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**Chairman Dupree:** Good evening colleagues and welcome to the January 16, 2019 meeting of the Hyde Park Planning Board. You know all the exits around the room so please join me as we salute the American Flag. *Chairman Dupree commenced the Pledge of Allegiance.*

Before we start, I’d like to thank the Town Board for reappointing me as Chairman at their last meeting, the reorganizational meeting. *Applause.* I want to thank them for trusting me with the authority to continue to guide our little ship here. The Chairman’s term is a one year term, renewed ever year. That also reminds me that Anne and I are entering our 14th years this year. *Applause.*

**CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING:**

**ENCLAVE SOLAR FARM**
Site Plan & Special Use Permit Approval (#2018-30)
Location: Cream Street
Grid#: TBD

**Chairman Dupree:** The first item on the agenda is a continued public hearing for Enclave Solar Farm. The applicants are seeking site plan and special use permit approval to create a solar array on Cream Street.

**MOTION:** Vice Chair Dexter  
**SECOND:** Mr. Oliver

**To re-open the public hearing for Enclave Solar Farm.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aye</th>
<th>Mr. Dupree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aye</td>
<td>Ms. DiNapoli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aye</td>
<td>Ms. Dexter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aye</td>
<td>Ms. Weiser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aye</td>
<td>Mr. Oliver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aye</td>
<td>Mr. Pickett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aye</td>
<td>Ms. Wasser</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VOICE VOTE** 7-0 Motion Carried

**Chairman Dupree:** The applicants are not here this evening. They asked me first if they should appear. We are waiting to hear from the US Fish and Wildlife Service, so we can conclude SEQRA. I need to point out that because the Department of the Interior is shuttered, so is the USFWS. This means that the numerous amounts of solar farms that we have proposed in the Town at this time will all be on a delay because the USFWS will not be able to review their projects. USFWS is involved because the state energy agency that provides funding, NYSERDA requires it. We are also waiting to hear from DEC.
I had some contact by telephone with the reviewer who indicated that they are reviewing it and that they had no problems with us being lead agency. At any rate, the applicant’s requested that we adjourn this to February 6, 2019. Any comments from the Board or consultants? There were none.

There was also no public comment.

MOTION: Ms. DiNapoli
SECOND: Mr. Oliver

To adjourn the public hearing for Enclave Solar Farm to February 6, 2019.

Aye Mr. Dupree
Aye Ms. DiNapoli
Aye Ms. Dexter
Aye Ms. Weiser
Aye Mr. Oliver
Aye Mr. Pickett
Aye Ms. Wasser

VOICE VOTE 7-0 Motion Carried

Chairman Dupree: A side note, the reason why they requested the February 6th meeting is that as we all know they won’t be able to cut down trees from March 31st to October 31st due to the DEC restrictions, so they’d like to come in to discuss what can be done if they still haven’t heard from USFWS. I’m looking at the consultants because I don’t think anything can be done, that we can authorize, unless we somehow heard from DEC and they agree, even then I’m not sure how.

Ms. Polidoro: I was thinking about what we did with the last solar application where the Board consulted with an outside environmentalist to review the work. That’s one option I suppose. It ended up that USFWS did get back to us after the fact and we didn’t get a definitive answer from the consultant.

Chairman Dupree: No because USFWS, as I recall has different standards than what the consultant did in terms of certain bats. In this case, bats don’t seem to be an issue, this is Bog Turtles. Before we meet again, I’ll speak to the applicant’s consultants and see if that’s an avenue they’re interested in pursuing to push this along.

Ms. Polidoro: The Board has reviewed Bog Turtle studies numerous times, so I think that with DEC’s comments and perhaps an outside consultant’s, you should be in a position to make a SEQRA determination.
WORKSHOP:

CAMP VICTORY LAKE MASTER PLAN & PHASE 1 CHURCH
Site Plan & Special Use Permit Approvals (#2018-66)
Location: 277 Crum Elbow Road
Grid#: 6265-04-630350

In Attendance: Rich Rennia Jr. PE, Rennia Engineering Design

Chairman Dupree: The next item on the agenda is Camp Victory Lake Master Plan and Phase 1. At the last meeting Mr. Rennia had submitted a site plan with a new location for the church and small revisions to parking areas.

