



TOWN OF AMENIA

PLANNING DEPARTMENT
4988 Route 22, AMENIA, NY 12501
(845) 373-8860, Ext. 122-124 Fax (845) 789-1132

**PLANNING BOARD MEETING
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 11, 2023
7:00 P.M. – IN-PERSON
AMENIA TOWN HALL
PLANNING BOARD MEETING ROOM - UPSTAIRS**

AGENDA

REGULAR MEETING:

- 1. SILO RIDGE CONDO AREA – MODIFICATIONS TO SITE PLAN**
- 2. SL KEANE STUD – REVISIONS TO APPLICATION**

**OTHER MATTERS: - SBA/NEXTEL – UPDATE?
MINUTES 12-14-22 MEETING**



TOWN OF AMENIA

4988 Route 22, AMENIA, NY 12501
(845) 373-8118, Ext. 122-124 Fax (845) 789-1132

PLANNING BOARD MEETING WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 11, 2023 IN-PERSON AT TOWN HALL 2ND FLOOR MEETING ROOM

PRESENT: Robert Boyles, Jr. Chairman

Tony Robustelli

Nina Peek

Jim Walsh

John Stefanopoulos

ABSENT: Neal Kusnetz

Matthew Deister

OTHERS PRESENT – Paul VanCott- PB Attorney

John Andrews, PB Engineer

Rich Rennia and Peter Sanders – Rennia Engineers

Patrick O’Leary – VHB Engineers for SILO

Joe Ariel – SILO Attorney

The meeting was held IN-PERSON at Town Hall. Chairman Robert Boyles, Jr. opened the meeting at 7:01pm, with all those present Reciting the Pledge of Allegiance. The exits were announced in case of emergency.

The Regular Meeting was opened with the first item on the agenda being the **SILO – CONDO AREA - SITE PLAN MODIFICATIONS**. Patrick O’Leary, VHB Engineer for SILO presented the Plan drawing and spoke of the revisions. The original (approved) plan for SILO Ridge along with any modifications thus far, was shown along with the proposed plan to modify the area into Condos from Town Houses. Patrick presented a preliminary application in August 2022 noting the changes that SILO wanted to make to the Core Condo Area and is responding to comments made at that time on the drawings. This plan is now in a formal application to the Planning Board. This also puts forth a minor modification to the Master Development Plan (MDP) of SILO Ridge. The reason for this change is because of marketplace changes. There is no want or

demand for Town Houses and there are for Condos. Condo 1 and Condo 2 areas are built and Condo 3 area is under construction(almost complete).

- The change to the Core Condo Area if approved, will change 3 lots on Redtail Pass along the top from Town House Lots and Clubhouse & amenities to more Condos.
- The residents at SILO have indicated that there is no use for a clubhouse (1 lot) with amenities because everything they need is there already or will be with the future SILAND Project as approved. He also references a small yoga area that was on his original proposals, which would be moved to the “Family Barn” area which is where families send their children and gather anyway for other amenities already. (includes outside activities; pool, slides and tennis).
- The other change as part of this proposal would be to delete 2 VG lots and merge the 3 lots together to use for cart barns and valet parking.
- The proposed units would then be Condo A (3 stories which includes underground parking)in place of the clubhouse. And Condo B and C (3 stories)in the same location with underground parking as well. In Place of the Town Houses, the proposal is for 2 Condo Units; D & E (both 3 stories with underground parking) and also a small coffeeshop(which eliminates the original proposed restaurant) and resident’s office space is being proposed in the area as well. (permitted use per zoning) and will have no detrimental impact. It will not be changing any masses in the MDP.
- SILO Since 2014 MDP included 245 units approved which went to 248 in 2022 now with these changes the # of units may be less than 248 when all is said and done. Patrick says Silo Ridge is about 1/3 developed. He anticipates still more lot mergers moving forward with the development. He says that will adjust the units to less than 248. (probably 2)
- Impervious areas will stay essentially the same as per MDP.
- Stormwater patterns from a drainage standpoint will remain the same
- Bedroom numbers have decreased because of the demand for larger family rooms, larger kitchens, etc. Net decrease is about 18 bedrooms for SILO
- Utility usage (community) is based on the number of bedrooms. That will mean a lower demand for utility with the proposed plan than with the original MDP.
- So far in 35% of the units built, there are 0 school children

