

A **Regular Meeting** of the **Planning Board** of the Village of Cooperstown was held in the Village Office Building, 22 Main Street, Cooperstown, New York on **JUNE 18, 2019** at 5:00 PM

IN ATTENDANCE

- **MEMBERS ATTENDING (5 + 1 Alternate)**
 - Members Present: Gene Berman (Chair) / Richard Blabey / Ellen Pope/ Fred Schneider / David Pearlman / John Webb (Alternate)
- **MEMBERS ABSENT (1) : James Lacava (Alternate)**
- **OTHERS ATTENDING**
 - Jane Gentile (Zoning Enforcement Officer) / Mikal Sky-Shrewsbury (Clerk, PT)
 - **(14)** Member(s) of the **Public** (+Joe Membrino (Trustee))

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER by Gene Berman at **4:30 PM**

PUBLIC HEARING: (0) ITEM(S)

REGULAR AGENDA: (7) ITEM(S)

1. **10 Chestnut Street (Josh Edmunds)**
 - a) Acknowledge the Village Trustees as lead agency for SEQR
 - b) Discuss whether there are recommendations for the Trustees to consider for the PDD
- **PRESENT / PARTICIPATING**
 - Josh Edmunds
- **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**
- **JOSH EDMUNDS**
 - **Proposing to remove existing structure on the property**
 - **Replacing with 12 unit multi-family dwelling with off-street parking for 22 cars in on- site lot**
 - All units will be 2 bedroom / approximately 800 square feet each
 - All rentals will be long term
 - Firmly set on 12 units
 - Originally was considering between 12-14 units but after running various scenarios 12 worked best
 - Will be Affordable Housing
 - NOT low or moderate income housing
 - **Ellen Pope**
 - Definition of Affordable Housing
 - = 30% of income
 - Rent can be any price depending on who target renter is
 - In this case target renters are young professionals/nurses ...
 - Does NOT mean low or moderate income housing
 - Project advances Village's goal of increasing population density
 - Drainage for storm water may be addressed using pipe on Pine Blvd that ties into Chestnut
 - Trustees see this as a possible opportunity
 - **PDD will be created from combination of 2 lots**
 - PDD is outlined in red on the plan drawing
 - 1 lot is long and narrow / 2nd lot sits behind the long lot

- o Smaller lot will be used for parking lot
 - o Larger long lot will be used for the dwelling
 - NOTE: 3rd lot is being sold along with the other 2 but will NOT be part of the PDD
 - o Will remain single residential dwelling
 - Josh Edmunds and the Board reviewed the location of building and setbacks on the site plan
- o **Detailed Sketch Plan**
 - **Gene Berman**
 - o Planning Board is required to have a sketch plan with specific info called out
 - o **Josh Edmunds**
 - Does NOT have a plan with that level of detail ready tonight
 - Making sure the plan is potentially viable before investing heavily in detailed development/design
- o **Impact of fuel tanks previously on the property?**
 - o Tanks were removed in 1987
 - o Village did a study of environmental concerns - found there were NO issues
 - **Josh Edmunds**
 - o Will update the SEQR application with a copy of the study
- o **Basement**
 - NO Basement
 - Will only be excavating down 4' for foundation and systems instead of the 10' required for the basement
 - Excavating down 3' to put in structural support
 - Excavating down approximately an additional 1' to put in drainage, electric and other systems
- o **Trees**
 - Removing approximately 30 trees
 - o Several large trees
 - o Many 4"-8" trees
 - o Back of property is relatively overgrown
 - Hope is to leave trees on the North property line
- o **Overview of Property Layout**
 - Goal is to keep North side of property highly residential
 - o No doors / No patios / No walkways
 - o No cars or people spending much time on the North side
 - Egress will be on the southern side
 - Vehicle egress will wrap around Mark Kingsley's property and back onto Chestnut
- o **Hydrant / Fire Safety**
 - Existing hydrant is still in place to service the building
 - Building is 2 stories (less than 30') so ladder truck will NOT be needed and access for vehicle that large is not paramount
- o **Footprint**
 - Will be narrower than the current building
 - Will come forward approximately 20'
- o **Historic Appearance / Impact on the Neighborhood**

