

**TOWN OF EAST FISHKILL
PLANNING BOARD SPECIAL MEETING
JULY 18, 2023**

Chairperson John Eickman called the meeting to order.

Members present:

John Greenan, Don Papae, Lori Gee, Richard Campbell, John Eickman, Ed Myoshi, Sarah Bledsoe; Scott Bryant, Engineer; Peter Setaro, Engineer; Matt Rickett, Zoning Administrator; Frank Rufino, Fire Advisory Board; Chris Jodlowski, Board of Fire Commissioners; Staff: Jackie Keenan, Clerk.

The meeting began with the Pledge of Allegiance.

CHAIRPERSON COMMENTS

Mr. Eickman stated that the upcoming meetings were Tuesday, August 15, 2023, and Tuesday, September 19, 2023.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

June 20, 2023

Mr. Eickman stated since the entire Board had not yet had a chance to review the minutes, they will be held over until the August 15, 2023, meeting.

ADJOURNED PUBLIC HEARING:

2023- 051 – Rising Sky Housing, Donovan Drive (6455-00-288434)

Applicant is proposing a 9000 sf building on 2.047 acres to have a contractor yard and building

to be used by contractors for storage and equipment.

Joseph Berger was present.

Mr. Berger stated they are proposing a 9000 sq. ft. contractors' yard and building on a 2+ acre lot on Donovan Drive. Parking for the commercial vehicles will be in the back with just employee parking in the front. It is serviced with a subsurface sewage disposal in the front and a well. Storm water will be collected and drain into an infiltration system in the front, which will have an overflow connection into the Town system on Donovan Drive. They are proposing a retaining wall between their property and the daycare center, which will have a vinyl fence on top. There were photos provided of the vinyl fence and the proposed wall. The fence will act as both a visual and a sound barrier from the trucks in the back. The trucks will be leaving in the morning and coming back late at night so there won't be much traffic during the day when the daycare center is operating. Most often the contractors will be gone during the day. Recognizing there will be some backup sounds they did do an analysis to show that they are within the Town Code. There was a question asking if they could do something to beautify the wall and fence between those two properties. Mr. Berger supplied a photo of the retaining wall which they could line with shrubs or a hedgerow at the base between the wall and the property line. They would not want to plant trees there. He stated the lighting in the back is just for when it is being used so it will be on motion detectors. Once the contractors leave at the end of the night the lights go off. All the lighting is dark sky compliant. Mr. Campbell asked if the choice of lighting was delineated on the plan and Mr. Berger said yes. Mr. Campbell asked if they had an anticipated time of construction from start to finish. Mr. Berger stated in this environment it is difficult to get materials to build. They would love to see it finished in six months but more than likely it will be a year.

Chairperson Eickman asked what the total height of the wall and the fence were. Mr. Berger stated the fence is 6 feet and the wall varies from 4 feet to 6 feet. Attorney Cunningham stated last year the Town Board amended its ordinance that fence in industrial zones can go up to 12 feet.

Chairperson Eickman asked if the fence ended just before the very front of the property and if there was a way to create a barrier between the very front portion of the property and the daycare center. Mr. Berger stated they can extend it right up to the property line if the Board would like it. They ended it at the proposed location for grading purposes but are happy to extend it all the way out.

Ms. Robbins stated the daycare has informed them that there is a bus stop right at the cul-de-sac. She believes that might have to be changed. It is located in the cul-de-sac instead of the driveway because they can see the bus from inside the building. There is some concern that there might be some conflict there. Mr. Campbell asked if the children were received by somebody in the cul-de-sac and Ms. Robbins said yes. Even though it is in an industrial zone there has not been anything going on there so the daycare has been able to use that area without conflicts. Ms. Gee asked if they needed to consider posting a "children at play" sign in the area. Ms. Robbins stated it would not be a bad idea. Attorney Cunningham stated that is something that they can talk to the Highway Department about.

