



## **TOWN OF AMENIA**

36B MECHANIC STREET, PO BOX 126, AMENIA, NY 12501  
845-373-8118 • 845-373-8860

### **PLANNING BOARD MEETING THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 4, 2008**

**PRESENT:** Chairman George Fenn  
Bill Flood  
Jim Walsh  
Nina Peek  
Norm Fontaine

**ABSENT:** Gina Mignola  
Tony Robustelli

The meeting was opened at 7:00 P.M. by Chairman George Fenn.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING**

**AMENIA FIRE COMPANY**

**LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT**

**CASCADE ROAD  
AMENIA, NY**

MOTION TO OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING was made by Bill Flood, seconded by Jim Walsh

Bethany Ralph represented the Amenia Fire Company. The application was for a lot line adjustment with the property owner. There is a trade off with the two neighbors. There was no comment from the public on this hearing.

MOTION TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING was made by Bill Flood, seconded by Jim Walsh

VOTE TAKEN – ALL IN FAVOR

Chairman Fenn did Part 2 of the short EAF form for the Fire Company.

MOTION TO APPOINT THE PLANNING BOARD LEAD AGENCY FOR AN UNCOORDINATED REVIEW OF THE POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS was made by Jim Walsh, seconded by Norm Fontaine

VOTE TAKEN – ALL IN FAVOR

MOTION TO MAKE A NEGATIVE DECLARATION WITH RESPECT TO POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED ADJUSTMENT was made by Norm Fontaine, seconded by Jim Walsh

VOTE TAKEN – ALL IN FAVOR

The Town waived fees for the Amenia Fire Department.

MOTION TO GRANT THE LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT AND AUTHORIZE THE CHAIRMAN TO SIGN THE MYLAR was made by Bill Flood, seconded by Jim Walsh

VOTE TAKEN – ALL IN FAVOR

**REGULAR MEETING**

**LRC**

**PUBLIC HEARING DATE**

**ROUTE 343**

**AMENIA, NY**

No one in attendance from the LRC Group. Bill Flood mentioned they need to be notified they need \$2000 for escrow. Michael Hayes – Because there are other involved agencies, the Board should declare its intent.

MOTION TO DECLARE THE PLANNING BOARD AS LEAD AGENCY FOR REVIEW OF THE LRC PROJECT was made by Norm Fontaine, seconded by Nina Peek

VOTE TAKEN – ALL IN FAVOR

This project needs to go to Dutchess County Planning, the Town Engineer and GreenPlan for review.

**KEAN STUD LLC/DEPOT  
HILL SUBDIVISION**

**DEIS**

**DEPOT HILL  
AMENIA, NY**

Brandee Nelson began by stating last week at the workshop Depot Hill made responses to comments from GreenPlan, Mike Soyka, Dr. Klemens and Michael Hayes. They met with the Hudson Group, Wednesday and today received comments from George Janes regarding visual comments. The Board received them today. The Board to consider the DEIS complete, in the most recent comment letter fiscal and visual issues were raised, mostly technical. We have identified in the EIS there are impacts. The visual impacts are photos showing existing, proposed as worst case and proposed as filled in with vegetation. Mr. Janes made comments regarding how that mitigating scenario was presented. Nina Peek felt it would be good to see a conceptual plan before site plan. Ms. Nelson stated they have had a conversation with MaryAnn Johnson regarding this.

Mr. Janes went over his memo of September 4, 2008 and did a presentation talking about each of the issues from the memo.

- There are still issues with the visual resources. The inventory of the visual resources is incomplete. There are a couple of parks not in the Visual Resources as well as no discussion of cumulative visual impacts.
- There are issues with the photographs and photo simulations, they raise reliability of the simulations. The photographs are fine; however, the trees are in leaf on condition. They are panorama. Performing a simulation on a panoramic photo will not produce reliable results. Are the simulations what you will actually see when it is done? The methods and data were another concern. Google Earth, not USGS, data was used. They also use software that does not perform automated camera matches. If the applicant is using Sketch-up and Google Earth to develop photo simulations, the information needs to be supported and justified in more detail. The simulations showing the planted buffers should be either redone or eliminated.
- A comment not in the memo regarding the scale of the buildings, they appear to be off.

