Board knows this
2 facility well because of the Board's review of the tower located at the
3 Somers Commons Shopping Center. He mentioned that the Board has to
4 determine if the equipment shelter should be parallel or perpendicular to
5 the existing facility. He explained that it was decided to make the
6 equipment shelter parallel to the facility which necessitated that a wetland
7 permit was needed in addition to the Site Plan, Special Use Permit and
8 variances that were granted. Attorney Alexander stated that the variance
9 and Special Use Permit run with the land. He indicated that he is
10 requesting the renewal of the Site Plan and Wetland Permit. He reminded
11 the Board about the Federal pre-exemptions under the
12 Telecommunications Act, Shot Clock and §6409A. He indicated that the
13 applicant is ready to build now.

14

15 The Chair asked Director of Planning Dym to discuss her memo for the
16 benefit of the public.

17

18 Director of Planning Dym explained that there was confusion generated by
19 the word "renew" in the letter from the applicant's attorney. She indicated
20 that the Board is being asked to look at the extension of the Site Plan,
21 Wetland Permit but not the Telecommunication Permit which runs for five
22 years and still has time within its five year period. Director of Planning Dym
23 noted that she has a question on the format the Board will use to grant the
24 applicant's request. She mentioned that the applicant's Site Plan was
25 never signed; therefore, the applicant needs time for the Signature of Site
26 Plan and an extension indicating the failure to comply with Site Plan
27 Approval that was granted on April 13, 2012. She said that the Resolution
28 stated that approval shall be deemed null and void one year from the date
29 of signing of the Site Plan unless a Building Permit is issued. Director of
30 Planning Dym indicated that the Planning Board may extend the time to
31 obtain signature of the Site Plan and time to obtain a building permit if the
32 Planning Board deems such extensions "warranted under the
33 circumstances"

34

35 Mr. Foley asked about how the Board can grant an extension when the
36 Code states *although such request is supposed to be made prior to the*
37 *expiration of the specific time period, the time period can be extended "if*
38 *good cause" is shown* . He asked what the good cause is.

39

40 Attorney Alexander stated that the applicant is working in good faith

1 and is co-locating on an existing facility. He said that the Planning Board
2 has a different perspective on the five-year renewal than the Zoning Board
3 of Appeals (ZBA).

4
5 Director of Planning Dym explained that if the Board feels the extension
6 has lapsed the Board can approve a re-grant of the Resolution.

7
8 Attorney Alexander said that the Board can waive the Public Hearing on the
9 Site Plan and the Public Hearing on the Wetland Permit if the original intent
10 of the permit is not altered or extended in any significant way. He opined
11 that §6409A favors the process of extending the Site Plan and Wetland
12 Permit for the purpose of getting this approval at one meeting.

13
14 Director of Planning Dym said the Board can approve a re-grant of the
15 Amended Site Plan Approval and Wetland Permit to co-locate on an
16 existing T-Mobile wireless facility located at 80 Route 6 at the Somers
17 Commons Shopping Center.

18
19 Mr. Keane said that the incursion into the wetland buffer is minimal.

20
21 Mr. Foley noted that there are two issues that have to be determined. One
22 issue is the extension which Attorney Alexander gave reasons why the
23 extension is justified, and two, the extension request was late and the
24 Board has to determine if there is justification for the lateness of the
25 extension request.

26
27 Attorney Alexander said that a reason the request was late was the loss of
28 time because of the merger.

29
30 Town Attorney Eriole stated that a request for an extension could have
31 been made no matter what was going on but it is the Board who decides if
32 good cause was shown. He said that the Board can approve a re-grant of
33 the Resolution.

34
35 Consultant Engineer Barbagallo said that the Board can: (1) grant an
36 extension, (2) re-grant, or (3) re-review the application.

37
38 Attorney Alexander stated that §6409A says you may not deny and you
39 shall approve is a mandatory process and is not discretionary. He said that
40 the Board has a broad interpretation of the word *extension*.

1 Consultant Engineer Barbagallo indicated that new certification language
2 can be added to the Resolution if the Board grants a re-grant of the
3 Resolution instead of an extension.