Ms. Robbins stated it is very quiet right there now because the whole area is wooded. Trucks can be a little bit noisy, so the vinyl fence will help attenuate some of that noise. There are classrooms that face that wall and little fenced in areas for the smaller children. It is a very tiny area which is approximately 15 feet from the fence line. They have been talking with the daycare center to find out if they would like just a wall there or if they would like it softened by having some shrubbery there. The daycare has voiced safety concerns about the woods because they can see into them. They might prefer just the fence, but Ms. Robbins is unsure yet so she would like some flexibility in deciding what goes on that fence line. She stated her other concern is that during construction it is very close so they will have to figure out how to keep it fenced off during construction. Mr. Berger stated they are planning on having a construction fence all the way around the zone. Ms. Robbins asked if it would be a chain-link fence and Mr. Berger said no, just the orange fence. Ms. Robbins stated she is unsure if the orange fence would stop a

curious child. Mr. Berger stated the first item of work could be putting up a wall and the fence. He stated the wall needs to go up first anyway in order to delineate the grading.

Chairperson Eickman asked if there were any other questions or comments from Board members. Mr. Greenan asked why the fence stops right at the playground next door. Mr. Berger stated it stops there because it starts going up the hill and this grade is steeper there. They did extend the fence further than the elevation so no sound would creep around it.

Mr. Setara from CPL stated Mr. Moore had sent out a letter today. Most of the prior comments have been addressed. There were some minor storm water design comments. The only other issue is the monument signs are proposed to be within the Town right-of-way. He is unsure what type of agreement that will require. Attorney Cunningham stated that would require a license agreement or they could move it back on to their own property. That would be the best and easiest option. Mr. Berger said there are storm water facilities right there, but they can probably move the sign into there as well. Ms. Robbins suggested putting the sign on the gate across the front as an option as well.

There were no other questions or comments from Board members. Ms. Robbins stated if the applicant makes most of those changes by the next meeting, they will probably be ready to propose a resolution at that point.

PUBLIC HEARING:

#2023-062-Formicola Subdivision, 378 Route 376 (6457-03-392487)

Applicant is applying for a 2-lot subdivision. Lot #1 will be 2 acres with the existing house. Lot #2 will be 1.6 acres for a future dwelling.

Brian Stokosa was present.

Mr. Stokosa stated this application was before the Board last month. It is for a two-lot split on Route 376 next to the ball fields and Town Hall. There is an existing house on just over 3 acres. The proposal is to subdivide it into one new residential lot with one driveway access on to Route 376. As discussed at the last meeting, being sensitive to the ballparks behind them, they are showing a 30-foot restricted easement along the entire rear portion of the property to ensure that the vegetative buffer remains. It will provide a buffer between the ball fields and any future homeowner there. They have been out there with the Board of Health and done some soil tests. They came back good as they are in a gravelly loam site. They have reached out to DOT and are hoping to have a meeting on site toward the end of next week to discuss the new driveway entrance where the proposed house is.

Chairperson Eickman stated they did talk about a possible easement for a potential sidewalk in the future. He asked if that was part of this application. Mr. Stokosa said yes. They wanted to get things set with the Department of Health regarding the soil tests first. Chairperson Eickman asked if there were questions or comments from Board members.

Mr. Miyoshi asked if this was going to have a well and a septic or if they were connecting to the Town water and sewer. Mr. Stokosa stated water is not in that stretch of roadway.

Mr. Setaro stated the majority of Mr. Moore's prior comments were addressed. Regarding the 30-foot buffer strip, he recommends as a condition of approval that the monuments are installed before the master signed. That way it is there right away if someone buys the lot. That will prevent someone from accidentally clearcutting the area. He recommended spacing them with not just one on either end, but between 100 and 150 feet apart as well.

Ms. Robbins stated that she would like to see them preserve a strip of land across the front for a future sidewalk in the event that they decide they want to do that since the other side of the road is almost impossible to put a sidewalk on. She believes that in the rest of the site there is an additional right-of-way and utility poles through the site as well.

MOTION made by Richard Campbell, seconded by Lori Gee, to open the Public Hearing. Voted and carried unanimously.

Chairperson Eickman asked if there were any members of the public to speak for or against this project. There were none.

Attorney Cunningham asked if the applicant would be willing to extend the voting deadline because the September meeting falls outside of the 62 days. He asked if it could be extended to the October meeting and Mr. Stokosa said that was fine.

MOTION made by Richard Campbell, seconded by Lori Gee, to close the Public Hearing. Voted and carried unanimously.

DISCUSSIONS:

DISCUSSION:

#2023-060 – Stormville Square, 194-198 Route 216. (6657-03-064313, 066295)

Applicant is applying for an amended site plan for a climate-controlled storage building. Changes include reducing the footprint of the building by making it two-stories, 36,000 sq. ft. and eliminating the 13’ retaining wall.