Mr. Rennia: Good evening everybody. At the last meeting we had discussed the revised Phase 1 plan, which was this area here and then we submitted a revised Master Plan taking into consideration the comments that we received. Some of those comments that we received, starting at the front...this is Crum Elbow Road here... the outer loop road went around the back side or the road side of the buildings and the comments was made to look into bringing these buildings closer to the road. We went ahead and did that and we think that it created a very nice road connection here. This is the ‘Downtown Victory Lake Area’ and then this is all recreation in this area. In looking at this, we think that this will actually be better for the camp because with this outer loop road they could actually shut these down during events and use the road for part of the event. It actually makes great sense and is a win-win. From the Town’s side of things, you see more buildings and less road from the County Road and for the camp, where that road is placed is more central and useful for events. The other area that we had looked at was parking. The comment was made that we had inadequate parking so what we did was convert some of the hardscape parking up front to grass overflow parking, so on a normal basis, driving by you'll see a lot of green. Then we looked at the contours and road placement for where we could put hardscape parking and came up with this area here. We originally had a smaller parking area here and we took this road that came in through this area and pulled it out to develop this into a hardscape area of parking for the future that you don’t really see from anywhere. There’s plenty of room for us to do the stormwater treatment we need to do. The other comment was where would we park buses and we thought that across from the Wastewater Treatment Plant would be a good location because there’s not much else you’d want there. Even though it’s a nice looking building. We thought this was a good spot to do that because it’s closer to Phase 1 and we’d like to incorporate it into Phase 1.

Chairman Dupree: Thank you Mr. Rennia. In the interim, CPL Team issued its review memo on the original master plan and you’ll need to respond to the
bulk of those comments. Some of them you may have already incorporated into this.

**Ms. Axelson:** What we tried to do with this review is kind of paint a way forward so that the Board can do a generalized SEQRA review and then each phase will be covered under that. It looks like a big laundry list but the intent is to come up with the maximum thresholds for the uses on the site so that that can be noted in the SEQRA and planning review as we move forward. As long as things fit within those established thresholds, when we get there it should facilitate every project that comes forward after this first site specific one. The way I structured the comments it’s all master plan stuff up front to try to establish those thresholds. We have a few questions about existing conditions. One of the things we were trying to point out is to show us and tell us as much as you can in a tabular summary about the existing conditions. On the Phase 1 plans it wasn’t really clear where the phase begins and ends, so you’ll have to take a look at that. Then on the Phasing Plan, there were some areas that were definitely numbered items meant for improvement, loop roads, pedestrian ways, etc. that didn’t appear to be in one phase or another. So in order for us to get the whole threshold of the entire development we need those to be stuck in somewhere. The narrative was very helpful. When you have structures that are over 50 years old you should consult with SHPO and find out what they want you to do.

**Chairman Dupree:** I believe you’ve come to us first to try to work on the broad strokes of the concept plan before you get into the details. Some of what is in the Memo about requiring more contours, etc. I think you’ve been waiting to do that once you know if we’re comfortable with the layout. The Memo more or less will, as Liz said, take you to the next steps so we can get into the more detailed review and conclude SEQRA ultimately. One of the items we discussed last time was the need for a traffic impact study, based again on the maximum numbers. I think this will be a very attractive site at full build out and that you’ll probably have a lot of interest in using it. In addition, most of this is outdoor, so it looks like it will be peak in the summer, but maybe the Spa area may be used throughout the year, so we’ll need to take a look at how this may be utilized throughout the year. It was an excellent Memo and very detailed.

**Ms Axelson:** In some of the narrative it mentioned sort of 2 uses, the religious and the camp. The camp is all part of the religious use, so I just looks at this as a religious use with various activities that were related to worship, recreation, fellowship, etc.

**Mr. Rennia:** Okay. Some of our description was making it clear that it also acts as a Summer Camp and you don’t have to be a member of the Religion itself to attend the camp. There are local children who attend the camp.
Chairman Dupree: The majority of it is utilized by the congregation, but you and they have made it clear that there are members of Hyde Park that use it as well.

Mr. Rennia: They want it to be clear that they are open to everybody.

Mr. Setaro: I helped Liz with certain aspects of the Memo. I went through the water, the sewer and the drainage. You’ll need to beef up the EAF long form and include some reports in the back. The Chairman had mentioned about the traffic study and I think that we should come up with a proposed scope to agree on before the study is done. I think it can be simple, when you have a big event.

