

## ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

July 15, 2008

Present: Michael Dudick, Chairman , Dale Gleason, Douglas Strother, Robert Ritter (arrived at 7:08 p.m.), Christopher Lemire

Absent: Gilbert Kortz

Also Present: Joel Peller, ZBA Counsel  
Steve Myers, Director, Building & Zoning

Mr. Dudick called the meeting at 7:05 p.m. He explained that the Zoning Board of Appeals is a seven-member Board and in order for an application to be approved, an applicant must have four yes votes. At this time, there is a vacancy on the Board, so there are six members currently. One member is sick, bringing it down to five members. One other member has not arrived yet, which brings the Board down to four members. Mr. Dudick presented the applicants with a choice to be heard at this meeting or the next. He advised the applicants that if they are heard tonight, they must have a unanimous vote of the four members present. At this point, Mr. Ritter arrived, bringing the total of voting members to five.

### **NEW BUSINESS:**

- 1. An application from Shenendehowa United Methodist Church (Preschool), requesting a variance from Chapter 171, Table II, for a second freestanding sign on a single parcel. The property is located at 971 Route 146, Clifton Park, New York. Permit #80699**

The secretary read the Legal Notice as it appeared in the Daily Gazette on July 10, 2008.

Nancy Hogan, Chairperson of the Shenendehowa Methodist Preschool Board, presented this application. They are requesting a second freestanding sign for more preschool advertising for the preschool. It would be a small sign which would indicate the name of the preschool, the phone number and the ages of the population it would serve.

Mr. Ritter asked Ms. Hogan if she brought any pictures of the proposed sign. Ms. Hogan replied that she had not, that they had not drawn up any plans as they are waiting for the variance to be approved first.

Mr. Dudick replied that this seems to be an open-ended request for a variance.

Mr. Dudick asked if there was a sign already hanging from the church sign advertising the preschool. Ms. Hogan replied that there was a sign that was a separate freestanding sign which was put up years ago, but it fell down last summer. Someone said to her that her sign fell down and they need to put up a new one, so she came for an application and was told they should not even have the first sign.

Mr. Lemire again asked if there was something hanging from the church sign. Ms. Hogan replied no, that there is the church sign and underneath it is listed the service times. Mr. Lemire asked if the nursery school sign she is requesting is in addition to the church sign. Ms. Hogan replied yes. Mr. Lemire asked where they intended to put the sign. Ms. Hogan replied that there are two entrances to the church. She stated it would be the right entrance.

Mr. Dudick asked if the nursery school is operating presently. Ms. Hogan replied that they are on summer break right now. Mr. Dudick asked if they are busier during the school year. Ms. Hogan replied that they have meetings. Mr. Dudick stated that he was trying to figure out the hours of operation. Ms. Hogan replied that the first class starts at around 9:00 and the last class ends at 3:00. The school runs from September to June. Mr. Dudick asked how many students attend the preschool. Ms. Hogan replied 300 students. Mr. Dudick asked if she feels the signage is necessary in order for people to know about the school. Ms. Hogan replied yes.

Mr. Peller made a suggestion to the Board that because this application is so broad, the Board may want to consider holding the application over to give the applicant an opportunity to be more specific regarding exactly what the preschool is looking for. Usually Board would look at the nature and size of the sign as well as the impact it has on the road

Mr. Dudick stated that the applicant is going about this application in a different order from what is normally done. He explained that usually an applicant who is looking for a sign variance presents a rendering from a sign manufacturer. He stated that in order to make an informed decision, the Board needs to know more about what is being requested.

Mr. Myers asked Ms. Hogan if the sign she is requesting is going to be about the same size as the old one. Ms. Hogan replied yes. Mr. Myers stated that that sign was 4 x 8. Mr. Lemire asked if it was going to look like the old one. Ms. Hogan's response was inaudible. Mr. Myers stated that he was told the sign blew down in a storm.

Mr. Ritter stated as a point of information regarding freestanding signs on properties, if we look at some of examples of decisions of other freestanding signs and the direction this Board has taken, it is not an issue of size, dimension, but the request is really for a second freestanding sign with no alterations. He stated that other churches and businesses have come to the Board looking with similar requests. We have in the past encouraged businesses to remove their freestanding sign if they wanted additional signage on their store. He thinks it would be helpful

if the applicant came back with more details and also have some alternatives so that the Board can make an informed decision.