- **Josh Edmunds**
 - o Front of the existing building and the lights are the only historic parts left in tact
 - No plans to retain any part of the existing building including the front
 - Hoping to retain the lights
 - o Ran through many scenarios to figure out the best layout for 12 units / parking / egress etc
 - o About to start the actual design process and have a street view drawn up
 - Ellen Pope suggested including neighboring structures to provide a sense of scale and impact
- **Ellen Pope**
 - o Will be able to maintain the historic streetscape if the existing front facade and the lights are retained
 - o Concerned that scale of the structure will be overwhelming for the neighborhood
 - o Placing the building within 5' of the street will affect the character of the street
 - Inn at Cooperstown is set back from the street and doesn't impose on the neighborhood
 - o Suggested making retaining the historic part of the building financially attractive by pursuing historic preservation tax credits
- **Josh Edmunds**
 - o If dwelling has less than 12 units the financial viability of the project disappears
 - o Primary goal is net 0 energy
- **HPARB has set a demolition hearing but has NOT yet addressed appearance**
- o **Reducing Parking Space Requirements - Potential Impacts**
 - **Richard Blabey**
 - o Reducing the number of required parking space may allow more flexibility to come up with a design and/or layout that fits the character of the neighborhood better
 - Could increase amount of grassy areas
 - Could allow building to sit farther back from the street
 - Could open up better possibilities for handling trash disposal (dumpster/trash cans etc)
 - o Could consider 1 1/2 spaces per unit (18 spaces) instead of 2 spaces per unit (24 spaces)
 - **Josh Edmunds**
 - o From tenants perspective more spaces are better
 - o Whether or not he would consider reducing the number of required parking spaces to be beneficial would depend on requirements for setbacks, etc
 - o Primary concern is providing adequate amount of off street parking
 - Wants to make sure tenants never park at the Inn at Cooperstown
 - o **Fred Schneider**
 - Each space is 18' long
 - Reducing parking by as little as 4 spaces would make it possible to push the dwelling back 19' and maintain the streetscape
 - o **Gene Berman**
 - Trustees can consider reduced parking requirements
 - o PDDs are their own zoning areas so existing regulations need not apply
- **Bicycle Parking**
 - o **Ellen Pope**

- Need for 2 parking spaces per unit could be reduced by providing bicycle parking to encourage using them as an alternative to cars
- Recommends incorporating bike infrastructure to help meet Cooperstown's goal of creating a "complete streets" village
- o **Josh Edmunds**
 - Hopes to provide covered entryways where bikes can be parked
- **Setback Requirements**
 - o **Richard Blabey**
 - If the property is sold in the future they would be able to build a large single family residence within 20' of the street and there would be nothing the Village could do about it
 - Believes it is an argument for setting setback requirements farther back from the street
 - o Village can enforce a larger setback than usual because it is a PDD
 - Important to think long term
- o **3rd Property**
 - Josh Edmunds
 - o In contract to purchase it along with the other 2 properties
 - o Located on Pine Blvd and is NOT physically connected to the other 2 properties
 - o Considered incorporating into PDD and using for parking or an additional structure but did not add any value to the PDD
 - o Intends to purchase and keep it as a single family residence (NOT part of the PDD)
 - NOT including it in PDD reduces impact on residential neighborhood of Pine Blvd
 - PDD is better suited to Chestnut which is already partially commercial (Inn at Cooperstown)
- o **Snow and Trash**
 - Josh Edmunds
 - o Snow will mainly be trucked out
 - Similar to how snow is currently handled on Old School Ct (off of Susquehanna)
 - o Trash will either be put in
 - Dumpster at the back of the building
 - Individual cans for each unit
 - o Tucked into building (under porch overhang)
 - o Decisions are NOT finalized - this is currently concept only
 - o Reducing parking requirements by a few spaces could help make more room for amenities like dumpsters and trash cans
 - Could open up a lot more space for putting trash out behind the building
- **Accessibility and safety**
 - o Sidewalk runs along building and connects to street so pedestrians need not walk through parking lot
 - o All apartments fully handicap accessible - great for aging in place
 - Higher grade in back makes it possible to provide direct access to 2nd floor apartments without stairs
 - 2 sets of stairs will be located in the front of the structure
- **Energy Efficiency**
 - o **Josh Edmunds**
 - High Performance building intended to meet the following goals