Mr. Rennia: You’re right on track. My thinking was that you have to look at the winter time period where there really isn’t anything going on, then the summer camp time period with a lot of action with drop off in the morning and pick up in the afternoon. Then look at a couple of their key activities or events and take a hard look at the peak event.

Mr. Setaro: It may end up that for the larger events you need some traffic control people with a permit for the County road.

Mr. Rennia: I do believe they hire the Hyde Park Police Department to help with larger events.

Ms. Polidoro: On the traffic impact report, I’m just a little nervous about treating something as seasonal because once you build them they can be used year round. Unless you’re going to have a restriction on the permit that says it can’t be used in the winter months, I want to be sure the traffic report is comprehensive and considers year round.

Mr. Rennia: I wasn’t meaning that during winter months that nothing would be at the sanctuary because we did have that discussion, as the Chairman said, “if you build it, they will come”. I agree with that too. I was just taking a kind of low use period of because there will be times when nothing is going on there and then there are times when there is daytime activity and also these big events. That would go with the scope...we pick those times that should be studied.

Ms. Polidoro: Okay. I was having trouble following exactly how many units are being built and how many additional people are coming to the site. I know it’s in Liz’s comments...

Mr. Rennia: The tabular format.

Ms. Polidoro: Yes, I think that information will help us when we put together the scope for the review.
**Mr. Rennia:** We started working on that now with the camp, trying to get information from them such as how many people sleep in a particular unit and working on a spreadsheet to build that out so we have all of that information.

**Ms. Axelson:** I have an example from another camp, a matrix of all of the inventory...the existing conditions, square footage, beds, etc., number of people...and then the proposed conditions. I can email that as a sample. It was based on a plan in Milan by Fleet Meyer.

**Mr. Rennia:** That would be great.

**Chairman Dupree:** I think that sounds great and will provide some clarity as we move forward. And yes, I’m going to credit Ms. Wasser who actually said that, “if you build it, they will come” because the size of the church or the sanctuary is so large that we assume there will be weddings and perhaps other events there. It’s going to be a big enough space, and new...I doubt that they’ll want it to sit there empty after going to the expense to erect it.

**Mr. Setaro:** Rich and I will need to get some kind of a conceptual stormwater plan together for the master plan. Then as each individual phase comes in for site plan approval we’ll need a formal SWPPP and as each phase comes in, you can build off of the original plan. As far as the Master Plan SWPPP, Rich can break up the property into drainage areas with preliminary plans for stormwater. On the water supply, they’re classified as a public water supply, right.

**Mr. Rennia:** Yes.

**Mr. Setaro:** We’d like to see the permit for each one and the capacities and it’s hard to figure out what the flows are now because they’re so up and down, but I assume that there’s an operator that submits reports every month for both water and sewer. We need to get an idea of what the permit is, the flows, maybe a 30 day average to get the thresholds for what would trigger the expansion of the plant. There will probably be an expansion of both plants, unless the sewer plant has enough.

**Mr. Rennia:** The sewer plant is rated for 30,000 and my projection if they build everything is for 60,000...

**Mr. Setaro:** So that will need an expansion. So as part of this, we want to look at the locations of each plant and make sure that there is viable space to expand, not next to wetlands, etc.

**Chairman Dupree:** When I first started I thought that stormwater was a big SEQRA issue, but I’ve learned since that you can conclude SEQRA and not
have all of the stormwater nailed down completely because you’re either going to get a permit or not. I think the Board will be comfortable moving forward with what you’re talking about.

Mr. Setaro: We do want to make sure in the SEQRA findings that we address it. Not too overboard because there will be change with each phase.

Ms Axelson noted that the phasing order should have flexibility for funding purposes and Mr. Rennia agreed.

Ms. Polidoro: I’m going to stick to the big picture items. With water and sewer...there are currently 5 lots...so for instance, the northern lot, is that going to have its own system or is that proposed to be part of the big system for sewer?

Mr. Rennia: We haven’t gotten to that level of detail yet. I suspect that one option for us to look at is using its own onsite system since it’s a separate lot and the existing house has its own system or it might be easier to work that into pumping that to the sewer treatment plant. That could make sense as well.