Mr. Dudick stated that 4 x 8 is a large sign. Ms. Hogan stated that she was told that 24 sq. ft. is the maximum allowed. Mr. Dudick stated that this would be a second sign. Mr. Dudick stated that he has seen other churches whose signs appear smaller. Mr. Dudick agrees with Mr. Peller's suggestion that the applicant go back and get a rendering from a sign manufacturer and come back with more details.

Mr. Lemire asked if the nursery school is part of the church or are they two separate and distinct entities. Ms. Hogan stated it is part of the church. Mr. Lemire suggested combining the two signs. Ms. Hogan stated that she is trying to do this cost-effectively. Mr. Ritter stated that if there is a thought within the church to improve the existing freestanding sign that could accommodate all the needs and functions of the facility, that would be appropriate.

Mr. Dudick read a letter from Jason Kemper Director of Planning of the Saratoga County Planning Board regarding this application. From the County's perspective, there does not appear to be any significant countywide or intercommunity impact. However, Mr. Dudick stated that the Zoning Board would like more information.

Mrs. Gleason asked Ms. Hogan if she knew how long the other sign was up. Mrs. Hogan stated that she did not. It was before she became chairperson 2 ½ years ago.

Mr. Dudick asked when the next scheduled Zoning Board meeting would be. The secretary replied August 19<sup>th</sup>, with a submission deadline of July 29<sup>th</sup>. The following meeting is September 2<sup>nd</sup>, with a submission deadline of August 12<sup>th</sup>.

Mrs. Gleason said she wanted to state for the record that she owns the property across the street and that her grandchildren attend that nursery school. She wanted to advise counsel of this.

Mr. Strother asked Mr. Dudick if it is typical for the County pass something like this without any information regarding size and scale. Mr. Dudick replied that the County gives their perspective on an application. Usually the County would have more information, but in this case the County found this to be satisfactory. The Zoning Board takes this into consideration but this does not direct the Board as to how the Board would make a decision.

Mr. Peller stated that the Board has 61 days to make a decision on an application and asked the applicant if she would agree to waive the 61 days in order to hold this over. Mrs. Hogan stated that she would.

Mr. Ritter suggested that the May 30, 2008 letter from John Scavo, Director of the Clifton Park Planning Board, be read into the record. Mr. Dudick read the letter, which stated that from a Planning perspective, the sign should be reviewed and by the Zoning Board of Appeals.

The application was tabled without a date.

2. **An application from James D. McAtee, requesting variances from Section 208-12 for a new accessory structure in a Hamlet Residential (HR) Zone as follows: (1) Front setback required = 50 feet, available front setback = 7.5 feet, variance requested = 42.5 feet; (2) maximum allowable height = 15 feet, height is 19.5 feet, side setback variance required = 0.5 feet, 9-foot side setback available, 5 feet required (for every foot over 15 feet in height, 1 additional foot of side setback required). The property is located at 28 Bluff Road, Rexford, New York. Permit #80703.**

The secretary read the Legal Notice as it appeared in the Daily Gazette on July 10, 2008.

Mr. Strother questioned the section that was being referred to in the application. After discussion, it was determined that the correct section was being referred to.

Mr. James McAtee presented this application. He has owned the property since 1979. He stated that there is an existing garage on the property which is more like a shed in that it can only store small items, not a car. He stated that on the drawing submitted he forgot to include that the garage is actually 29 feet back from the edge of the street, but it does not appear to be as close to the road as one might think. He explained that this street basically consists of camps from the 1920s and 1930s. Most of the lots and houses are small and almost all of the garages are close to the road. He feels that his garage would not be very unusual. He stated that his next door neighbor built a garage within the last few years that is basically the same size, 26 feet deep.

Mr. McAtee stated that he needs a larger garage because he has more items to store. He has a camper and boats. The added height is for an attic. The house itself only has two closets and he would like to have easy access to more storage in the garage. He stated that there are two large trees behind the garage and he would remove one of them. The other would be very expensive to remove. He does not feel he could go back much further.

Mr. Strother asked who owns the property between the 7 ½ feet and 29 feet. Mr. Myers stated that it is the Town's right of way. Mr. Strother asked what would happen if the Town needs to expand that road, as there is nowhere else to go. Mr. Myers explained that it is a dead end road and that most of the garages are as close to the road now so the Town would have to buy all of the garages if they wanted to expand the road. Mr. McAtee stated that the other side of the road is swampy and no one has been able to build on it.