- o Certified passive
 - o Net 0
 - Will use photo voltaic cells on roof
 - o Cells will be flat on the roof
 - o Design will be approved by HPARB
 - Pitch of gabled roofs on historic buildings in within 1 degree of the optimal angle needed to achieve high energy efficiency goals degrees
 - o Optimal roof angle is 30 degrees
 - o Intends to use a gabled roof on the proposed dwelling to simultaneously facilitate energy goals and create a more historic look
 - **Vehicle Traffic**
 - o **Josh Edmunds**
 - Described traffic flow using site plan for clarification
 - Plans to encourage 1 way traffic flow
 - o Traffic IN to parking lot will come through existing Village road (Fenimore Lane)
 - o Traffic will exit out the other side of the parking lot onto Chestnut using road created for PDD
 - Will NOT be able ensure everyone follows this 1 way route because Fenimore Lane allows 2 way traffic but will strongly encourage it
 - o Plans to install directional signage
 - o Nothing will actually prevent people from exiting through Cooper Lane
 - Egress will be created for the new property
 - o
 - o **Fred Schneider**
 - Doesn't think cadence of Inn traffic and apartment traffic will conflict & escalate problems
 - Residents and tourists will have tend to have different patterns
 - **3 Stories**
 - o **Josh Edmunds**
 - Would require variance and/or compromises to design
 - o 3 stories runs into height restrictions
 - o won't allow gabled roof etc
 - o Trying to keep the number of variances needed as few as possible
 - **Buffering**
 - o **Josh Edmunds**
 - South side of building has an existing fence belonging to owner of the Inn
 - North side of building will act as its own fence
 - o Similar to existing
 - o There will not be any doors or walkways on this side of the building (only windows)
 - Will install a fence around any areas that are for trash
 - Parking lot buffering
 - o Partial buffering is planned for 1 side
 - Not planning to install buffer between PDD lot and Inn lot

- **Gene Berman**
 - o May need buffering on the other side too
 - o Can be shrubbery
- o **Board recommendations/concerns for Trustee's consideration**
 - **Setback** of building from street
 - **Bike Infrastructure**
 - o Facilitate Village plan for Complete Streets
 - **Reduction of standard parking requirements**
 - o **Volume of traffic for the area**
 - 2 spaces/unit will greatly increase volume traffic from existing
 - o In summer traffic on Chestnut already backs up from increased volume created by Inn guests
 - o **Consider advantages of reducing required number of spaces per unit**
 - Balancing number of spaces against setback from street
 - Balancing number of spaces against amenities for sanitation
- o **Board comments: Is approval appropriate?**
 - **Fred Schneider**
 - o Believes approval IS appropriate
 - **Richard Blabey**
 - o Believes approval IS appropriate
 - o Condition
 - Issues discussed are addressed
 - **David Pearlman**
 - o Believes approval IS appropriate
 - Benefits the Village by providing new affordable housing
 - o Concern
 - Impact on traffic
 - **Ellen Pope**
 - o Believes Trustees should go forward with application
 - o NOT FULLY IN SUPPORT OF APPROVAL IN CURRENT STATE
 - Not sure this is an appropriate location for multi-family dwelling
 - **Gene Berman**
 - o Approves the concept
 - o NOT enough information to approve the plan
 - Wants to see the specific locations of components and more defined design
 - o **Josh Edmunds**
 - Agrees there is still a whole lot of planning work that needs to be done
- o **MOTION #1: Recommendation to Approve PDD**
 - Made by: **Gene Berman** / Seconded by: **Richard Blabey**
 - Proposition:
 - o Move to inform the Trustees that they should go forward with the PDD