- They are not expanding into any Greenspace and not intended to be built on. It actually strengthens the community by not having the clubhouse in that area
- Town attorney sent comments re: EAF. SILO Ridge attorney Ariel will address them.
- Joe Ariel (attorney) briefly addresses Paul VanCott's comments. Nothing they are presenting will exceed the environmental envelope of all of these approvals. He is not certain of the segmentation issue, but he says they are cognizant of the concern and will put a package together to respond to that. He will also respond to any comments that John Andrews may have.
- Patrick O'Leary goes on to say that there are no impacts from any archaeological or environmental resource. And there is no adverse impact with regard to physical standpoint. There are no additional school children, the number of units is being maintained as opposed to a decrease at this time. The number of 245 units is the same as being the anticipated number of units on the tax rolls for this project.
- There will be modifications to stormwater easements.
- A Lot Line revision to eliminate some lots and create 2 new lots of different size(moving lines) to be able to fit the buildings is also being proposed. This will NOT add more lots; just revise the size of existing lots.
- No changes for water, sewer or roads are needed for the new plan
- There are no visual changes with the new plan
- The plan is consistent with the MDP except for 248 units vs 245 units.
- The changes will not be seen from Route 22 and there will be no aesthetic impacts

John Andrews speaks of the Amended Site Plan and MDP Process. It is for the Core Condo Area which involves an increase in the unit count. From 245 to 248, which is relatively minor. But there will be a decrease in the number of bedrooms. (18 or 21). The lot line changes and new count of condos will affect the HOA documentation as well. The attorneys will handle that. John says that with the Town Houses there was proposed covered parking with them. Now, with the proposed Condo units, there is underground parking being proposed making more space for building units and parking above ground as well. Patrick will need a clear delineation of what Condos are where, and owned by whom, etc. It will have to indicate HOA, Golf Club, etc. The SEQRA documentation will have to include a consistency analysis. The SPA area that was proposed is

now being moved to the internal area of the community and going to be of minimal disturbance. These Spa areas (for adult use) will be moved closer to the Family Barn Area (which is where activities for children already take place). These will create virtually no impacts. No new studies will be needed. The applicant needs to expand the narrative and link their comments to the EAF to make for ease of the project to move forward.

John says that SILO Ridge wanted to concentrate the big selling point and major development around the Village Green during the initial plans. (the CORE AREA of the site). This proposal is very much in keeping with the MDP for SILO. And it is a market driven response, on SILO's part that makes perfect sense. Lastly, there are no substantive changes to water and sewer. There will be some minor adjustments to the stormwater management facility. An updated and altered plan for Fire Department access was created for the better with this proposal as well. John says from a SEQRA standpoint it is a very easy analysis. There will be additional work needed. From a Site Plan Analysis; it can't be seen from outside the site and it is basically the same footprint and will be an easy lift. Paul VanCott speaks of the segmentation issue. The SEQRA Review from both amendments from Site Plan to MDP aspects needs to be done. Most, if not all, of the documentation you need for this is already in the record. This will enable the Planning Board to do the site plan review for this phase. Each site plan will be reviewed separately by the Planning Board for approval. And each site plan is legally appropriate (given the linkage between the 2 amendments).

Questions from the Planning Board members include

J. Walsh – For the 3- story condos Does our Fire Department have the necessary equipment? They have no ladder truck. How would they respond to a fire at these locations?

Rob Boyles and Patrick O'Leary respond with the knowledge that a Ladder truck has been ordered and will be here soon. (hence the approval of the new Truck Garage from the Planning Board last year) John Andrews also notes that these 3 story units are fully sprinklered and fire alarmed and have all of the current safety features. The Fire District also asked for a dry hydrant which is also where it is needed. John also referenced the fire that they had on Lot #49 December 2020. They fought that fire (50ft up hill) from the road with Sharon's ladder truck and their own equipment. Jim also questioned the sewage treatment and if it is adequate for the different homes to be built. John Andrews says it is more

than adequate. There are two factors that contribute; the number of bedrooms has decreased from the original plan with the proposed plan and the actual wastewater generation characteristics of an occupied unit are less than they use. Their Treatment Plant will have excess capacity use. And also, Jim questions the tax contributions to the Town of Amenia. Patrick discussed that, and there will be no change because the number of units proposed and the number in the MDP are the same; there is no change meaning there will be no change in tax dollars. Jim also wants to know why the view from NYS Route 44 is not mentioned; only the view from NYS Route 22 as far as the SILO development. Has there been any thought to putting a screen; landscaping/trees in to hide the view of the development from DeLaVergne Hill? He has heard complaints from Amenia residents about the view of the “village” at SILO. A visual Impact Study? Patrick states that they are trying to emulate the new plan into the present one and it is their intent to maintain the aesthetics as they are now with all of the existing site as is. Patrick will be meeting with the Fire Department again on February 23rd to show them these plans to have their concurrence. Patrick says that this change has no adverse impacts on the community, the environment, the health and safety of the people within the community or people external to the community.