Ms. Polidoro: Okay, because what I’m getting at is that you can’t have your systems cross lot lines. They lots were created by filed map and so you do need subdivision to merge them back together, so that’s something you’d have to consider as part of your phasing plan, when would the subdivision be appropriate.

Chairman Dupree: Couldn’t they form a transportation corporation?

Ms. Polidoro: Yes, that’s the other option, although I would doubt that they want to do that.

Mr. Rennia: It’s easier to merge them if they’re going to own it all. Unless they had some idea that they need a different entity within the church to own that for whatever reason, insurance or liability, but I’m just getting.

Ms. Polidoro: Just keep that in mind moving forward that may be an additional approval that’s needed and or a transportation corporation approval from the Town Board. I just want the Board again to consider some design standards and decide whether or not this meets them, so the parking on Crum Elbow Road...108-4.5 says parking shall be located to the rear of front building line of the building it serves. On a corner lot you have two front building lines. Parking shall not dominate any site, cannot have large uninterrupted areas of parking stalls, screening shall be required and also that the primary entrances to any building shall be oriented to the lot frontage, with the secondary entrance oriented to the parking plazas, parks, etc. I just want you to keep
that in mind as you go through your review. I reiterate the need for the traffic impact study and to really pin down...we can't really start the SEQRA process until we have an understanding of how many people are coming to the site and what impacts that entails. I just want to note that the Bog Turtle study seemed to exclude the 5 northern lots, if I was reading it right.

**Mr. Rennia:** The Blandings Turtle study?

**Ms. Polidoro:** One of the studies. I just wanted to make sure that was fine with everyone. It doesn’t look like you’re proposing much disturbance in that area.

**Mr. Rennia:** No, but the zone where the turtles may want to travel through was in this direction. The main area that the trapping study was done at Victory Lake and within the wetland areas in this direction. The preliminary-original master plan had the sanctuary building in this area. When this became a potential travel corridor for Blandings Turtles, that’s when we said, okay what we need to do is pull that out. That’s how that arrived over here and then keeping this as an open area with forest and then a camping area over here.

**Ms Polidoro:** Lastly, I haven’t been to the site yet, are those stream crossings existing?

**Mr. Rennia:** Yes.

**Ms Polidoro:** Okay and they’re not being changed? That’s it for now. It’s obviously premature to circulate.

**Chairman Dupree:** Again this is just Rich wanting to get a feeling from the Board on whether or not they can drill down on details based on a broad understanding of whether we like the overall Master Plan. I spoke to Ms Polidoro today about the primary entrance over here facing the parking lot. I believe there is a secondary entrance over here on the lower level.

**Mr. Rennia:** Yes.

**Chairman Dupree:** Our Code does say that in essence, buildings shouldn’t turn their backs on roads and I believe this will be the primary roadway that the entrance should face onto. It will be up to the Board whether or not you want to require a sidewalk going from all this parking over to there or not. In addition the screening of the parking as we noted at the last meeting, there is a rock out crop that would help provide screening for all this parking and this is actually lower than the roadway here and there is also a green space, an existing hedgerow of trees along here. If we supplement this with some plantings then we would have screening. We kind of discussed a lot of these
standards, but the Board would need to officially opine that we would relax
that standard if we think it’s more logical to have the entrance here where most
of the parking is. Before I call on my colleagues, I for one really like the way
this changed. I like the new kind of roadway here. I like the parking being
tucked as much as possible. This site along here, there is nothing anywhere
near it. In addition, now you have green where you may have parking, but
you’re not going to have parking dominate it because the nature of the use is
that you would only have overflow parking as needed, so that when you drive
down Crum Elbow you’d essentially see some attractive buildings and not
necessarily note that that’s a parking lot depending on what you want to put
underneath there, or leave it grass, but it leaves it green and pervious.

Ms. Dexter: I would echo the Chairman’s comments in their entirety. Really,
awesome turnaround and incorporating everything that you’re hearing.

Mr. Oliver: Again, thank you for your responsiveness. I think that adhering to
our Code on the entrance, I don’t see the sense in doing that and I’m personally
okay with how you have it laid out. I think the internal circulation looks good,
thank you.

Mr. DiNapoli: How many phases do you think will be involved?

Mr. Rennia: A lot. I don’t know off the top of my head, 18? Basically, it’s like
Liz had said, there will be a benefactor that will offer to fund a specific phase.