Mr. Dudick asked Mr. McAtee if lot #34 on the diagram is his. Mr. McAtee responded yes. Mr. Dudick noted the signatures obtained from different people on lot #35. He asked about the lot numbers of the properties on each side of Mr. McAtee's lot. Mr. McAtee explained that lot #43 is Frank Spataro's and lot #35 is Jeff Downing's. Mr. Dudick asked if they are okay with this project. Mr. McAtee replied yes.

Mr. Dudick asked if there were any comments from the public and there was no response.

Mr. Dudick made a motion to close the public hearing. Mr. Ritter seconded. Approval unanimous.

Mr. Dudick asked Mr. Myers for his comments. Mr. Myers replied that he does not have a problem with this application, as the applicant is not putting this any closer to the road and what the applicant is requesting is pretty common in that area. He also stated that he feels the added height variance is minor.

Mr. Dudick agreed with Mr. Myers. There was discussion about the garage being taller than the house. Mr. Myers stated that it is not that much out of balance with the rest of the neighborhood.

Mr. Lemire asked Mr. McAtee about the one tree that would be cost prohibitive to remove when he is removing the other tree. Mr. McAtee explained that the tree he is removing is much smaller.

Mr. Lemire commented that he appreciates the applicant's effort to speak with his neighbors and get their input as to whether or not they have any objections to this variance. Mr. Dudick agreed.

Mr. Ritter made a motion to approve the application as submitted. Mrs. Gleason seconded. Ayes: Ritter, Gleason, Dudick, Strother, Lemire. Noes: None.

- 3. An application from Upstate Waste Reduction Services, Inc., requesting variances for a proposed temporary farm stand in a B4A Zone. Variances requested are: (1) Required front parking setback = 30 feet, 10 feet available on Route 9, variance requested = 20 feet; (2) Clifton Park Village Road has 3 feet available, variance requested = 27 feet; (3) required side parking setback = 20 feet, 2 feet available on the north side, variance requested = 18 feet; and (4) side parking setback available on the south side = 5 feet, variance requested = 15 feet. The property is located at the corner of Route 9 and Clifton Park Village Road. Permit #80704.**

The secretary read the Legal Notice as it appeared in the Daily Gazette on July 10, 2008.

Sam Paquin, co-owner of the property, presented this application. He would like to put a farm stand on the property and needs parking variances. There would be a gravel parking lot, handicapped parking, and a fence around it. This would remain for 60 to 90 days per year to sell farm products. The rest of his response was inaudible.

Mr. Ritter asked about the acquisition of this property. Mr. Paquin replied that he bought it at a County auction 18 months ago.

Mr. Dudick asked Mr. Paquin about his relationship to Upstate Waste Reduction Services, Inc. Mr. Paquin replied that it is his company, basically. The name is Paquin Mulch Company. They make mulch and topsoil. They also have the farm stand on Grooms Road. They are neighboring companies.

Mr. Dudick asked Mr. Paquin if this would be a farm stand that would sell fruits and vegetables. Mr. Paquin replied yes. Mr. Dudick stated that he noticed there is a mulch truck there. He asked

Mr. Paquin if he would be engaging in mulch and topsoil sales. Mr. Paquin replied no, that it is too small. The rest of his response was inaudible.

Mr. Strother asked Mr. Paquin to explain about farm stand and retail sales. Mr. Paquin replied farming / farming products, fruit baskets, pies, vegetables. The rest of his response was inaudible.

Mr. Strother directed his next question to Mr. Peller and/or Mr. Myers. He asked about Section 208-100 Roadside Sales. The farm produce / products is one thing, but if you get into manufactured, cottage industry retail items, where does that fit in - is that an issue. Mr. Peller replied that it is not allowed, so he has to limit what he is selling to farm produce / farm products or nursery stock.

Mr. Dudick asked Mr. Paquin if he has a farm in Clifton Park. Mr. Paquin replied that he just got another one in Clifton Park but he has two over in the Schaghticoke area. Mr. Dudick asked Mr. Paquin what he is growing on his farm. Mr. Paquin replied corn, tomatoes, squash, pumpkins. Mr. Dudick asked if this was in Schaghticoke and Mr. Paquin replied yes.