4
5 On motion by Mrs. DeLucia, seconded by Mr. Keane, and unanimously
6 carried, the Board moved to waive the Public Hearing under §170-114.F.
7 on the Site Plan and the Wetland Permit for New Cingular Wireless PCS,
8 LLC (AT&T) located at 80 Route 6 at the Somers Commons Shopping
9 Center.

10
11 On motion by Mrs. DeLucia, seconded by Mr. Goldenberg, and
12 unanimously carried, the Board moved to determine that the re-grant of the
13 Site Plan for the existing approved AT&T Tower and related wireless facility
14 action is a Type II Action and is therefore exempt pursuant to the New York
15 State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) §617.5 (c) (26) and §92-
16 6.B. (15) of the Code of the Town of Somers and therefore no further action
17 under SEQRA is required.

18
19 On motion by Mr. Keane, seconded by Ms. Gerbino, and unanimously
20 carried, the Board moved to re-grant Conditional Amended Site Plan
21 Approval to New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC (AT&T) at Somers Commons
22 Shopping Center subject to the insertion of the recent standard conditions
23 for telecommunication co-locations and in accordance with Resolution
24 2011-01 dated April 13, 2011 for the Chairman's signature.

25
26 **INFORMAL APPEARANCE**

27
28 **WRIGHT'S COURT SITE "B"**
29 **APPLICATION FOR AMENDED SITE PLAN AND**
30 **SPECIAL EXCEPTION USE PERMIT FOR THE GROUNDWATER**
31 **PROTECTION OVERLAY DISTRICT [TM: 17.11-1-5]**

32
33 Chairman Currie noted that this is an application for modifications to the
34 approved Site Plan to rotate and relocate the proposed building and
35 expansion of the parking area. He explained that the discussion will be
36 limited to the cross access to the adjacent Il Forno property.

37
38 The Chair asked the applicant's representative to explain the reason for the
39 informal appearance.

40

1 Timothy Allen, the applicant's engineer, noted that Silvio DiNardo
2 purchased Site "B" at Wright's Court. Engineer Allen showed the Board the
3 original plan for Site "B" that has the building setback from the road,
4 parking behind the building and the septic system at the back of the
5 building with stormwater going under the pavement. Engineer Allen said
6 that the intent of the Business Historic Preservation District (B-HP) Zone
7 encourages buildings to be close to the road. He said that the applicant
8 wants to keep the same square footage of the building but turn the building
9 to face toward the road. Engineer Allen stated that the tree will be
10 preserved. He said that the Master Plan encourages shared parking.
11 Engineer Allen indicated that the parking will add 6 parking spaces. He
12 stated that he would like to discuss with the Board the overall concept and
13 the connection to the two properties.

14
15 The Chair asked Consultant Engineer Barbagallo his thoughts on the
16 requested modification.

17
18 Consultant Engineer Barbagallo said that he wants to focus on the
19 connection to the two properties. He explained that the original approval
20 was approved with the requirement for vehicular access to be created
21 between the proposed site parking lot and the adjacent restaurant property.
22 He indicated that the Planning Board amended the conditional approval to
23 eliminate the access requirement at the April 11, 2012 meeting. Consultant
24 Engineer Barbagallo said that the current site layout does not include a
25 connection between the two parking lots but does propose a pedestrian
26 walkway connection. He suggested that the Planning Board consider
27 reinstating the requirement for vehicular access between the two parcels.
28 Consultant Engineer Barbagallo said that maybe a one-way connection can
29 be implemented. He noted that this is a technical item that the Board
30 should think about and provide the applicant with guidance.

31
32 Mr. Goldenberg suggested a site visit so the Board can visualize the
33 modification.

34
35 Engineer Allen explained that the applicant submitted a full Site Plan
36 application but because the application is in the B-HP District 45 days is
37 needed to refer the application to the various Boards and that is the reason
38 for the informal application.

39

1 Engineer Allen noted that during the Public Hearing on the project there
2 was a lot of discussion on the traffic coming out on Scott Drive.

3
4 Engineer Allen said that the applicant is looking to free up spaces by
5 having employee parking.

6 Ms. Gerbino asked about the plans for the building.

7
8 Engineer Allen noted that the first floor will be retail and the second floor
9 will have two apartments.