Brian Stokosa was present.

Chairperson Eickman stated they need to declare intent to be lead agency on this application.

MOTION made by Richard Campbell, seconded by Sarah Bledsoe, to declare intent for lead agency. Voted and carried unanimously.

Mr. Stokosa stated they had a discussion at the last meeting about the revisions they wanted to make going from a larger building to a two-story building with the same square footage. They revised the grading slightly and tightened up the curb lines so they could run a tractor-trailer. They

started putting spot level elevations on the plans and adjusted the drainage. They did put a lot of time and effort into the original SWPPP that was approved that supported the bigger building footprints and larger parking area. After speaking with the applicant, they are just going to retain what they have as far as the drainage and modify their basins to fit into the older system, which is actually oversized. They introduced back the concepts that were discussed at the last approval, which is the landscape buffer along the residential portion between their property to the South and to the East. They will have that same tightly stacked Evergreen pattern and a fence along the eastern side of the top in case anything rolls down the hill. They will continue the tree line around the top where it leads into the retaining walls. The retaining wall locations remain in the same spots as on the original approved plan. They have lowered them slightly because of the footprint being pushed in and tightened around the building. They are in the process of closing out the DOT permit at the entrance. They are working on the final as-built for the improvements for the new commercial entrance and the closing of the old entrance where the existing retail is upfront. They are hoping to schedule this for a Public Hearing, and they will be submitting to the ARB with their updated renderings. It is the same concept and same colors, just a two-story presentation. They are shooting for August to be on the ARB agenda.

Chairperson Eickman asked if they had been before the Fire Advisory Board. Mr. Stokosa stated he believes the FAB did review the application. There were some comments that came back. Mr. Rufino stated they did have comments regarding access to the building. They understand there is access from the back into the second floor and from the front into the first floor. Mr. Stokosa stated that is correct and on the sides of the retaining walls will be offset from the building 68 feet so there is a large four-door that will provide access to the back of the building. There will be a central hallway in the back and part of their Life Safety Plan will include access points for the back of the sites. Mr. Rufino asked if there were internal staircases between the floors. Mr. Stokosa said yes, there will be. Mr. Rufino asked what the height of the building would be. Mr. Stokosa stated he believes they are at 23 feet.

Chairperson Eickman asked if there were other questions or comments from Board members. Mr.

Miyoshi asked if the new retaining walls were shorter. Mr. Stokosa said yes. By taking the building from the larger footprints and compressing it and going up there was a substantial wall reduction. The original proposal was for 14 - 15 feet high and that has been removed in its entirety and it is now just graded. What you can see at the site now is roughly what the final grade is going to be. They could be a little bit of shading to make the turn going north to west a little easier but what is on site is close to what final will be.

Chairperson Eickman asked if they are bringing in a lot of fill. Mr. Stokosa stated they are not bringing in any. Mr. Setaro stated that one of the sheets has a cut and fill calculation and he believed it said 10,000 cubic yards of fill to be brought in. Mr. Stokosa stated that may have been an old table. He said there will be zero fill coming in or going out. They did push a lot of fill into the front, specifically where they had the approved storm water area to level the site down. He believes they are under 300 yards. Mr. Setaro stated there were a few more comments from Mr. Moore but nothing major that could not be worked out with Mr. Stokosa.

Ms. Robbins stated that the applicant had clear-cut most of the site and there is a slope right now so there is a small concern that there could be some erosion. They are showing some plantings and the Board needs to make sure that the plantings will handle any of the erosion. They should re-vegetate some of the slope that was clear-cut. The Board may want some additional plantings. Also, along the property line with the residential, the applicant might be better served staggering the trees line instead of making a straight-line. Mr. Stokosa stated where the retaining wall is currently is pretty tight but as they move past the building, they do have the ability to do that. Ms. Robbins stated the public hearing that the applicant would like to schedule will also be the public hearing for the ARB. The applicant will need to bring the elevations with them. If it turns out that they will need more cut and fill they will also need to advertise for that special permit as well. Mr. Stokosa stated he is 100% confident they will not need it.

Chairperson Eickman asked if there were any questions or comments. There were none.

Ms. Gee asked that the application be reviewed again by the ARB. Ms. Robbins stated the ARB's meeting will be before this Public Hearing.

MOTION made by Lori Gee, seconded by Richard Campbell, to schedule this application for a Public Hearing on August 15, 2023. Voted and carried unanimously.