- Taking concerns in mind
- Acknowledging a lot more detail is required
- Vote:
 - **Ayes (5):** Berman / Blabey / Schneider / Pearlman / Pope
 - **Abstentions (0):**
 - **Nays (0):**
 - **MOTION CARRIED**

o **MOTION #2: Lead Agency**

- Made by: **Gene Berman** / Seconded by: **Fred Schneider**
- Proposition:
 - o The Planning Board has **NO OBJECTION TO MAKING THE TRUSTEES THE LEAD SEQR AGENCY** for the proposed **PDD at 10 CHESTNUT STREET**
- Vote:
 - **Ayes (5):** Berman / Blabey / Schneider / Pearlman / Pope
 - **Abstentions (0):**
 - **Nays (0):**
 - **MOTION CARRIED**

o **NEXT STEPS**

- Gene Berman will write a draft of Board recommendations/concerns and circulate them through email for Board feedback/approval

2. 21 Glen Avenue (Beth Emerick)

a) Referred from Trustees to review request for change of zone from R3 Residential to C Commercial

• **PRESENT / PARTICIPATING**

Beth Emerick and George Emerick

• **RATIONALE FOR ZONING CHANGE REQUEST**

o **George Emerick**

- House currently permitted to rent out 2 of the 3 units short term
 - o Owners are required to live on the property
- Goals:
 - o Have a third short term rental unit to increase income
 - o Allow property manager to reside on the premises so owners are free to travel/be elsewhere
 - Plan to have their son manage the property to reduce costs and maximize profit
- Impact on neighborhood is minimal
 - o Only 3 properties on their side of Glen Ave are not already commercial
 - **Jane Gentile (ZEO)**
 - o At Martin Tillapaugh's (Village Attorney) recommendation tried to have owners of all 3 residential properties apply for zoning change to commercial because it would be simpler than just changing one
 - One owner was not interested
 - o Martin Tillapaugh (Village Attorney) then recommended applying for a zoning change for just their property

- Better to leave 2 properties Residential instead of just 1
- o Cooper Lane apartments can be seen from their backyard
- o Does not believe changing to short term will significantly increase traffic or change traffic patterns from existing
- **DISCUSSION**
 - o **Antithetical to Village goals/efforts of increasing amount of long term housing in the Village**
 - **Ellen Pope**
 - o Village is recognizing there is a significant need for long term housing in the Village
 - o Changing zoning to allow conversion of long term to short rental does not fit these goals
 - o Area is residential
 - The Thanksgiving Home is a residence even if it is a commercial one
 - o Law has tightened in favor of long term housing since 06/07 when the property changed renting all 3 units long term to renting 2 units short term
 - o Precedence is a concern
 - If every residential property at the edge of a commercial zone changed it would significantly chip away at residential areas
 - **Fred Schneider**
 - o Goal is to allow short term and long term rentals to coexist
 - o Recusing himself from the rest of the discussion and any votes because he is the owner of the Landmark Inn
 - Could be considered to have a potential conflict of interest
 - **Richard Blabey**
 - o Village changed the commercial zoning law to allow residential houses in commercial districts to address housing needs
 - Trustees want to ALLOW more residential housing
 - o Proposed change is contrary to the most recent Trustee action for this zone
 - Proposed change moves to more commercial rather than more residential
 - o **Spot Zoning**
 - **Richard Blabey**
 - o If changing the zoning for this property would be considered spot zoning it is not legal in NY state
 - **Gene Berman**
 - o If it is spot zoning it will change the character of the neighborhood
 - Jane Gentile (ZEO)
 - o It has been done before
 - Property across from the Agway building was rezoned from residential to commercial 5 years ago
 - Wanted to put offices in the house and have it zoned the same as adjacent properties
 - o No one (including Martin Tillapaugh, Village Attorney) has suggested rezoning of 21 Glen could be considered illegal
 - o **Future Use of Property**
 - **Gene Berman**
 - o If converted to commercial and property is sold there will be nothing to prevent the new owner from replacing the residence with a commercial enterprise
 - Will have a significant impact on the neighborhood