N. Peek – discusses the applicant making their presentation a full sale, the current package and any updates forthcoming showing bedroom counts, a consistency review, and the Environmental Findings statement when the environmental review was done and where we are currently. She wanted to make sure that is on everyone’s radar for the next submission. It will also compare what is actually built and what is different from the original MDP. And it should also show what is still pending. A SEQRA Finding Statement comparison would also be helpful. Nina asked for numbers; how many units are in the ground and occupied now? Patrick says is around 80 units that have been given CO’s so far. Patrick will confirm the bedroom count for those units for the next meeting. His next submission will show a color-coded map with actual built homes and CO’d as opposed to under construction or not built and the number of bedrooms associated with the ones built. Nina also recalls a document stating that when the plan was approved for SILO, there was a document that said that a check-in would be done on traffic assumptions, traffic generation assumptions, fiscal benefit of the project and a review would be done to see if the assumed projections of the environmental impact of the project is in line with what is

being done. Nina does not recall the details of when that review should be done; whether it was to be upon 50% of building or if was tied to the number of CO's. John Andrews noted her concern but did not recall such a document to do this review and will check his records for those notes from the project. A fiscal analysis, Nina feels, would be important to see, because of the points that were also made by Jim Walsh; the changes from townhouses into condos and the different tax implications it might/will have for consideration. Nina would also like to see documentation for the condition of the findings for night sky compliance; are they being respected? She asks that Patrick check on this and make a list of compliance issues. She speaks of lights that are on 24 hrs a day, and 7 days a week. Patrick sees that request as a compliance issue on operations and separate from what he is bringing to the Planning Board. Nina says that the exterior lighting is still part of the plan that is being presented. Attorney Ariel agrees with Patrick that the Night Sky Compliance issues are separate from the plan that he is presenting. He is stating that this plan should not trigger new analysis. He states they will address that issue. Patrick says that the photometrics plan that is provided shows that the plan is in compliance with the lighting scheme in the original plan. Patrick says that residents at Silo say there is insufficient night lighting but it is explained to them that the lights are night sky compliant as per agreements with the Town. Patrick says he will be happy to speak to Silo management about any issues, but that he sees them as separate zoning issues.(Code enforcement) Paul VanCott notes that John Andrews and he will look back into the original documentation and agreements to see if these compliance issues need to be reviewed. Nina also noted that the SILO Scenic Overlook area was to be open from dawn until dusk and it is open 24/7 presently. And people park there with their lights on at night shining down through the valley/town which is an issue. Joe Ariel says that if there are definite compliance issues, then they need to take them to SILO for remedy. Patrick says if there is a list of compliance issues, to please provide him with it and he will speak to the applicant about them. Tony says the lights people are seeing at night are only lights from the houses because there are no street lights in the development. Tony also states that the visual impact is different during leaf off season than leaf on season. That being, more lights are seen during leaf off and more hours of darkness. John Andrews says the development going on now at SILO Ridge is generally consistent with and follows the signed Site Plans for this site. The

Estate Homes have to be approved by both John Andrews and Mike Segelken as to their site plan and building permits. The only changes that are now included that were not on the original plans are that the houses are now including cart garages (barns). John assures the Planning Board that the homes are being built in accordance within the approved plans. John says a good 70% of the homes that are built and CO'd, the people are not there. People just turn on outside lights to make the house look like someone is at home. John Stefanopoulos asked what the timeline for this application would be. Patrick answered by saying their goal, with approval time from the Planning Board, is to commence construction in the spring. John S. also asks how many more units are planned to be constructed in 2023. Patrick will see if he can get the numbers for the next meeting.