DISCUSSION:

#2023-067 – J.F.E. Associates, 2528 Route 52 (6456-02-885563)

Applicant is applying to amend their site plan to install three practice softball fields.

Michael Gillespie was present.

Mr. Gillespie stated this is the property that has the small dome at the East Fishkill Golf Center. It is next to the property owned by the Fire District. What exists there now is a small dome and the golf range. The Huskies are a girls softball travel organization that has been using the enclosed area of the site for approximately 10 years. They have a need to provide additional space, as they are growing. This is their main hub site for practicing. They're looking to use the front of the site to install a couple of ball fields. They're not looking to set up tournaments at this location. There will be three fields, one smaller for juniors and two standard sized ones. They're not proposing any fencing, dugouts, or backstops. These are just etched areas in the field to be used by players for the purpose of practice. In this particular zoning area, it is required to have a 100-foot setback for any structures. The line of the larger fields run that 100-foot mark. It will be far off the road. The two bigger fields will be batting towards the golf range and the smaller one will be in the back corner batting towards Route 52, but those are the juniors, and they don't foresee them hitting as far as older girls. Right now, it is a big grassy field. There are a few golf sticks for promotional purposes to bring people into the site. Those would be removed. The area would be cut, and these are what they call fully skinned fields. That means the infield area inside the bases is just clay or dirt. It is the same as fields two and three at the recreation park. The note

regarding the area of disturbance is really just the area of concentration where the work they are doing is. There will not be a whole lot of disturbance to the site other than those areas. The area is pretty flat so in terms of grading and pushing dirt around they don't anticipate much of that. The client was supposed to be here to fill the Board in on more regarding the organization, but he is not here. It is a pretty straightforward proposal.

Mr. Campbell asked if anything was going to be eradicated or if it will just be strictly fields going down on the grassy area with no changes impinging on parking or anything else. Mr. Gillespie stated no. His own daughter was involved with this organization for a while and the parking is very underutilized there. The thought might be that with additional fields there will be additional children and more traffic, but it is really a matter of indoor practice versus outdoor practice. As long as the weather is decent, they prefer to be outside.

Mr. Myoshi asked if this would be 100 feet off Route 52 so there would be no chance of stray balls hitting vehicles. Mr. Gillespie said that is correct and the two larger fields have been oriented to have batting going into the site. Field three in Town is where the juniors and the seniors play. That is behind the basketball hoops. Occasionally a ball will stray out and hit a car that is facing those fields right at the basketball area. That is not close to 100 feet away. He does not see any balls being fouled off or kicked back or hit onto Route 52.

Ms. Gee asked if the orientation of these fields would have any ball travel towards where there is parking or near the travel way to the dome, since he said no nets were going up. Mr. Gillespie stated there is parking between the dome facility and Route 52. Pedestrian traffic would not be venturing out by the main road. Mr. Gillespie stated the field to the east is where the batting cages are. The next one in the middle has a corner on the left side that a strong hitter could have the possibility of hitting a car. He stated most people just don't park there.

Chairperson Eickman asked if there was any chance of impacting any the residents nearby. Mr. Gillespie stated the abandoned restaurant is to the left and the fire district to the right. That is

quite a good distance away in terms of the buildings and driveway.

Mr. Greenan asked if they anticipate these fields being used all at one time and Mr. Gillespie said he can see that happening. Right now, two or three groups will come into the dome and practice by moving from station to station. It would be a huge advantage to be able to come out and use additional fields. The dome has been great for them, but it is getting a little tight. Mr. Greenan asked how many additional cars would be coming out traveling in that area if all three fields were in use. Mr. Gillespie stated each team could have at least 12 cars so with coaches it could be an additional 40 to 50 cars. A lot of it is drop-off and come back and a lot of it is share driving because some of these kids are coming from Westchester and other areas. He feels that there is more than adequate parking on-site.

Mr. Campbell asked if that meant there would be no opposing teams coming to play. That would really increase the parking use. Mr. Gillespie stated he was unsure. Mr. Campbell asked if there was any parking space count that they have for that location, knowing that it is all gravel and unmarked. Ms. Robbins stated she wanted to hear first how they were planning on using the fields before she tried to make a determination. She said they may need to look at the parking and maybe put some use restrictions on it if they feel there will be an issue. Mr. Gillespie stated there is an original approved site plan on file so there should be a hard count for parking someplace. He stated he could get that parking amount determined and get clarification from the owner of the Huskies.