10
11 Consultant Engineer Barbagallo asked if the primary reason not to connect
12 the parking lots is not to lose parking spaces.

13
14 Engineer Allen agreed that the reason is the applicant does not want to
15 lose parking spaces.

16
17 Consultant Engineer Barbagallo said that maybe the Board can give the
18 applicant two extra spaces on Site "B" if the applicant agrees to the
19 vehicular access between the site parking lot and the restaurant.

20
21 Engineer Allen said that he will look at Consultant Engineer Barbagallo's
22 suggestion but he does not think it will provide the necessary parking
23 spaces.

24
25 Mr. Keane indicated that the Board's concern was pedestrian and parking
26 availability for the B-HP District. He explained that the Board wanted the
27 parking lots to be interconnected so you can walk over to St. Lukes. He
28 said there was a dispute between the owners of Site "A" and the present
29 owner of Site "B" over the legal access from each site.

30
31 Engineer Allen reminded the Board that the applicant has a Building Permit
32 on the original approval but he will review the options suggested by the
33 Board. He said that the applicant is looking for additional parking spaces.

34
35 Consultant Engineer Barbagallo said if the Board is not interested in the
36 connection to the parking lots the applicant should not have to spend time
37 working on the option.

38
39 Director of Planning Dym asked that the applicant clarify what the Board is
40 being asked to act on. She said that because of the issues with Site "A"

1 and the Design Guidelines of the B-HP District, Site "A" should be included
2 in the submission.

3
4 Town Attorney Eriole noted that there is a single Site Plan that has two
5 separate owners. He said that his concern is that the Board approved the
6 plan based on a unified plan and the Board can still keep in mind the vision
7 it had in mind when it approved the plan. He indicated that the Board can
8 approve the modification that is requested but needs a finding explaining
9 those changes.

10
11 Engineer Allen said it is doubtful the adjacent owner will sign on for a new
12 Site Plan and share in the cost. He noted that he can provide a street
13 scape showing the new building.

14
15 Town Attorney Eriole clarified that the adjacent owner does not have to
16 sign off on a revision to the Site Plan but both owners apply for approval of
17 the site plan that changes nothing on Site "A" and then the owner of Site
18 "B" asks for approval of a separate Site Plan with the requested changes.

19
20 Engineer Allen clarified that the applicant has applied for a modification to
21 the Site Plan on Site "B".

22
23 Mr. Foley stressed that if this is a new application in the B-HP District a
24 meeting with the technical committee has to take place within 31 days.

25
26 Engineer Allen stated that he will make the request to the Planning Board
27 Secretary to schedule a meeting with the technical committee.

28
29 Consultant Engineer Barbagallo said that there are six additional parking
30 spaces on Site "B" and he is curious what they will be used for.

31
32 Engineer Allen said that they will be used for employee parking.

33
34 Mr. Keane asked how many employees are there for the restaurant.

35
36 Rick DiNardo, applicant, clarified that some employees park across the
37 street but when the Town has functions his employees cannot park at Mt.
38 Kisco Medical. He said that everyone is aware that there is a parking
39 problem in the B-HP District. Mr. DiNardo said that he submitted an
40 application to get an idea if the Board is willing to maximize the area to get

1 additional parking. He said in concept the connection is a great idea but in
 2 reality it does not work. He noted that you will need a large turnaround and
 3 that will make you lose at least 4 parking spaces. Mr. DiNardo asked the
 4 Board to consider the options he is asking for.

5
 6 Mr. Keane opined that the pedestrian access is functionally the better way
 7 to maximize the greater number of parking spaces.

8
 9 **SOMERS CROSSING [TM: 17.15-1-15.1]**
 10 **REVIEW OF PART 2 OF THE EAF FOR TOWN BOARD**
 11 **AS LEAD AGENCY**

12
 13 Mr. Goldenberg, after speaking to Town Attorney Eriole declared that he is
 14 recused himself on the application of Somers Crossing.

15
 16 Chairman Currie asked the Board if they want to review drafts Part 2 and
 17 Part 3 of the EAF for Somers Crossing in advance of the joint meeting with
 18 the Town Board on August 1, 2013.

19
 20 Chair Currie said that there was a consensus of the Board to review the
 21 Somers Crossing EAF Part 2 and 3 at the Joint Meeting with the Town
 22 Board on August 1, 2013.