Mr. Dudick read a letter submitted from a neighboring property owner, BBC Development, LLC, written by manager, Hratchia Bardakjian. The letter states that they own the property adjacent to the property Mr. Paquin claims to own on Route 9. They oppose Mr. Paquin's application and state that Mr. Paquin bought the parcel knowing of its limitations; that this is what the law defines as a self-created hardship. Traffic on Route 9 makes this site very dangerous to the public. It does not appear that any traffic study has been required throughout the planning process and there is no legal justification for a variance on this parcel. It is substandard, and was substandard when Mr. Paquin purchased the land. Parking is inadequate.

Mr. Paquin responded by stating that this neighbor has been trying to steal his property since he bought it. He stated that this neighbor has filled in 63 feet of Mr. Paquin's property with his fill, pipe and irrigation lines. He further explained that the way the property line exists, it cuts halfway across his neighbor's lawn. He has been having issues with this neighbor since day one. The rest of Mr. Paquin's response is inaudible.

Mr. Dudick asked for comment from the public and there was no response.

Mr. Dudick made a motion to close the public hearing. Mr. Ritter seconded. Approval unanimous.

Mr. Dudick read the area variance guidelines which the Board reviews when considering area variance requests. Mr. Paquin stated that he checked out the property before he bought it. He does not feel he created a hardship. Mr. Dudick replied to Mr. Paquin's statement that he checked out the property before he bought it by stating he cannot think of any use of this property without a variance. He asked Mr. Paquin what he intended to use the property for if he did not get a variance. Mr. Paquin stated that he has been a farmer for his whole life and whenever he has had to go for a parking variance for a farm stand there is no law that says he has to do anything for parking as a farmer, but since he does not grow anything in Clifton Park, they

use it against him. He mentioned Kinns Road and Moe Road. The rest of his response was inaudible.

Mr. Dudick asked how long Mr. Paquin has owned the farm stand on Moe Road. Mr. Paquin replied six years. Mr. Dudick commented that it has been there longer. Mr. Paquin replied that it has been there since 1959. Mr. Dudick stated he is not sure when the first zoning laws came into effect in Clifton Park, but the rules in 1959 were definitely different from what they are now. He does not believe there were parking and green space requirements. Any business in operation dating back to the 1950s would be grandfathered in.

Mr. Paquin stated that the Town has a stand right now opening up everyday without any approval. Two years ago he set up right up on Grooms Road in front of this house right on the highway, no parking issue, just opened up. A guy on Route 146A in front of his residential property has an old farm stand with no additional parking.

Mr. Dudick asked Mr. Myers for his comments regarding whether others are opening up farm stands that are illegal in the Town. Mr. Myers replied that if you read the definition of a farm in the zoning law, it states if you have 5 acres growing agricultural products you are allowed to sell, so if Mr. Lindsey wants to sell his product outside his 100+ acres, he does not feel it is illegal. There are probably people who have stands who have less than 5 acres. If people grow vegetables in their back yard and put a few out front to sell, he guesses you can call that a farm stand, but for the most part, if people have 5 acres or more and grow the product on their land they are entitled to sell it. He feels that the difference here is that this is a commercial retail property that the use is changing on. The reason the applicant needs a parking variance is due to the nature of the parcel and where it is located. Mr. Myers feels that this is a unique situation. He is not growing a product on that property, but he bought the property and is entitled to develop the property to what he feels its best use is. He has great limitations because of where the property is located and the setback requirements. Mr. Myers further stated that the applicant is correct in that his next door neighbor obtained significant variances for his building and parking lot. This parcel was left, and for whatever reason, was never picked up by his neighbor.

Mr. Peller asked Mr. Myers to elaborate on why he feels the use is changing. Mr. Myers replied that it is zoned for retail commercial use, but this is more of an agricultural use that you do not normally see in this heavy a commercial zone. Originally, when Mr. Paquin first came to him, Mr. Myers told him he did not have a problem with what he was trying to do, but he needed concepts from Planning so that they buy into his theory that he could do this there, which is what he did, and Planning approved it.

Mr. Lemire asked Mr. Myers if he feels the change in use is based solely on the product being agricultural. He is not farming there. Mr. Myers stated that he does not know what else he would do with this property, and it being heavily commercially zoned, it is not something you would normally see there. Mr. Lemire asked if, for example, the applicant were to put a Fotomat there that was not selling farm goods, would he need to be here for the parking setbacks. Mr. Myers replied that he would then be putting up a structure and could not meet the structure setbacks. Mr. Lemire stated that the applicant is actually doing less than that. Mr. Myers replied yes, that this is very temporary. Mr. Myers stated he has told Mr. Paquin that a canopy or a tent

is the only way he can do it because it is temporary and is not considered a structure by the zoning law. This is the only way he can get around the setbacks for structures.