Mr. Campbell stated his concern would be that if there are three fields going with everyone playing, there needs to be a protected area for people who are off the fields to gather. Ms. Robbins stated that along the driveway she has concerns regarding foul balls. She is feeling there needs to be some sort of netting there. Mr. Campbell agreed that there had to be some sort of protective area. Ms. Bledsoe stated the batting cages are enclosed but the waiting area is not. That will back up to the middle of field two and three. Mr. Campbell stated with the driving range there, they have to be watching for people walking in that area as well.

Ms. Robbins asked Mr. Gillespie if the existing dome is operating under a special permit for outdoor recreation developments. Mr. Gillespie said yes. Ms. Robbins stated that since it is already operating under a special permit, in order to do the fields and include the existing fields that were added afterwards they will need to amend the special permit. Attorney Cunningham said that was correct. Mr. Campbell asked if that permit had run out or if it was indefinite. Attorney Cunningham stated generally speaking it is indefinite as long as the use is ongoing. Chairperson Eickman asked if that amendment was to be made by the Planning Board or the Town Board. Ms. Robbins stated it is a Planning Board special amendment. Attorney Cunningham stated the applicant should be in touch with Mr. Fitzgerald and his team as they will probably have comments as well as the DOT. Ms. Robbins stated there is a requirement for 30 spaces per backstop in the special permit. They will have to review that. There is also a section of the special permit that allows the Planning Board to grant relief from the parking requirements. Fencing is also a requirement of the special permit for active recreation facilities and that is also subject and at the discretion of the Planning Board. She asked if there would be any lighting and Mr. Gillespie said no.

Ms. Bledsoe asked how many fields were inside the dome. Mr. Gillespie stated just one. It does meet the standard size relative to a full-size field. There's more training going on there and ball games being played. The area inside just does not allow for that. If they need to scrimmage or do tournaments, they go to the town or rent out fields.

Ms. Robbins stated as part of the special permit there is also a community benefit requirement. They will need to see if there is any way for community benefit with field or time use, and if so, it would be helpful to have that for the next meeting. Mr. Campbell stated that would become the definitive problem if our recreation department started to use those fields because then you're talking about men being on those fields and cranking softballs out towards Route 52 with zero safety nets in place. Ms. Robbins stated they could limit the use to youth programs, but those restrictions would have to be put in the special permit. Mr. Gillespie stated the intent of this

proposal is not for it to become something out of hand, which is why there are no dugouts or backstops. Mr. Campbell stated he is sure there is a cost involved in doing this type of project but having zero safeties in place is a little Wild West.

Mr. Rufino asked about ambulance access into that area. Mr. Gillespie stated the access way cuts across the parking lot. They would be able to get an ambulance up to the edge of the field on field number two. Mr. Jodlowski stated his concern would be anyone with their back to the lower fields, as they might be inclined to get hit in the back of the head with a straight foul ball from the other fields. Mr. Gillespie stated maybe the solution would be a piece of 6- or 8-foot-high fencing along where the girls stand. Ms. Robbins stated there must be some sort of standard practice that they should be able to do some research on, understanding that they are practice fields but also understanding that they have a way of morphing into other uses. Mr. Campbell stated the applicant is trying to quadruple what is there now, so they do need to review safety measures as part of the trade-off and find out what the best practices for this type of use are.

REFERAL FROM TOWN BOARD:

Chairperson Eickman stated 90 Old Route 52, Stormville, has been referred to the Planning Board. Ms. Robbins stated there was a request by the applicant to move into an existing building that is in the Hamlet of Stormville. It is zoned R1, so it is residential. In the past it had been used as a gun range and a gunshop. More recently it was Tumbleweed Daycare. Daycare is a special permit use in a residential zone. They were able to get that special permit use. The applicant has come to the Town interested in using the building as an art gallery and storage location for Life Energy Arts Center. Ms. Robbins did send an e-mail around with information about it. The planned usage will be primarily as a storage site housing the fine art painting collection of John Diamond M.D., which is nearly 45,000 individual works. They would set up a by-appointment art gallery and various museum/library type rooms featuring his other works and collections, which may also serve on a limited basis as a teaching and learning area. Occasional meetings might held either in the gallery