- o Important to look to the possible future use of the property and not just at the current owner's intended use
- **Richard Blabey**
 - o Believes the problem is it is a mixed use area
 - o Thinks Trustees need to determine whether the area is residential or commercial
- o **Neighbor's Input**
 - 2 neighbor's have signed a letter in support of the request to change to commercial and rent short term
 - Kaminski's have expressed concerns
- o **MOTION #1: Recommendation: Approve Zoning Change**
 - Made by: **Gene Berman** / Seconded by: **Richard Blabey**
 - Proposition:
 - o Move to inform the Trustees that they should go forward with the Zoning Change from Residential to Commercial for 21 Glen Ave.
 - Vote:
 - **Ayes (0):**
 - **Abstentions (1):** Schneider
 - **Nays (5):** Berman / Blabey / Webb / Pearlman / Pope
 - **MOTION FAILED**
 - *Note: Fred Schneider abstained so John Webb voted*
- o **MOTION #2: Recommendation: NOT Approve Zoning Change**
 - Made by: **Gene Berman** / Seconded by: **Richard Blabey**
 - Proposition:
 - o Move to inform the Trustees that they should NOT go forward with the Zoning Change from Residential to Commercial for 21 Glen Ave.
 - Vote:
 - **Ayes (5):** Berman / Blabey / Webb / Pearlman / Pope
 - **Abstentions (1):** Schneider
 - **Nays (0):**
 - **MOTION CARRIED**
 - *Note: Fred Schneider abstained so John Webb voted*

3. 13 RAILROAD AVENUE (Terracentia Properties / Jon McManus) non-contributing

- a) Acknowledge the Zoning Board of Appeals as lead agency for SEQR
- b) Preliminary Site Development Plan Review per Section 300-41
- **PRESENT / PARTICIPATING**
 - o Jon McManus
- **DESCRIPTION/DISCUSSION**
 - o **Background**
 - ZBA and HPARB have already seen the proposed siteplan
 - Village approved for 5 parking spaces in 2003
 - Business changes since 2003

- o Retail use is significantly less than expected in 2003
- o Demand for the product itself has grown
 - Meeting the demand requires significant additional space for manufacturing and storage
 - o Would like to add 35, 750 square feet to the back of the building
 - o Will have a full basement of equal square footage
- o **Number Of Parking Spaces Required By Code**
 - Approximately 80,000 square feet is being added total (including the basement)
 - o Code requires 1 parking space for every 10,000 square feet of warehouse/manufacturing space
 - If code is strictly adhered to will need a total of 13 parking spaces
 - o 5 existing + 8 new
 - Counting Basement as working space / Impact on Parking requirements
 - o Jane Gentile (ZEO) and Jon McManus agreed
 - Since basement is being used for storage of the product
 - o It is working space and should count towards parking
 - Site plan has been drawn up to handle 13 parking spaces
 - o Retail spaces will remain on the street
 - o Additional spaces will be added to the back
 - Parking will be very tight and require a lot of maneuvering
 - Intend to post rear parking as *employees and deliveries only*
- o **Request To Reduce Parking Requirements**
 - **Jon McManus**
 - o Believes existing code does not actually address the way the space will be used and therefore modification of parking requirements may be appropriate
 - o **Code is for warehouse space** which requires constant movement of product and requires constant handling by employees
 - Parking is needed for all the employees actively engaged in handling the products in the warehouse
 - o **Distillery is actually creating storage space rather than warehouse space**
 - Liquor is stored and sits in one place for extended periods of time to age
 - Employees are seldom needed to handle the stored product
 - Much less parking is needed for a storage facility than a warehouse facility
 - There is a hole in the Village code since it does NOT address storage facilities as a unique type of entity
 - o **Would like the Planning Board to consider reducing number of required parking spaces to reflect the the actual use of the building**
 - There are 2 shifts per day / Each shift has 6-7 employees working
 - Retail use is 80% less than expected when 5 spaces were required
 - **Use of Building Requires a Minimum of 8 spaces**
 - o to handle all employees on site at one time plus occasional retail customer
 - o **If allowed to have less than 13 spaces graveled area in back will still be put in but lines for individual spaces may not be put in**
- o **Screening**
 - Jane Gentile (ZEO)