- Clarity – There is excessive annotation on photo from viewpoint 2 that detracts from the understanding of the change. You need existing and proposed conditions on the photo with nothing on it except changes caused by the action.
- There is little discussion of qualitative impacts on visual resources. There are quantitative measures in there; however there should be qualitative discussion on the impacts of the visual resources, visibility, and displacement.

An audience member asked if the memo was available for the public to review. This includes information that is included in a PDEIS so this must be decided if it is appropriate for distribution. Another audience member asked if they did the same for Silo Ridge project. Mr. Janes stated he examined the Silo Ridge simulations. The latest has not yet been reviewed.

Mr. Stark felt all Mr. Janes comments were made clear in his memo and would like to comment on each of the matters.

- Failure to include inventory of Visual Resources the parks mentioned. Ms. Nelson began stating in the scoping outline the Board identified viewpoints that were of concern. They are using the DEC policy memorandum as a guideline and in that memo the option of identifying locally important resources. It does not include every local park, however does include parklands that are state or federally recognized. In our August 28<sup>th</sup> response memo, the HVRT is seen from viewpoint 6 this was corrected and will be in the revised DEIS.
- Cumulative Impacts - No where in the scoping document is there any discussion of cumulative impacts. From DeLavernne Hill, Silo Ridge will be in the foreground of the project. It is better to assess the project without Silo Ridge as we don't know how much they are going to block coming down DeLavernne Hill the view across the valley for any development near the road. Not having them in the visual assessment one can assume that this will continue to be open space and have high visibility across the valley to Depot Hill Site.
- Leaf on condition – A discussion with Mr. Janes in May, we got more photos in May before the leaves were full, unfortunately the weather did not cooperate the days needed to be clear and there were none for 21 days. We asked Mr. Janes if it was ok to proceed and his indication was that if the other corrections were made to our photos from his comments. Mr. Janes stated that the comments regarding leaf on is an observation. It is contrary to generally accepted SEQR standards. There is no control over the season of the year. What is more important the season or the clarity of the photo. The clarity of the photo is more important.
- Panorama's - We can provide Mr. Janes a list of the photos which are panorama's and which ones are not. Views 1, 2, and 3 are one single photo. The images were cropped at the top and bottom to provide uniformity after they were simulated. Mr. Janes stated that was a problem. Ms. Nelson said they would provide uncropped photos.
- Data - In the DEIS in several instances actual topographic data for on site including post development grading is included in the photo simulations. This will be made clearer. The only place Google Earth was used was in conjunction with USGS to establish the off site elevations for the camera locations. This will also be made clearer. Mr. Stark added that they had checked the USGS and Google Earth elevations and they were the same.
- Software - Mr. Janes has some concerns regarding software that was used for modeling purposes. This will be addressed and will provide additional information, however was not aware of any legal requirement to switch to particular software. Michal Hayes stated that because the software is not commonly used or does not have the features that might provide a greater degree of reliability, if you want to use the software you may do so. In using the software, however, you must provide information that demonstrates the software you selected provides a reliable simulation. Mr. Janes stated he uses this software all the time,

however does not use it for this purpose. I am concerned with the camera match. You must justify what you see is reliable. Mr. Stark stated they will provide all the references that have been used in the simulation and the barns are very good references and the barns were used in these simulations. Ms. Nelson stated that most of the existing structures on the site will remain so that will help in the match process.

- Planted Buffers – There are a series of photos that show no buffer at all. The planted ones can be eliminated if the Board wishes.
- Scale of the Buildings – The modeling was done and then the photos were stitched together for the panorama views. This will be confirmed with our consultants.
- Annotation by GreenPlan - We were responding to a request however if Mr. Janes wants this off there is no problem.
- A qualitative discussion between Mr. Janes and Michael Hayes.

Mr. Stark felt Mr. Janes issues have been resolved and this can be demonstrated to him. The Fiscal Impacts were worked out yesterday, the bottom line difference between Depot Hill and GreenPlan's consultants are less than 10% and do not change the impact positive or negative with the various fiscal constraints. We feel the DEIS is complete. The remaining issues during the comment period will be discussed. Norm Fontaine asked if all the issues had been addressed from Michael Hayes comments. Mr. Hayes stated that after the consultants meeting yesterday, they were discussed and worked out resolutions. The revised document is next to see that it matches everyone's expectations. Mr. Janes will need to be satisfied with the photo simulations.