23
 24 Richard O'Rourke, the applicant's attorney, explained that the reason the
 25 applicant is here is because of a courtesy the Town Board wanted to
 26 extend to the Planning Board. He said that the EAF will be discussed at
 27 the joint meeting with the Town Board on August 1, 2013.

28
 29 **FIELD CHANGE**

30
 31 **ROUTE 100 REALTY, LLC**
 32 **SUSSMANN MOBIL STATION**
 33 **APPLICATION FOR AMENDED SITE PLAN,**
 34 **WETLAND, STEEP SLOPES, GROUNDWATER PROTECTION**
 35 **OVERLAY DISTRICT PERMITS [TM: 17.18-1-2]**

36
 37 Chairman Currie explained that this is a request for a field change with a
 38 sketch that shows the elimination of the six-foot wide sidewalk adjacent to
 39 the proposed parking spaces 2, 3 and 4 and the realignment of the
 40 proposed curb at the Sussmann Mobil Station.

1 Chair Currie asked the applicant's representative to update the Board on
2 the field change.

3
4 Timothy Allen, the applicant's engineer, said that he questioned the idea of
5 the parking in the back of the building as it relates to the stormwater basin.
6 He asked that the sidewalk be removed from the plan. Engineer Allen
7 mentioned that there still will be the handicapped access and the access to
8 the building on the side. He opined that the sidewalk is not necessary
9 because a driver will pull into a parking space and walk to the front door
10 and will not walk away from the front door to a sidewalk.

11
12 Mr. Foley asked what will replace the sidewalk.

13
14 Engineer Allen indicated that it will just be a graded shoulder.

15
16 Mr. Keane said his idea of a field change is some condition in the land that
17 makes it more difficult to install the original plan.

18
19 Engineer Allen explained that the stormwater basin was made a little larger
20 which makes the slope closer to the curb line. He indicated that if the
21 sidewalk is put in a full handrail will be needed and there will be an
22 expense for something that will not be used.

23
24 Consultant Engineer Barbagallo explained that Engineer Allen contacted
25 the Engineering Department and he was asked to review the issue as a
26 field change. He said the way he looks at a field change is if the intent is
27 changed the Board has to make a decision and if the same intent is being
28 achieved he is comfortable making that a field change. Consultant
29 Engineer Barbagallo said that he felt this was a modification of the Site
30 Plan and he suggested it be put on the agenda this evening. He noted that
31 there will be some use of the sidewalk by those using parking spaces 2, 3
32 and 4.

33
34 Ms. Gerbino said that Engineer Allen encouraged Board members to visit
35 the site prior to the meeting in anticipation of a decision. She said she
36 parked as if she was going to put gas in her car and she walked over to
37 parking space 4. Ms. Gerbino said that there is no sidewalk near space 4
38 and she found that the curbing has a steep drop off and then there is a
39 wall. She opined that a sidewalk would protect you because a truck will not

1 go on the sidewalk. Ms. Gerbino said that she sees a need for a sidewalk
2 for spaces 2, 3 and 4.

3
4 Mr. Keane noted that the sidewalk was designed for a purpose on the
5 original plan. He said one reason the sidewalk was on the plan was for
6 safety.

7
8 Engineer Allen said he does not know why the sidewalk was on the original
9 plan. He noted that a delivery truck may use the sidewalk in order to get to
10 the back door.

11
12 Consultant Engineer Barbagallo suggested that concrete bumper blocks be
13 used. He mentioned that they are used at Reis Park and are very helpful.

14
15 The Chair said that it was a consensus of the Board to keep the sidewalk
16 adjacent to parking spaces 2, 3 and 4.

17
18 There being no further business, on motion by Mr. Keane, seconded by Mr.
19 Goldenberg, and unanimously carried, the meeting adjourned at 10:15 P.M.
20 and the Chair noted that there will be a joint meeting with the Town Board
21 on August 1, 2013 and the next Planning Board meeting will be on
22 Wednesday, August 14, 2013 and will be held at 7:30 P. M. at the Somers
23 Town House.

24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

Respectfully submitted,

Marilyn Murphy
Planning Board Secretary