- o Screening is NOT needed because all adjoining properties are zoned commercial even though one of the properties is a residential structure
- o Fencing was approved with the original application to make it more comfortable for the neighbors
- o **Lighting**
 - Gene Berman
 - o Low level cutoff lighting at doorways will be required to be shown on siteplan at next meeting
 - Jon Mcmanus
 - o Low level security light will NOT be in the lot
- o **Public Hearing / SEQR**
 - SEQR review is required because size of addition is well over the gross square footage allowed
 - o Allowed=4,000 sq feet / Proposed addition is greater than 70,000 square feet
 - ZBA Public Hearing for SEQR is scheduled for July 2, 2019
 - **Request To Waive PB Public Hearing**
 - o Jon McManus
 - ZBA is already holding a SEQR meeting
 - Believes NYS law says 2nd public hearing can be waived
 - o As long as one agency of the Village holds a public SEQR hearing the law has been satisfied
 - Can withdraw the Zoning hearing but would need to have the Planning Board assume the role of lead agency instead of the Zoning Board
 - o Believes the Zoning Board is the more appropriate Board to be the lead agency for this project so will not withdraw the scheduled Zoning hearing
 - o Gene Berman
 - Disagrees with Jon McManus' interpretation of the law
 - Believes law requires Planning Board to hold its own public hearing
 - Will NOT waive the hearing
- o **MOTION #1: Lead Agency**
 - o Made by: **Gene Berman** / Seconded by: **Fred Schneider**
 - o Proposition To:
 - **Approve the proposed concept** for the addition at 13 Railroad Avenue
 - **Schedule a public hearing** the Next Regular Planning Board Meeting (currently July 16, 2019)
 - Vote:**
 - **Ayes (5):** Berman / Blabey / Schneider / Pope / Pearlman
 - **Abstained (0):**
 - **Nays (0):**
 - **MOTION CARRIED**
- o **MOTION #2: Public Hearing**
 - o Made by: **Gene Berman** / Seconded by: **Ellen Pope**
 - o Proposition To:
 - **Acknowledge the ZBA as lead agency** for the purposes of SEQR for the proposed addition at 13 Railroad Avenue
 - Vote:**

- **Ayes (5):** Berman / Blabey / Schneider / Pope / Pearlman
- **Abstained (0):**
- **Nays (0):**
- **MOTION CARRIED**

4. 21 RAILROAD AVENUE (Greystone Holding LLC / Doug and Carrie Thompson)

- a) Proposed exterior wall signage (18.5 sq ft) for Suite #4 (right side of front façade) per Section 227-4B and the 2003 approved Total Building Signage Package

- **PRESENT / PARTICIPATING**

- o Carrie Thompson

- **DESCRIPTION/DISCUSSION**

- o Carrie Thompson

- **Store**

- o butcher shop / meat market featuring meat from local grass fed cattle
- o Will also serve gourmet hotdogs
- o Hoping to open Monday June 24

- **Sign**

- o Will read: GLC Farm / Green Cow
 - Plans to return in future to update sign language to identify beef as main product
 - Background: Matte Black (matches other signs on building)
 - Font = Logo font (does NOT match other signs on building)
 - Font Color= green logo color (does NOT match other signs on building)

- Jane Gentile (ZEO)

- o Proposed sign is for #4 on the plan
- o Whole building was approved for a signage package
 - Background and size was specified but not a specific font style
 - Some of the businesses were approved for gold or red fonts
- o Sign font of previous business did NOT match any of the other business in either color or style
- o Specs
 - Size and background matches other signs on the building
 - Font is unique from other signs on building
- o Because font is unique she thought Planning Board approval was appropriate