Nina Peek asked Mr. Stark for a brief on the meeting with the Hudson Group from yesterday. What was the agreement that you all came to. Mr. Stark began with

- Valuation of the project and the taxes that will result.
- General agreement for the application to town's general highway, and fire department.
- Discussion of what enrollment figures to use. We used the figures provided by Dr. John's; the Hudson Group used a different number. We used the 2008-09 School Budget and the 2007-08 State Aid figures; the H G came with the 2008-09 numbers and we agreed to use those. Regarding the calculation of State Aid we agreed there were 3 variables; income, valuation and number of students resulting from this project. These were all agreed on. The HG states it has a software program that calculates the state aid numbers. They all agreed based on the 3 variables they would calculate the state aid numbers and provide to Depot Hill, based on 0%, 50% and 100% full time occupancy. We also agreed since the HG has all state aid figures, they would figure the wealth number. They would take this number and compare to 8 school districts closest to that number and use it to calculate what the expected state aid would be.

Bill Flood had a question regarding the road grades some being 15% in Neighborhood 1 and 2.

Mike Soyka I believe asked you to have a discussion with the Fire Department. There is no notice of that. It usually is around 11%. Also the length of the cul` de sac` – one is 2700', they allow 1500'. Mr. Stark added they are over the number of houses. This was discussed yesterday and they agreed with Mike they would amend the DEIS to show that we needed waiver for each one of those items; length, grade and number of houses. Ms. Nelson added to provide any supplemental information that would be appropriate as to why it is justified for environmental impacts. Bill Flood felt that the Fire Department would allow a 15% grade. Ms. Nelson stated there were preliminary discussions with the Fire Department but nothing on the specifics. Mr. Flood then asked about the Kean Stud Horse Farm, was it a separate entity? Mr. Stark stated at the present yes, it is separate. Mr. Flood asked about the spring? Mr. Stark said they had a spring and a well that produced 50 gallons per minute. Mr. Flood asked if there were going to be fire hydrants for the barns. Ms. Nelson stated no, however the Equestrian facility will have fire protection.

Ms. Nelson asked what the Board was looking at for completeness. Chairman Fenn asked they complete the picture with a letter on the recent issues that have been addressed and agreed to. Ms. Nelson will amend the letter of the 28<sup>th</sup>. Instead of revising Volume 1 it can be handled in a letter. Michael Hayes stated when the DEIS is deemed complete then produce a clean copy. A resolution can be prepared for the next meeting. Patrick Nelligan asked Chairman Fenn about the MDP. Was it available at the Town Hall and the Library? Michael Hayes said that it was part of the DEIS, however its preliminary for SEQR purposes, but it is not the level of detail. Mr. Nelligan asked if that level of detail be available to the public for the Public Hearing process or will it come after? Mr. Hayes stated the preliminary MDP for SEQR purposes will be available for the Public Hearing but not as final. Mr. Nelligan stated as a comment, "It seems to be in contrast to the basis of SEQR is to have the entire project in front of you for the Public Hearing."

## **SILO RIDGE**

## **DRAFT FEIS**

## **ROUTE 22, AMENIA, NY**

Michael Hayes began by circulating his memo which reviews the version of the FEIS we had received last week. This was shared with Dan Leary yesterday afternoon.

- The first two pages addresses the issue that in the FEIS there are a number of places that contain the statement "In the applicants opinion" or "the applicant believes". My advice to the Board is there should be language in the introductory section that acknowledges those statements may appear periodically in the FEIS. They are there to complete the record, but does not mean the Planning Board adopts or endorses those statements. In the Findings Statement the Planning Board will make its own assessment. The involved agencies will be required to make independent Findings Statements with respect to any permit or approval they may have to issue. This will apply to them as well. Mr. Leary stated he found it acceptable.
- Page 2 – Bottom and to top of page 3 – The table that outlines mitigation measures of potential impacts – the recreation issue the sentence "the project will not have any impacts on the town's recreation resources" be removed. Mr. Camann stated it had been removed.
- Page 50 revised FEIS, Figures ES-2A and ES-2B, these are the environmental constraint maps with overlay for existing conditions and overlay for proposed on the MDP. There is a triangular shape on the photos coming down DeLaVergne Hill. Mr. Camann explained that when the site was walked with the Planning Board and GreenPlan, the cone was put there as DeLaVergne Hill was a visually sensitive area. We put the illustration on the map to note the view there. GreenPlan asked for us to put these illustrations to help explain things. If you want this removed, we will take it off. Mr. Hayes felt where there is development on DeLaVergne Hill, identified in the RDO, that should get the highest priority for open space attention and development in other areas falling within the SPO it would be better to make a requirement of the map not to take the whole map out but to take the areas that are visually sensitive to an NXG. Mr. Leary agreed with this.
- Page 218 the comment was provided for illustrative purposes only.
- Figure 3.1-2 – Response Plan. Pete Romano talked about this last week at the meeting. It shows the alternative plan trying to reduce the amount of development on slopes in excess of 30%. How much of a reduction is actually achieved under that alternative plan? Mr. Camann said that was not calculated yet. If the Board chooses we can do an analytical review. If you do not want the homes on 30% slopes, we can put them elsewhere; however they may be moved to more sensitive visual areas. Mr. Hayes began so the Board understood that the difference between the plan they have now and the 30% slope reduced alternative, the difference is 9 single-family homes were moved from locations in the northwest corner of the site or from the ridgeline and then placed at the very southern end of the road. This is the area where the Board had previously asked, for visual impact reasons and biodiversity