Mr. Peller asked Mr. Myers if he suggests the Board use the use variance criteria vs. the area variance. Mr. Myers replied that perhaps he may have made a misstatement about a change in use. His view is that that trying to sell seasonal farm products in a heavily commercial zone is not how he would normally expect this property to be used. When this went from vacant land to a developed use, he told the applicant that he is changing the use of the land enough that he needs Planning approval, and if he gets that, he needs setback approvals. Mr. Peller recommended that the Board's deliberations be based upon the area variance criteria read by the Chairman.

Mr. Myers handed out the deliberations / minutes from the Planning Board, which was discussed among Board members.

Mr. Strother stated he disagrees with the comment from BBC Development that this will create a traffic problem. There is a fence bordering Route 9 and it appears there is adequate clearance even if there is a little congestion at the entrance. He is familiar with that area and he does not feel that this would create any significant traffic problem.

Mr. Myers stated that Mr. Paquin is correct about the drainage line and some of the other things he is pursuing with his neighbor. Mr. Paquin commented, but his comment was inaudible.

Mr. Lemire asked about the distance from the entrance to the parking lot to the intersection with Route 9. Mr. Paquin replied about 130 feet. Mr. Lemire asked about the entrance across Clifton Park Village Road, whether that is for the hotel. Mr. Paquin replied yes. Mr. Myers replied that he expects that there will be diner which will use the same entrance.

Mr. Peller asked about the canopy not being a structure. Mr. Myers replied yes, but that he will need a canopy permit based on the size, issued by the Building Department. He needs to meet the fire code for anything 200 square feet or larger, as well.

Mr. Lemire asked if there will be any security on the property. How will he close if there is no structure on the property. Mr. Paquin replied that the shed has sides on it. The tent and tables will be there but there will be no products on it. Mr. Lemire asked about the shed. Mr. Paquin replied it will be a canopy shed like you'd buy at Walmart, a 10 x 20. It will be a temporary garage.

Mr. Dudick asked if there will be any signage indicating the farm stand. Mr. Paquin replied 16 square feet.

Mr. Lemire asked how many people would be working at the site. Mr. Paquin replied two, him and one other person.

Mr. Dudick asked if there would be parking for three people at a time plus a handicapped customer. There was no response.

Mr. Ritter asked if there have been any comments about this project from NYS DOT. Mr. Paquin replied that there was a letter from the NYS DOT provided to the Planning Board. The rest of his response was inaudible. Mr. Ritter stated that within the Planning Board minutes of May 29, 2008, there are comments from several of the Planning Board members that they would recommend reviews and comments by the DOT. Mr. Myers referred to the last page, second paragraph, where it states that Mr. Paquin has provided a letter from DOT stating that the applicant does not have to provide additional information to that agency or apply for a permit.

There was discussion about the fence and a dumpster. Mr. Lemire asked about delivery and removal of the product. Mr. Paquin's response was inaudible. Mr. Lemire asked about running water and toiletry. Mr. Paquin stated there is a porto potty.

Mr. Lemire asked for clarification from Mr. Myers. The farm stand is allowable, but parking setbacks are needed? Mr. Myers replied yes.

Mr. Ritter stated that it would be helpful if the applicant provided a sketch of what the proposed parking would look like. There was discussion about that, and Mr. Ritter was shown where the sketch is. Mr. Ritter asked if the lot as we see it now would be one large parking lot, with the exception of the 20 x 20. Mr. Paquin explained the grass area and fence as well. It is not a solid fence. The rest of his response was inaudible.

Mr. Lemire asked whose responsibility it is to oversee the parking, is it ours? Mr. Dudick replied yes, with regard to whether the parking lot should be granted in the space allowed. Mr. Lemire clarified his question and referred to the parking along the street. There is a NY Telephone or Verizon hut there and the Verizon trucks park there or have parked there. He has driven by there and it is often difficult to get by because of the site lines when the trucks are there. He is concerned that this is a very dangerous section of road. Mr. Paquin's response was inaudible. There was further discussion about the fence and where Verizon would park their trucks, but much of this is inaudible.

Mr. Dudick stated his concern based on his frequent driving along this road that he has seen the Verizon trucks and across the street there is the entrance to one business, soon to be two businesses.