The next item on the agenda was the **Keane Stud Subdivision** and revisions to the plan. Since the last time they met with the Planning Board in August of 2022. These are the highlights of the proposal as it stands. It includes a proposal for a Conventional Subdivision, non-realty, with each of the components in compliance with the underlying zoning district, both RA and RR. It exists of 4 existing parcels encompassing 704 acres. The proposed subdivision proposes 32 individual lots. It is composed of 26 new residential agricultural parcels, 1 equestrian facility parcel, 1 farm parcel with an easement and 2 conservation parcels. It also has 1 existing agricultural parcel and 1 existing residence parcel. A Conservation Analysis was provided in August of 2022 along with Environmental studies and a traffic report, also outlining all conservation efforts, including conservation areas, building envelopes, agricultural preservation methods to be implemented, hedge rows to be put in for screening and to provide a more natural look to the area for the subdivision on the new proposed rural lanes and deed restrictions. A visual analysis study was submitted then as well. Also included were some renderings of what the building lots would look like with buildings that addressed the formerly proposed Depot Hill Subdivision (proposed for the Keane Stud Lots – 180 units). The Board wanted current photos for the renderings not past photos of area (which included renderings of buildings and trees not current). That submission included 9 different renderings and done by 2 companies.

The Board was looking for a more detailed and easier to read version of the plan and to see the changes that were being proposed. The newest revision submission

was completed using the concerns from the Board and comments about the sight that were needed so that all aspects were being covered in the renderings, etc. 1 company has done the photos with the most up to date imagery as well. Hudson Valley Ariel (drone operator) flew the entire subdivision area. Because of 400ft limitations, numerous passes had to be flown to complete the photos. Then the renderer completed the drawings of the site using the new photos from the drone photos taken to produce the documents in this submission. Each of the renderings were produced from 3000 SF to show that they would still not be visible from some of the view angles; all being confirmed by a GPS for its location. The next step in the process is to close out the Conservation Analysis. This is the preliminary stage of a Preliminary Subdivision within the RR and RA Zoning Districts. Part of this analysis is to determine if the subdivision may adversely reflect the Town's rural landscape and natural resources. Peter explains the items to make sure that the rural landscape and natural resources are to be preserved with this proposal and application. This includes

- Much lower density than is permitted
- 70 dwelling units (per conservation analysis) are permitted as of right, not including the RDO district which allows substantial increase in density
- Also doing 2 conservation (forest) parcels – about 15% of the total subdivision area
- Doing building envelopes – blending in with the environment
- Providing hedgerows along proposed rural lanes
- 71% of entire acreage will be preserved (with the conservation acres) with either agricultural or open space through deed restrictions within each lot

This demonstrates that they will not ruin the natural views of the site and will preserve environmental resources. This would then make it possible to close out the Conservation Analysis and lead into the Preliminary Subdivision review which will start with SEQRA review, etc.

Chairman Boyles spoke about the project when the Public Hearings begin and the view from DeLaVergne Hill (Route 44) and the Scenic Overlook Area and the concerns that it will be compromised AGAIN with houses or agricultural structures on the pastures and fields on the sidehills above Old Route 22 and more. Mr. Rennie speaks to the low density of the project being a plus and says that this should not be a problem and he hopes it won't be with the public. Peter then continues by saying

that each lot, once purchased, will have to have their own site plan approved with a building envelope before they can get a building permit and that it complies with the Town Zoning Code. Nina questions the current submission and the visual impact. The proposal shows the proposed subdivision but does not show or compare to a clustered subdivision and the visual impact of such. The Depot Hill Proposed subdivision was for a clustered subdivision (and was not approved). A comparison to show that "A" - the Keane Stud Proposal is better than "B" - The Depot Hill Proposed subdivision. It was supposed to show that the proposed Keane Stud Subdivision is the better of less impactful than the Cluster Development proposed and never approved. John Andrews suggests that Renna compare and contrast the same location (in renderings, etc.) for "A" and "B" at the same date and time and add it to the packet and the conservation analysis as an evaluation. Joe Ariel says that the applicant is not going to change the conservation analysis to show the 2 different plans and the different impacts they would have on the land environmentally. He feels that the conservation analysis is complete and that (for the record) there is enough information and documentation from the applicant to come to a conclusion at this time. He says it is inappropriate to the documentation and to be part of the decision. Nina says it is not inappropriate. The applicant states that the Depot Hill Subdivision plan of over 10 years ago, was for cluster and they are not proposing this, but will need to supply evidence of a comparison and one of less environmental impact to sell to the Planning Board. Paul VanCott speaks to the Town's Subdivision Zoning Code. The decision that the Planning Board needs to make is whether it is okay to move forward with a conventional subdivision. Or whether the board wants a conservation subdivision design. At some point the Planning Board needs to say this will work the same way that a conservational design would. And which would be less visually impactful? John Andrews says there are probably 2 or 3 key vantage points that need to be thought out and evaluated. To Chairman Boyles' point about the Public and the visual impact it will have from Route 44 and 22, that is a very big contender. Compare each location with both "A" and "B" and document them. This is the element that is missing from the analysis. John suggests that the Planning Board pick several pertinent views to do comparisons of and to be documented and evaluated. Paul VanCott says to pick 3 views (areas). Joe Ariel wants to know what is satisfactory with the Planning Board members. He says that this level of information to ask of the applicant is not necessary, but they will provide it with specific sites to be documented. Joe then states that Town Law 276 in the subdivision