Mr. Oliver: As the sanctuary goes in, it should jump start the rest of it.

Chairman Dupree: Naming opportunities, those are called.

Ms. DiNapoli: I wanted to thank Liz. She, as always has a way of bringing it
all together and she helped tremendously with refocusing. The reason I asked
how many phases is because I innocently thought 4 or 5 and if there was a way
you could do the master plan, but then also supply us the phases delineated
by color.

Mr. Rennia: We did do something similar to that with highlighting in the
original full-set with bubbles around phases. One of Liz’s comments was that
in between the bubbles are trails, or paths or roads and we’ll tweak that.

Ms. DiNapoli: That helps, thank you.

Ms. Wasser: I echo the comments previously and especially the improvement
in the plan and road connections. I’m happy to see that and appreciate the
response. Just a few quick comments. Regarding whether the sanctuary
building’s back would front one of the roads, I think one of the ways I would be
open to seeing it open to the parking area depends on the architecture of the
building. I think the better the architecture, the more likely I would be to consider the main entry toward the parking area.

Mr. Rennia: With a building this size, it’s likely that for egress reasons there will have to be some doors there just for emergency exits. On the architectural side, we could do some kind of feature. Although it’s not the main entry, there could be some detailing. Something more than just a blank wall.

Ms. Wasser: Some nice fenestration would be good. I would like to see a revised Phase 1 schematic layout to show the addition of the bus parking. What is ‘Downtown Victory Lake’?

Mr. Rennia: Is supposed to be an outdoor type of recreation area.

Chairman Dupree: It’s the central area where most of the children or young people come to play.

Mr. Rennia: It’s this area here which is basically an open outdoor plaza. It’s supposed to be a large outdoor gathering area.

Mr. Pickett: I like the process, the timeliness and how everything has gone. My biggest question coming up now is to see the next rendering of the main sanctuary. How it’s going to fit and look on that corner. It’s going to be big, 61,000 square feet or something like that.

Chairman Dupree: This is the largest new structure that we’re going to see built, in terms of overall footprint. The hotel is going to be taller, but this has a larger footprint.

Ms. Polidoro: Keep in mind they’re seeking a height variance as well.

Ms. Weiser: I echo my colleague’s sentiments. I just had one question now that I know what Downtown Victory Lake is. Between Downtown Victory Lake and building #14 in that area, there’s an orange circle in the center. Is that going to be a building? It doesn’t have a number on it.

Mr. Rennia: I will double check, but I think this is only an outdoor area. The whole thing should be an outdoor plaza unless they had thoughts about having a gazebo there.

Ms. Weiser: That’s it, thank you.

Chairman Dupree: If I can summarize and I think Ms. Wasser you can speak for the Board, that better architecture will help persuade us to allow the main entry along the parking area. It seems as though you heard from everyone that the new layout is acceptable. If I can take a moment to brag on my colleagues
and our consultants, this is another case where the back and forth is helping. Mr. Rennia has already said that what we’re suggesting is actually driving better design for their part too. I find this process really exciting and I think that shows you when you have seasoned and dedicated volunteers up here, it really does make the process work better. It wasn’t that it was a bad layout in the first place, it’s just that it’s more Code compliance and also seems like it’s going to be more welcoming and inviting to people. Instead of cars, you’ll see more of what going on in there when you go by. You have now, I believe all 7 of us saying that the current layout is better. You’ve heard from the consultants in terms of what we’ll need to have, in the Memo. You heard from Ms. Wasser also about redoing Phase 1 to add the bus parking. Otherwise, I think the next time you make a submission we’ll be looking forward to it being more detailed in terms of responding to the CPL Team Memo and also perhaps even before that, coming up with the scope for the traffic impact study. This has been a long gestation, I know. It’s nice to see that it’s starting. I think this is going to be one more thing that helps put Hyde Park on the map. Something exciting in terms of development. We’ll wait to hear from you and get you back on the agenda when we do.

**Mr. Rennia:** Just so everyone knows what we’re working on next is taking Phase 1 and the new layout that everyone is happy with and grading that out because that’s going to create our constraints and then sending that to the architect, who’s going to work on the building. Then we’ll be working on coming up with the traffic impact study scope. Probably the first thing that you’ll hear from us is the scope.