or in one of those teaching spaces. One or more staff members may eventually work regularly from this building, although not for the foreseeable future. There are no employees proposed right now. Their argument requesting the zoning change is that this would be a low traffic, low impact proposed use. The historic usage of the building was for commercial businesses. It would be close to B1 properties now. It is over the tracks from the center of the Hamlet. If you go into the Hamlet, there are some commercially zoned buildings but most of the property on their side of the tracks are residential. She stated although this particular use would be low impact, they have to consider what could be used in the future if it wasn't this use and was rezoned. This board can recommend to the Town Board that the applicant apply for a use variance. It might be hard for them to get that. This Board can recommend that they rezone it to an existing business district that exists. They could recommend that they create a special permit for this type of use and maybe there are some other properties in town that could benefit from that. That would really restrict the uses that could occur on the property and could be considered sort of a transitional zone between residential and commercial. There are a few properties that are kind of in between. They do need to supply some feedback to the Town Board as they have to consider whether or not to grant this type of rezoning. They are specifically asking to go to something commercial, but the Town does not have many options for commercialized properties. The only commercial zoning they would probably go to is a B-1 but that might be a too high intensity use. That means later it could be a restaurant or retail business and that is a very residential area. In her opinion, B1 would not be the correct rezoning.

Ms. Gee stated in a R1 there are uses like daycare and an accessory doctor's office. She asked what the other accessory uses or special permit uses were. Ms. Robbins stated the most ideal would have been historic structures, which it may have been at one time but does not look like that anymore. She is also not sure it is on the list. Museums and galleries can be offered in that special permit, and they can condition for that. They might have the opportunity to propose something to the Town Board that they consider for properties similar to this. There are some other properties in other locations that may benefit from something like this. Mr. Miyoshi asked if there was B1 zoning across the street that is undeveloped right now. Ms. Robbins said there is B1 zoning in the Stormville Hamlet. On the side of the tracks where this building is located it is all R1. Mr.

Campbell asked if they own this building, or they are going to rent it. Ms. Robbins stated they are considering purchasing it. They currently have a gallery in Mount Kisco. It seems like they are trying to phase out of that gallery. It doesn't look like they get much traffic there. She stated she is less worried about this use than about the future business coming in.

Ms. Gee stated she would be leaning more towards the special permit instead of rezoning. Mr. Campbell agreed. Chairperson Eickman stated he thought something on their website said they do reproductions with special inks and special paper. He asked if they plan on doing that at this location. Ms. Robbins stated they did not mention that. She can ask that question. Mr. Campbell asked if this artist was deceased, and Chairperson Eickman stated he believed he passed in 2021. Ms. Robbins asked the Board to think about it and then send her any thoughts as to if it was a special permit what types of use might be allowed other than an art gallery and storage. Would they allow an architect's office or psychologist but not the full medical group for example. They would need to limit the number of employees. Mr. Setaro stated their type of uses would be dependent on water and sewer as well. Mr. Campbell stated you have to be careful labeling it as an art studio because that could open it up to welding or metallic's which could increase their water use. He is not sure how they could limit specific uses like that. Ms. Robbins stated she believes they would have to limit it to a transitional use between residential to very low impact commercial use. Attorney Cunningham stated they would have to specify no manufacturing or welding as an example. Mr. Campbell stated they will have to be careful because sometimes arts can lead to things that could be construed as manufacturing. Ms. Robbins suggested possibly just storage and a gallery but no production. Mr. Miyoshi stated he would be leaning towards some kind of tie into the rail trail.

Chairperson Eickman asked how big the building is. Mr. Greenan stated it is listed as 7124 total square feet and it has a full basement. It is a little under an acre of property. There is also not a lot of parking there.

Ms. Robbins stated if the Board has any recommendations or restrictions that they would like to

see presented to the Town Board to please get them back to her in the next few weeks. Ms. Bledsoe stated for further discussion she will recuse herself as she has relatives that live adjacent to the property. Mr. Campbell suggested a possible site visit so that the Board understands what exists there now. Ms. Robbins stated that was a good idea. It would also be a good idea to get a sense of the neighborhood.

Chairperson Eickman asked if there was any further business to be brought before the Board. There was not.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION made by Sarah Bledsoe, seconded by Richard Campbell, to adjourn the Planning Board meeting. Voted and carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted:

Julie J. Beyer, Meeting Secretary
East Fishkill Planning Board