review process, has timelines associated with it. The conservation analysis process keeps that process from ever kicking off. He says it's self-evident that there is enough information for the conservation analysis. Tony suggests that the planning board decide on 3 major (sensitive visual areas) to come up with comparisons for visual impact and documentation. Discussion between Nina and Joe about the documents that have been supplied to the Planning Board being enough to base a decision on at this time continued. Joe wants to hear what is satisfactory from the rest of the board. John Andrews speaks of the next steps for the applicant.

- Make modifications necessary (per John's comment memos) to complete the Conservation Analysis
- At the next meeting for Keane Stud, the Planning Board makes decision to allow Paul VanCott and John Andrews to write the Conservation Findings
- Applicant would then prepare their preliminary plan and EAF
- After those are completed, they would make an application for Preliminary Subdivision Approval for a Conventional Subdivision

The biggest issue for the Conservation Findings; per the way the code is written, one of the findings is a conventional subdivision, on a project of this nature, the best way to go or a cluster subdivision? Joe Ariel says again that there is a "mountain of information" given to the board at this time which he says is sufficient. John Andrews says there need to be improvements made to what they have submitted. Rich just said that the last packet that was given to the board was inadequate as to what the Board was looking for. The goal is to make this application "public proof". The public doesn't like to look at all of the "little" packets that are being given to the Board. He asks that all of those packets be merged into one and a conclusion be made in one document. The Board chooses viewpoints for evaluation as per numbers and locations on the drawings supplied.

THE VIEWPOINT MAP

John suggests that the applicant do an overlay map for the next submission that puts the viewpoint map over the subdivision map to show the locations and proposals at the same time.

1. DeLaVergne Hill – looking east toward Depot Hill and Old Route 22
2. #13 on the current proposal
3. #2b or #3 on the current proposal

Jim Walsh wanted to discuss the conserving of agricultural lands on this subdivision as was spoken of at the previous meeting in August 2022. John Andrews says that is still 100% in the proposal. All of the surrounding land around the proposed building envelopes are still proposed agricultural only. Nina says to do the comparison based on the cluster (wherever is most dense; the worst case) and do the visual impact analysis from that perspective and the most visible. This will determine whether the conventional subdivision will be less impactful from a visual aspect than the cluster subdivision. John suggests that this visual analysis is completed along with a full document for the board's review at the next meeting. John suggests that all board members see the minutes from the last meeting as well as his comments to see what has been done and still needs to be done for the completed Conservation Analysis before the next meeting for review. John then highlights his comments (not emailed, but handed out at meeting).

- The plantings are “rendered at varying levels of maturity”. A legend should be provided or other similar explanations or details of the various levels of maturity
- The Viewpoint Location Map is based on an existing conditions base map. This makes it difficult to match the proposed view to the proposed subdivision. A development map should be included in the documentation. This would be a Subdivision plat with the building envelopes to facilitate build out views all in one document.
- The written description that was prepared is sometimes overly broad. (i.e. Actually note that the structure noted in the viewpoint on lot#6 is really on lot#8.) Label the Building Envelopes as Lot #'s as well on the plans.
- Label and identify elements and potential buildout conditions on the plans

Paul VanCott would like a draft Conservation Analysis prior to getting together to write the draft findings with John Andrews prior to the applicant's next meeting with the Planning Board. Chairman Boyles asks the board to discuss this. The Board members decide that this will help with their decision making process and to ask the applicant to make their next submission include the changes. Nina makes a motion seconded by John Stefanopoulos and carried, to have the applicant submit a complete comprehensive updated draft document for review by John Andrews and Paul VanCott. The Applicant will meet with the consultants to make any needed minor revisions to then be submitted to the Board along with draft conservation

findings, written by John and Paul, in a complete packet for the next Planning Board Meeting that they can be present at.