- Ellen Pope

- o Logo fonts are a standard way companies brand their businesses
- o Thinks logo font should be allowed on sign
 - Hard to tell a business they need to alter their logo
 - Sign will hang from existing brackets

- Richard Blabey

- o Owner of building was permitted to have more signage on the building than typically allowed by law
- o In exchange owner agreed to conform to specific design standards to create a uniform look and prevent visual clutter
- o Read a passage of the agreement

- "it would not be unusual for new tenants to have their own sign design
 - o Believes it is important for appearance to be compatible with other signs rather than identical
 - Not sure proposed sign design is compatible
 - o **MOTION**
 - Made by: **Ellen Pope** / Seconded by: **David Pearlman**
 - Proposition:
 - o Move to consider the proposed design to be compatible with other signs on the building and to **APPROVE** the **SIGN** for **21 RAILROAD AVENUE** as proposed
 - Vote:
 - **Ayes (4):** Berman / Schneider / Pearlman / Pope / Webb (Alternate)
 - **Abstentions (1):** Blabey
 - **Nays (0):**
 - **MOTION CARRIED**
5. **Discuss the need to hold a special meeting to begin addressing the proposed changes to Chapter 300 of the Village Code in regards to the recommendations from the Housing Committee**
 - o Gene Berman
 - Three have been significant and numerous changes to the code affecting all districts of the Village
 - o Newly drafted Chapter 300 code is 31 pages
 - o Trustees will review the code next week
 - o All changes to Zoning Law will need to come before the Planning Board
 - o No way to do everything at one meeting
 - o Would like to set up a special meeting so recommendations can be made to the Trustees
 - Meeting will need to last several hours
 - Board agreed to hold special meeting on July 10, 2019 at 4:30
 - o Richard Blabey may not be able to attend
 - o **MOTION**
 - Made by: **Gene Berman** / Seconded by: **David Pearlman**
 - Proposition:
 - o **To hold a special meeting of the Planning Board**
 - on **July 10, 2019 at 4:30**
 - for the purpose of **reviewing the newly drafted Chapter 300 Village Code**
 - o Vote:
 - **Ayes (5):** Berman / Blabey / Schneider / Pearlman / Pope
 - **Abstentions (0):**
 - **Nays (0):**
 - **MOTION CARRIED**
 - o **NEXT STEPS**
 - Jane Gentile (ZEO) will distribute the Code by email
 - o Planning Board will read the info before the special meeting and come prepared with comments
6. **REVIEW OF REGULAR PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES: TUESDAY, MAY 21, 2019**

- **DISCUSSION**
 - o No board members had questions or concerns regarding the **APRIL** minutes
 - o No changes/corrections
- **MOTION**
 - o Made by: **Richard Blabey** / Seconded by: **David Pearlman**
 - o Resolution
To **APPROVE** the **PLANNING BOARD MINUTES** for the **REGULAR MEETING** held on **TUESDAY, MAY 21, 2019**
 - o Vote:
 - **Ayes (5):** Berman / Blabey / Pope / Webb / Pearlman
 - **Abstentions (1):** Schneider
(was not at the May meeting)
 - **Nays (0)**
 - **MOTION CARRIED**

- **NEXT PLANNING BOARD MEETING: JULY 16, 2019**

- **MOTION TO ADJOURN**
 - o Made by: **Gene Berman** / Seconded by: **David Pearlman**
 - o Resolution
To **ADJOURN THE MEETING**
 - o Vote:
 - **Ayes (5):** Berman / Blabey / Schneider / Pearlman / Pope
 - **Abstentions (0):**
 - **Nays (0):**
 - **MOTION CARRIED**

Meeting adjourned at 6:50 PM (2 hr 20 min)

Respectfully submitted,

Mikal Sky-Shrewsberry, Clerk (PT)