Mr. Dudick stated that he feels this would be a very aggressive use of a very odd shaped piece of property. It is at an acute angle intersection which, based on his conversations with people from NYS DOT, is a dangerous intersection by its nature. He does not feel that this would be an appropriate use of the property and does not know if there would be any appropriate use of the property. He would not be in favor of trying to develop every last 1/8<sup>th</sup> of an acre. Mr. Paquin replied 1/4<sup>th</sup> of an acre.

Mr. Lemire commented that Mr. Paquin mentioned that this would be used to sell vegetables or farm goods for 60 to 90 days of the year. He asked if there is any authority for the Board to limit the dates for the canopy being up. Mr. Dudick replied that, as he understands the zoning correctly, if the Board approves the parking as it is, he can sell anything on that property any

time of the year. Mr. Lemire stated that this is his point, that it can be a Christmas tree stand, or something else. Mr. Paquin stated that he has had a stand here for six years and sold Christmas trees on it once. Mr. Myers stated that there is no limitation on the time he can have the tent up and that the permit is open for a year if it needs to be. Mr. Lemire asked Mr. Myers if the applicant would have to reapply. Mr. Myers replied yes. Mr. Lemire stated that he would not have to reapply for a variance then, just for the permit for the tent. Mr. Myers replied yes. Mr. Lemire stated that ultimately we could be looking at permanent tent. Mr. Myers replied yes.

Mr. Dudick stated that if he chose, he could sell vegetables off the back of a truck and not have a tent and that would still be allowed. He has a parking lot. Mr. Myers replied that he guesses, though he has not considered that option. He has not seen him sell vegetables off the back of a truck yet but supposes he could.

Mr. Ritter stated that he feels this is a very creative use for this little section of land. It is definitely impressive, although he would like to have seen more documentation relating to the comments or the actual original letter from DOT. He is concerned about the traffic impact on this intersection, but that is not necessarily a deal killer. Mr. Ritter further stated that he thinks that if the applicant conforms to all the rigorous process of the Planning Board and it is contingent on this, he is not saying he disagrees or agrees with it, but is very impressed with the creative nature and the extent of his creativity, to make a viable enterprise work in this spot.

Mr. Lemire asked for a repeat of the individual variances needed. Mr. Myers clarified this for Mr. Lemire.

Mr. Ritter stated to Mr. Myers as a point of information that the neighbor to the south needed similar variances. Mr. Myers stated that he looked at that file and he did get significant variances for both parking and the building. Mr. Myers and Mr. Ritter further discussed this and Mr. Myers stated that he does not think the parking variances asked for here are any larger than those granted to that other building.

Mr. Lemire stated that he feels the variances requested are substantial but he feels this is a refreshing change in the neighborhood to have a farm stand on Route 9, in keeping with the open space / farming culture of Clifton Park.

Mr. Ritter stated that this is innovative, and this is why he asked about the adjacent property to the south in terms of what they needed to erect that building and parking lot. He thinks that when you view this project, the substantial issue of this variance is not any more substantial than what the neighbor to the south had to do to make a viable business work there, although he is concerned about the parking issues. Mr. Myers replied that there is no access from Route 9, and if there is a problem along Clifton Park Village Road, we can monitor it.

Mr. Dudick asked Mr. Paquin if the mulch truck will remain on the property. Mr. Paquin stated that he lives in a trailer park and has no place to park that truck. The rest of his response is inaudible.

Mrs. Gleason stated that people who go to farm stands do not really park. They just get their things and get out of there. Mr. Paquin's response was inaudible.

Mr. Ritter made a motion to approve the application as submitted. Mrs. Gleason seconded. Ayes: Gleason, Ritter, Strother, Lemire. Noes: Dudick.

Mr. Paquin discussed with Mr. Myers what he needs to do with regard to signs and a temporary fence.

Mr. Ritter made a motion to approve the minutes of May 6, 2008. Mr. Dudick seconded. Approved by: Dudick, Gleason, Strother, Ritter, Lemire.

Mr. Dudick made a motion to approve the minutes of June 3, 2008. Mr. Ritter seconded. Approved by: Dudick, Gleason, Strother, Ritter, Lemire.

Mr. Ritter made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:28 p.m. Mr. Dudick seconded. Approval unanimous.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jess McCarthy  
Secretary

cc: Town Clerk, Town Board, Zoning Board Members, Joel Peller, Counsel, Steve Myers, Department of Building and Development, Planning Board, ECC, Assessor, Highway