concerns, homes be removed. The applicant feels that if they are going to reduce the slopes and keep the same number of homes, they you will have more impacts at the southern end of the project. This plan was presented as an alternative. If you are satisfied with the present plan and not interested in any other alternatives then it's there for illustrative purposes. However, if you are interested in the plan with some adjustments, then the other issue that comes up is the tree clearing issue. From last week's presentation, however, I understood the tree clearing would decrease. Mr. Leary said right, they had spoken about that and will make that correction. Mr. Camann added the tree claim decreases. He also stated that making that change does decrease the impact on slopes and clearing but requires a second crossing of a stream. That should be considered. Mike Dignacco agreed and stated there are units that have been moved from steep slopes that may not have visual impact as they are near where other houses are at the southern end of the site. We did not go past hole 13 with units, so that they wouldn't be centered right in the visual impact of the valley. Norm Fontaine asked if this is an alternative trade off. If you bring them off the edge of the slopes, the more visible they will be from various viewpoints, however keep them at 30% they will have less impact or you deal with 30% slopes. Mr. Leary said yes. Mr. Fontaine continued if you mitigate the 30% properly and the issues are not there, why would you want to go further south. Mr. Camann answered he and Pete had spoken with Mike Soyka and Mr. Soyka felt they did not have difficulty in achieving the proper kind of execution on 30% slopes. Michael Hayes asked the Board if they understood what the choices were. The Board agreed.

- Page 4-bottom – Vineyard Cottages in Appendix G. The artist's rendering basically surrounds the cottages by trees from Viewpoints 5, 6, 7 and 8. In the narrative of the FEIS this was not talked about. It spoke of removing the cottages from the 100' buffer under the SPO. The prior plan was in that buffer and they have now moved out of the buffer. It was talked about changing the buffer from grasses to trees; however the narrative is not there or in Figure ES-3A. Mr. Leary stated they were proposing that there will be trees in that area and will revise the narrative.
- Page 5 – FEIS pages 111 and 235 – Reducing the Vineyard Cottages would “decrease viability of the development proposal with respect to the Applicant's objectives and capabilities.” “With respect to the Applicant's capabilities,” is the language added. Mr. Leary stated the Vineyard Cottages are critical to the project. The language that was added gives a description of their necessity.
- Page 5 – FEIS page 123 there was a fuller explanation, a fuller response provided with respect to the comment regarding the size of the project and how it fit in with the Town. There is more information in the revised response that states “Further reductions to the program will not meet the Applicant's objectives.” Mike Dignacco handed Mr. Hayes another document that may fill in that blank. Mr. Leary continued this is what I discussed with Michael Hayes – on 221PHT that we were not being responsive so we revised that comment to give more detail about our consistency with the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Law and also the need for the 300 unit hotel. Why we have to sequence things the way we do, why we have the single phase and regarding the size and the height of the hotel, the narrative that we added outlines and responds to all those components of the comment. Mr. Hayes said it was the response to 222PHT. Mr. Leary felt 221PHT does address the issue regarding reductions in the project. He said by revising 221PHT they have answered the question. Mr. Hayes agreed and asked if 222PHT already cross-references the response to 221? Mr. Leary said yes. Mr. Dignacco stated that in the original scoping document there were 225 units in that location, now there is 25.
- Page 5 – FEIS page 156 – the comment regarding comparative pesticides and pollutants and agriculture uses versus golf course uses. The changes made were a big improvement. One sentence regarding turf grass does a good job of absorbing pesticides on the golf course,

“This cannot be said for row crops...grown in bare soil.” If the applicant feels that is important that sentence stays in. Mr. Camann interrupted stating they could take that sentence out.

