

PLANNING BOARD

TOWN OF TISBURY
P.O. BOX 602
TOWN HALL ANNEX
VINEYARD HAVEN, MASSACHUSETTS 02568
(508) 696-4270
Fax (508) 696-7341
www.tisburyma.gov

MEETING MINUTES

DATE: April 20, 2016

TIME: 6:00 PM

PLACE: Town Hall Annex, 66 High Point Lane

ATTENDANCE: C. Doble, D. Bellante-Holand, B. Robinson, D. Seidman and H. Stephenson

MINUTES: As referred in the February 3, 2016 Meeting Agenda
03 February 2016 - AVAILABLE

BILLS: Tisbury Printer.....\$400.00

APPOINTMENT:

6:00 PM Public Hearing: James Goff – Special Permit Application for Wolf’s Den Pizzeria’s expansion (seating), AP 09B17
Attendance: J. Goff and M. Loberg (6:05P)

Hearing commenced in due form at 6PM. D. Seidman, Planning Board Chairman read the public hearing notice into the minutes, in which the aforementioned applicant is proposing to expand an existing food service establishment within the Commercial Management Area of the Waterfront Commercial District.

J. Goff, the proprietor of the pizzeria explained that a fellow tenant had approached him to inquire if he was interested in acquiring an additional 200 sq. ft. of retail space for his food service establishment because they were downsizing their office space. J. Goff accepted the offer and explained that he planned to create an entrance from the front of the counter to the rear area of the real estate office and separate the two businesses with the construction of a wall.

B. Robinson inquired if they had a bathroom. J. Goff replied in the affirmative, noting that it was currently available for staff only. He mentioned that it was public ready and used by the real estate office. He added that the food service establishment currently had sufficient water usage to accommodate 8 seats, and handicap accessible.

J. Goff informed the Board that he had submitted an application to the Sewer Advisory Board approximately one month ago to request an increase (100 gallons) in water usage to accommodate an additional 4 seats for a total of 12, but was advised that his application had not been acted upon because the Board had not met and the DPW Director was on vacation. He asked the Board if they would move forward on the application and grant him permission for the 12 seats, upon approval from the Sewer Advisory Board.

J. Goff indicated that he had asked the Board if he could change the hours of operation to allow him to serve breakfast awhile back, but he did not pursue it because of staffing issues. He was still considering the idea, and wanted to incorporate the service into his special permit.

J. Goff indicated that he had access to seventeen parking spaces after 5PM. Seven were designated exclusively for his business, and the remaining ten came from Ace Hardware (3 spaces), the real estate office (3 spaces) and the area in the back of the restaurant (4-5 spaces). J. Goff indicated that his patrons never had an issue with parking. His issues lie with his neighbor, the Artcliff Diner. He complained that the Artcliff Diner did not have sufficient parking for its patrons.

B. Robinson inquired about the makeup of his clientele. He asked if the majority walked or drove to the pizzeria. J. Goff replied that the vast majority were walk-ins. Business in the winter dropped substantially because he did not have seating accommodations. B. Robinson asked J. Goff if he had approached the MV Commission about revising the conditions of their decision DRI 626, pertaining to the seating capacity. J. Goff was not aware that his establishment was designated a DRI.

C. Doble inquired if he was still using the picnic tables. J. Goff replied in the affirmative, and explained that while he owned the picnic tables, they were available to the public. C. Doble questioned whether the seventeen parking spaces were sufficient to accommodate the take-out service, if patrons stayed to eat on the premises. J. Goff believed he would be able to accommodate his patrons. C. Doble inquired about the distribution of business. J. Goff answered that he did one-quarter of his business during lunch and three quarters of his business during dinner (5P-9P). D. Seidman inquired if the percentage was the same during the summer. J. Goff replied in the affirmative.

B. Robinson inquired about the referral. Board members discussed the subject, and D. Seidman concurred that the application had to be referred, since it had been reviewed as a DRI. D. Bellante-Holand asked the Board Chairman if they could expedite the process if they communicated with the MV Commission. D. Seidman noted that the Board could submit a written comment. The one item he was emphatically against seeing in the pizzeria was the sale of beer and wine. J. Goff did not have any intention of providing alcoholic beverages in the family establishment.

H. Stephenson inquired if the seating accommodations were limited to dinner, after 5PM. J. Goff replied in the negative, stating that he intended to open the dining area at 11A.

D. Seidman informed the Board that they received correspondence from the Board of Health affirming that the applicant had sufficient wastewater capacity to accommodate 8 seats. They did not have an issue with the 4 additional seats, provided they were approved by the Sewer Review Board. The letter also mentioned that the one handicap accessible restroom was acceptable by the Board of Health Commissioners and Plumbing Inspector, since the food service establishment had less than twenty seats.

Board members were advised that they received a second letter from the property manager, Mark Jones permitting the applicant to secure the necessary permits to pursue the expansion of the pizzeria, including the MV Commission.