John Andrews announces to the board that January 16th through the end of January he won't be available. He is having surgery. He will do his best to continue working on Troutbeck and meet those deadlines. January 25th is the continued Public Hearing that is scheduled. Chairman Boyles questions whether or not the Public Hearing can be closed at the end of the next meeting. Paul VanCott says that the applicant has made another submission as well as a letter from Stephanie Ferradino with her comments from Troutbeck's December submission. The next step is that the applicant will respond to Ferradino's letter by Jan. 20th. Troutbeck has updated a lot of their SEQR information, made additional SEQR information available in the application, included more visuals, adjusted new mitigation measures, and proposed to make revisions to the project that would, in Phase 1 – change the number of cabins, and the elimination of Phase 8 – to eliminate the hotel. These will be both responsive to the public comments and concerns as well as lessen the impact of the project. Paul and John are drafting comments to the board so that all will be as informed of the changes etc. as soon as possible.

Under Other Matters, the Board asked Paul VanCott about the SBA / Nextel situation as far as an update on the generator and the time limit for the owner and the carrier to get the plan in writing for the Town. With that information, if there is enough SEQR documentation, the public hearing could then be closed by their recommendation. At that point a decision will have to be made to either issue a Negative Declaration or to have the applicant do an Environmental Impact Statement.(EIS). The revisions that were made are NOT a revised plan it is just updated documentation on SEQR information i.e. the water and wastewater systems, and other areas that were of concern in public comments as well as written comments. Also included in their revisions are responses to public comment on the number of weddings in a year (THEY WILL HAVE FEWER), the fireworks issue (THEY WILL NOT BE ALLOWED ANYMORE), the sound of tennis balls on the courts (THEY WILL HAVE SOUND BARRIERS). Also, a visual impact analysis has been done to show from the different points that people voiced concerns over as well. The Board can evaluate those elements and also look at some of the items that were missing. The changes made to the original documents that makes it easier for the board to review is that they made them in red. Also, there were a number of appendices that were added to the documentation. Nina suggests that a ten day

period be allowed for more written public comment after the January 25th meeting date. The Board will also be able to comment on the changes before the next meeting as well. Paul suggests that a revision to Dutchess County Planning be sent for referral upon the closing of the Public Hearing (after all the updates are completed and filed for the record). A stenographer has been hired to transcribe the meeting minutes of the Public Hearing on February 8th. John and Paul will provide comments from the meeting also for the board's review. Nina suggests that the board also visit the continuous property ownership issue as was brought up in a letter that was received to get a little more background in that area before the next meeting. Nina says that a referral is also due to the Town of Amenia CAC of this project. Paul will check on the Town Code for this responsibility. John says that correspondence is also needed from the Dutchess County Department of Public Works on the project. The SEQRA Part II form will be completed the next time the Board gets together as well. This will identify the impacts as moderate to large and what needs to be done as far as mitigation to make them less significant. After that step is done, the board would ask John and Paul to prepare either a Negative or Positive declaration. If there is concern that there will be litigation on this project, Jim says to convene an executive session for that reason. Discussion can then be made without the public.

Under Other Matters, Paul briefly discussed the SBA/Nextel issue and being non-compliant with the generator that was requested by the Planning Board in their last resolution as a condition. Alec Gladd from SBA is still trying to track down the letter from T-Mobile regarding what their intentions are as far as having the necessary equipment on site for backup power at the Route 44 site. John Andrews states that the FCC states that T-Mobile has in place mitigation measures to prevent power outages. (that they are using alternatives, and elected to not provide a generator). They have battery backup already at the site. Paul says that the Town could revoke the permit (Resolution from the Planning Board) for non-compliance. Nina wants to know if the consequence would be that there would be no cell service. John says that the technology at this time has moved beyond generators and that battery backup meets the regulations. The language will be in the letter.

Jim Walsh made the motion, seconded by John Stefanopoulos and carried to adjourn the meeting at 9:18pm.

The next meeting is scheduled for February 22, 2023 7:00pm.

Respectfully submitted

A handwritten signature in blue ink, reading "Judith Westfall". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, stylized initial "J".

Judith Westfall

Planning Board Secretary