- Page 6 - Page 231 FEIS – regarding viewpoints 1, 2, and 3 identifying the views noted by the public’s letters during the written comment period and the Town’s visual consultant as important. The same introductory language is not used for viewpoint 4. The same language for viewpoint 4 should be used to describe the importance of the views to DeLaVergne Hill. This could apply also to viewpoints 6 and 7. Mr. Dignacco stated that they would add the language for viewpoint 4 stating, “looking from DeLaVergne Hill to DeLaVergne Hill.” James Walsh felt this was very important as he felt that was where a lot of the controversy is being raised from east to west. Michael Hayes added from the bottom of the hill back up the hill. He also added that it might be more applicable to viewpoints 5, 6, 7, and 8 which are uphill views. These viewpoints need almost identical language. Mr. Leary stated they would quote the law and use “to” and “from”. Mr. Hayes also felt they should include the public comment acknowledgement and put it in the RDO. Mr. Leary agreed. Views “to” and “from” are not in the Comp Plan, however, Mr. Hayes pointed out they were in the RDO zoning.
- Pages 241 & 386 – Response Plan – Mr. Camann felt they would have to look at that.
- Page 250 Figure 3.6-1 – the public park – Mr. Dignacco stated they will change that wording. The “wooded knoll” will be changed and he added on here about mitigation.
- Page 258 Appendix M – the Parking Study. Mr. Camann stated that the sentence was pulled out.
- Page 284 – views from and to DeLaVergne Hill. Just cross reference to one of the other responses. Mr. Leary said they would add “to” and “from” and do a cross reference.
- Page 299 - Issue of Fire and Emergency squads. If the Board is satisfied with the response or not, it is still a concern that exists. Bill Flood added that the Town is also serviced by Northern Dutchess Paramedics. James Walsh felt the Fire Company should discuss this. Mr. Torres stated that the budget supplied during the FEIS came from the fire department.
- Page 387 – Dr. Klemens comment regarding a number of recommendations including the relocation or removal of certain units. In the revision it still doesn’t respond to the recommendation regarding relocation or removal of buildings located on blocks A, J and L. Mr. Camann stated they were not anticipating moving those. Mr. Dignacco stated that they are fine with the Response Plan; however the Board may have a problem with it.
- Page 391 – Wetland and watercourse law. Barbara Beale was going to have a conversation with Dr. Klemens about this. Mr. Camann stated he spoke with Ms. Beale and she felt there was not an environmental/ecological reason it was more legal discussion. Mr. Leary explained that they were in compliance with the wetland and watercourse regulation specifically Subsection (d) of that law. If Dr. Klemens had signed off on that, they would not be subject to the other provisions; (a), (b) and (c). The applicant feels they have complied with the letter of the law to the extent that the law applies to this project. Michael Hayes agreed.

Chairman Fenn stated they have not heard from Dr. Klemens or GreenPlan yet. Mr. Leary asked if a Special Meeting could be considered for next Thursday. Mr. Camann added that he spoke with Dr. Strauss and he had added very detailed tables based on the plans and did want Dr. Klemens to review them before they were changed. Chairman Fenn stated that the Hudson Group comments should only take a day or two to get a response. Mr. Janes stated he will try to get it done by next week. Tuesday, September 16 was designated as a Special Meeting for Silo Ridge. Michael Hayes will draft the resolution. He continued once the completeness determination is made then the FEIS becomes available for public review. There has been a request for a Public Hearing however you are

under no obligation to do one. A suggestion of the Applicant was to provide an overview of the project with Power Points that could be televised, combined with a 30 day written comment period. Mr. Walsh asked Mr. Hayes to clarify what the DEIS is and the FEIS is for the benefit of the public. Mr. Hayes then went on to explain. Mr. Torres asked if there will be another public hearing one for the MDP and one for specific site plan approval? Mr. Hayes there will be a public hearing for the Special Use Permit Subdivision combined process and then for Site Plan approval. Any time you go for Site Plan approval there will be another public hearing. The Board was in agreement with the 30 day written comment period and that the Applicant will do two presentations and would be willing to informally answer questions afterwards. E-mails are considered as written comment.