M. Loberg, member of the Board of Selectmen affirmed that the Sewer Review was in the process of being re-established, given that the town had recently approved its restructure. In

the interim, she offered to look into the possibility of having the request reviewed and approved by the Board of Selectmen. She did not know if it was possible, but she offered to look into the matter.

There being no further discussion, B. Robinson moved to refer the applicant's proposal to the MV Commission. C. Doble seconded the motion, which motion carried. m/s/c 5/0/0

D. Seidman entertained a motion to continue the public hearing on May 18, 2016 to give the MV Commission the opportunity to respond to their referral. B. Robinson moved to continue the hearing on May 18, 2016 at 6PM. H. Stephenson seconded the motion. The motion carried. 5/0/0

The Planning Board resumed their regularly scheduled session at 6:20 PM.

6:45 PM Public Hearing: Marian R. Halperin, Tr. et. al. – Special Permit Application
for an accelerated Rate of Development Schedule
Attendance: D. Hoehn, SB&H Inc.; F. Markwica, broker at Sandpiper Realty

Hearing commenced in due form at 6:45 PM. Planning Board Chairman, D. Seidman read the public hearing notice into the minutes. Board members were advised that the applicants had submitted an application for a special permit to accelerate the rate of development for a four lot subdivision that was approved in December 17, 2008. Submitted with the application was a copy of a Form C plan of land approved on September 23, 2008.

D. Hoehn informed the board that none of the lots had generated any interest over the past eight years, until recently. The sudden interest in the lots prompted his clients to apply for an accelerated rate of development schedule to two lots per year, because the prospective buyers were concerned about securing building permits. Board members were given a copy of the proposed Rate of Development Schedule. The document dated 20 April 2016 listed Lots 2 & 4 for 2016 and Lots 1 & 3 in 2017.

D. Hoehn provided the Board with a copy of the applicable regulation, section 04.07.05 entitled "exemptions" that listed the criteria the Planning Board could consider in granting the special permit. D. Hoehn believed the applicants in this instance qualified under the following provisions: 1) housing for low income or elderly persons and 2) minimization of traffic congestion. He explained that M. Halperin had conveyed one of the lots to a non-profit organization known as Habitat for Humanity for \$99.00 at the time the property was subdivided. He believed the applicants met an additional criteria when they forwent their individual accesses on Edgartown Road to the one subdivision road, and granted an abutter (D. Dandridge) an access easement on the subdivision road to eliminate the need for another curb cut on Edgartown Road.

F. Markwica informed the Board that two of the three parties wanted to live on the island year round. In some sense the lots were affordable, because they were selling at \$250,000.00. D. Seidman did not think Habitat for Humanity was going to develop the lot in the immediate or near future. D. Hoehn understood that they were thinking about selling the lot at market value and using the funds to develop elsewhere. D. Seidman believed if that was in fact their plan, they were not entitled to the exemption. F. Markwica spoke with Margot from Habitat for Humanity and learned that they were not planning on developing the lot until 2017.

D. Seidman inquired if any of the lots had been purchased. F. Markwica replied that they were under a PNS agreement, subject to the approval of the accelerated Rate of Development

Schedule. B. Robinson questioned the application of the regulation when Lot 1 was not slated for 2016. D. Seidman questioned whether the two lots in 2016 were going to be developed by the end of the calendar year. D. Hoehn explained that the regulation applied to all lots within the development, so that the affordable lot did not have to be developed first. The intent for the regulation was to stagger the development of lots in order to minimize the strain on town services.

H. Stephenson thought it was less disruptive to the neighborhood to have the four lots developed within two years. She also thought that if they were going to develop the lot for affordable housing, it did not matter that it was going to be constructed in 2016 or 2017. B. Robinson did not think the applicant qualified under the low income or elderly housing criteria, if Habitat for Humanity intended to sell the lot at market value. He believed the intent for the bylaw was to have the property developed for affordable housing.

D. Hoehn noted that the developers also granted D. Dandridge an access easement on the subdivision road to negate the necessity of returning to the Planning Board for a special permit. D. Seidman did not think they could claim the benefit retroactively because the access easement was in existence.

D. Seidman noted that there were three applicants. He asked D. Hoehn if he was acting on their behalf as their agent. D. Hoehn replied in the affirmative. D. Seidman inquired if had a letter attesting to the fact. D. Hoehn noted that he was not asked to submit the information, but offered to do so.

B. Robinson questioned whether the applicant qualified for the provision that pertained to low income housing because the proposal did not include the affordable lot in the first year. C. Doble thought the regulation was intended to expedite the availability of affordable housing, whereas the proposal essentially accelerated the development of the market rate lots. She therefore agreed with B. Robinson that the applicable regulation could be the minimization of traffic congestion because it eliminated the need for an additional curb cut on Edgartown Road. D. Hoehn added that the developers did so by granting D. Dandridge an access easement on the subdivision road, so that if he ever decided to divide his property the lots would have frontage and access from Marion's Way.