**OTHER BUSINESS:**

**ENCLAVE AT HYDE PARK**

Re-Subdivision Site Plan and Special Use Permit (#16-49)
Location: Cream Street at Long Branch Road
Grid#: 6263-01-465957 (1 of 79 grid #s available upon request)

RESOLUTION GRANTING EXTENSION OF THE TIME TO SATISFY THE CONDITIONS OF SITE PLAN AND SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPROVAL

The Enclave (f/k/a The Meadows)
Two-Family Homes and Membership Club
Phase 4B of Membership Club and Residential Phases 1-25

**Date:** January 16, 2019  **Moved By:** Ms. DiNapoli

**Resolution:** #16-49L  **Seconded By:** Mr. Oliver
WHEREAS, on September 20, 2017, by Resolution #16-49D, the Planning Board granted site plan and special use permit approval to the applicant, 54-Hyde LLC, to establish 25 residential lots containing two-family homes (50 units) and a Membership Club (with separate lots for water and sewer service) in the Greenbelt District in connection with the resubdivision of 116.74 acres (the “Project”); and

WHEREAS, on August 7, 2018, by Resolution #16-49J, the Planning Board amended the conditions of site plan and special use permit approval for the Project; and

WHEREAS, the Project is depicted on a plan set entitled “Subdivision / Site Plan /Special Use Submission Set for The Enclave at Hyde Park” prepared by LRC Group, dated December 7, 2016, as last revised August 23, 2017 (the “Site Plan”); and

WHEREAS, approval of the Site Plan is conditioned on satisfaction of 21 conditions and the special use permits are conditioned on satisfaction of one condition of approval; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to § 108-9.3E(4)(c) of the Zoning Law, conditional approval of a site plan shall expire 180 days after the date of the resolution granting conditional approval, unless such requirements have been certified as completed; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with § 108-9.3E(4)(c) of the Zoning Law, conditional approval will expire on February 2, 2019 if the conditions of approval are not satisfied; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board, in its discretion, may grant up to two 90-day extensions of time in which to satisfy the conditions of site plan approval; and

WHEREAS, by letter dated January 8, 2019, the applicant has requested the first 90-day extension of time in which to satisfy the conditions of site plan approval; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board has considered the circumstances warranting such an extension.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board hereby grants the applicant a 90-day extension of time in which to satisfy the conditions of site plan and special use permit approval to and including May 6, 2019.
VOICE VOTE 7-0 Motion Carried

MOTION: Ms. DiNapoli
SECOND: Mr. Oliver

To Approve the Minutes from the December 19, 2018 Meeting of the Hyde Park Planning Board.

Aye Mr. Dupree
Aye Ms. DiNapoli
Aye Ms. Dexter
Aye Ms. DiNapoli
Aye Ms. Weiser
Aye Mr. Oliver
Aye Mr. Pickett
Aye Ms. Wasser
Aye Ms. Weiser

VOICE VOTE 7-0 Motion Carried

MOTION: Ms. DiNapoli
SECOND: Mr. Oliver

To Approve the Minutes from the January 2, 2019 Meeting of the Hyde Park Planning Board.

Aye Mr. Dupree
Aye Ms. DiNapoli
Aye Ms. Dexter
Aye Ms. Weiser
Aye Mr. Oliver
Aye Mr. Pickett
Aye Ms. Wasser
Recused Ms. Wasser

VOICE VOTE 6-0 1-recused Motion Carried

MOTION: Ms. DiNapoli
SECOND: Ms. Oliver
To adjourn.

    Aye    Mr. Dupree
    Aye    Ms. Dexter
    Aye    Ms. DiNapoli
    Aye    Mr. Oliver
    Aye    Mr. Pickett
    Aye    Ms. Wasser
    Aye    Ms. Weiser

VOICE VOTE    7-0    Motion Carried

From the February 6, 2019 Hyde Park Planning Board Meeting:

MOTION: Ms. DiNapoli
SECOND: Ms. Wasser

To Approve the Minutes from the January 16, 2019 Meeting of the Hyde Park Planning Board.

    Absent    Mr. Dupree
    Aye    Ms. DiNapoli
    Aye    Ms. Dexter
    Aye    Ms. Weiser
    Aye    Mr. Oliver
    Aye    Mr. Pickett
    Aye    Ms. Wasser

VOICE VOTE    6-0    1-absent    Motion Carried