Mr. Burnadette addressed the Board regarding letters received from various people as well as Friends For a Better Amenia. He was wondering why they had not been discussed or mentioned. Norm Fontaine and Nina Peek indicated they were just receiving theirs tonight. Mr. Fontaine asked how long before we stop accepting comments? Mr. Hayes replied the public comment period on the DEIS was in April. Once the FEIS is deemed complete then the public comment period will commence again. The Planning Board has listened to people as they have provided comments informally. They are not comments that need to be incorporated in the FEIS, and the comments may continue to influence the process. Mr. Hayes stated he has read the letter from Mr. Lyons and he was comfortable with the process that the Board is following. Norm Fontaine commented that if the Board reacted to every letter that we received, we would never move forward with the process. Mr. Hayes has reviewed the memo of law and was comfortable with the process and asked for any questions from the Board.

Bill Carroll thought that after the last meeting it had been decided to have Ann Conroy present tonight from the Dutchess County Economic. Chairman Fenn stated he had spoken to her after that meeting and it appeared that the Applicant had come to closure with the Hudson Group on all aspects of the fiscal analysis except school aid formula, which she would not have been prepared to address. He felt there was no reason for her to come, however I did offer her the opportunity.

Ms. Peek asked Mr. Clair about a letter he had referenced at one of the Town Board Meetings. He had read from a letter from the EDC and quoted some numbers. She does not have that letter and would like a copy as it was addressed to the Planning Board. Mr. Torres said it was addressed to Silo directly, and went on to say the numbers came very similar to what Hudson Group had done. They did a projection over the 10 years. Mr. Clair stopped by the office and we provided him with some of the information.

Mr. Leary informed the Board with the Hudson Group and the State's school aid formula, he had sent an email to Michael Hayes who forwarded it to the Hudson Group for them to look over. Mr. Leary continued they were working out a solution to analyzing the school aid formula in the FEIS.

Chip Barrett, owner and operator of Ledgewood Boarding Kennel in Northeast. Two comments he had were they were happy as they schedule one or two events per month and there are not many accommodations around. Also they own quite a bit of property and the school taxes are high. This project will help alleviate some of that. So I am in support of the project.

Ms. Levin addressed the Board regarding the public comment on the FEIS. She felt a public hearing would give an opportunity for the Board to listen to our voices. She continued on by saying she felt the letters would not be read. Chairman Fenn stated it is part of the process to read all those letters.

Tonia Schumatoff of the Housatonic Valley Association asked if Michael Hayes could also explain the role of the interested parties. The Housatonic Valley Association is an interested party and they have submitted written comments. If members of the public want to access and read those comments, how would they do that? Mr. Hayes explained what an interested agency was and then stated that members of the public could come in and see all the comments that are submitted by the involved agencies, interested agencies or members of the public. There are comments already received in the FEIS and the comments that come in during the findings process would also be available. Ms. Schumatoff then asked prior to the final comments how would the public read them? Michael Hayes stated it would be through a FOIL request. Ms. Schumatoff wanted the Board to take those comments seriously. Chairman Fenn agreed.

Cheryl Morse wanted to make sure the Board had received a document she had submitted last week regarding any document that comes into the Town is available for FOIL.

Pete Clair asked about the letter from John Lyons, if it was available for public viewing if we were to FOIL it? Norm Fontaine said he could have his copy. Mr. Clair asked also who the Friends For A Better Amenia were. Mr. Burnadette answered it is a small group of people who come together to make sure the process is being done properly.

MOTION TO ACCEPT THE MINUTES FOR JULY 31, 2008 was made by Bill Flood, seconded by James Walsh

VOTE TAKEN – ALL IN FAVOR

MOTION TO CLOSE THE MEETING was made by Norm Fontaine, seconded by James Walsh

Respectfully submitted,

Susan M. Metcalfe

Planning Board Secretary

The foregoing represents unapproved minutes of the Town of Amenia Planning Board from a meeting held on September 4, 2008 and are not to be construed as the final official minutes until so approved.

\_\_\_\_\_ Approved as read

\_\_\_\_\_ Approved with: deletions, corrections, and additions