B. Robinson referred the Board to the aerial photo and demonstrated that the property was not located in a congested area. He did not believe they would overburden the town services or add to traffic congestion if they allowed the development of two lots per year. C. Doble concurred.

D. Bellante-Holand noted that the regulation allowed the Planning Board to grant a special permit if the applicant offsets any perceived burden(s) placed upon the town. Although she'd hesitate to grant an exception, she felt the applicant qualified. D. Hoehn reiterated that when the land was subdivided in 2008, one of the developers, M. Halperin did so to create a lot that she wanted to give to Habitat for Humanity. Lot 1 was sold to Habitat for Humanity for \$99.00.

H. Stephenson did not believe the development of the four lots would have an impact upon the town in assimilating additional dwelling structures. It was her additional impression that when one of the developers assigned one of the lots to Habitat for Humanity, they met the provision for low income housing. D. Seidman thought the provision required the lot to be developed with low income housing. H. Stephenson noted that if the sold at market value, the funds would still be used to create affordable housing.

D. Seidman agreed that the four lot subdivision would have little impact upon town services. He did not appreciate seeing applicants utilize an exemption that was intended to create affordable housing within the town solely to accommodate the sale and development of the market value lots, especially when there was a possibility that the one affordable lot could be sold at market value. F. Markwica explained that all three parties had indicated to him that they would not purchase the lots unless the rate of development was approved. D. Hoehn added that he had already designed the septic systems for the three lots.

C. Doble inquired if they were restricted to the considerations listed in the regulation to approve the application for a special permit. The board secretary replied in the affirmative.

B. Robinson thought they could make a determination on the minimization of traffic congestion. The provision for low income housing did not specifically state that the applicant had to set aside a lot for affordable housing, because the applicant could have provided an affordable apartment. The accelerated rate of development would minimize traffic to a certain degree.

D. Bellante-Holand moved to approve the application for an accelerated rate of development schedule given that the applicant met the provision for housing for low income or elderly persons. B. Robinson seconded the motion, and asked if the applicant met the intent of the regulation if the lot sold and the funds from the sale were used to purchase a lot on the Cape. D. Bellante-Holand and H. Stephenson noted that the developer's gift to Habitat for Humanity met the intent of the bylaw. The language in the regulation did not specify that the provision for affordable housing had to be site specific or within the town. D. Bellante-Holand did not see how they could justify the minimization of traffic when they were adding four houses to an area that had none, or minimizing an existing traffic issue. The development in addition provided access to an abutter, who had the option of dividing his lot to create an additional lot.

D. Seidman recommended entering into deliberations before taking a vote. B. Robinson moved to close the public hearing and to immediately enter into deliberations. H. Stephenson seconded the motion, which motion carried. 5/0/0 The hearing officially closed at 7:21 PM

7:21PM Deliberations: Marian R. Halperin, Tr. et. al. – Special Permit Application for an accelerated Rate of Development Schedule

The deliberations of the previously closed public hearing were duly opened at 7:21 PM. D. Seidman noted that the Board had a motion on the floor, which was to approve the special permit to accelerate the rate of development schedule to two lots per years, with lots 2 & 4 to be developed in 2016 and lots 1 & 3 in 2017. D. Bellante-Holand reiterated that the applicant met the provision by giving the lot to Habitat for Humanity. B. Robinson concurred.

H. Stephenson thought it was important to assist in the development of affordable housing. Additional discussions ensued with this regard, and the Board agreed that the development of the four lots would not overburden town services, or add to the congestion in the area, since the area was predominantly comprised of large densely wooded vacant lots. D. Seidman entertained a vote on the motion. Board members voted 4/0/1 D. Seidman abstained.

C. Doble inquired if Habitat for Humanity's lot (Lot 1) was deed restricted. F. Markwica could not respond. She explained that without the deed restriction, Habitat for Humanity could sell the lot at market value. D. Bellante-Holand thought the subject warranted further discussion, because if that was the intent of the bylaw, they may wish to clarify this with an amendment. Board members agreed. D. Seidman and C. Doble noted that it was important to keep the affordable stock in town, if the town was to benefit from the provision as intended. D. Seidman thought the lot should have been permanently deed restricted as affordable. Board members agreed to add the subject on the list of potential bylaw amendments.

D. Seidman recommended continuing the deliberations on May 4, 2016 at 6PM to review the draft decision for an approval. H. Stephenson seconded the motion, and the motion carried. 5/0/0 The Planning Board resumed their regularly scheduled session at 7:25 PM.

BOARD DISCUSSIONS:

1. Tisbury Planning Board's Projects 2016/2017

RE: Identifying, prioritizing, etc.

Board members were given a revised list of the Planning Board's projects and planning studies for 2016. C. Doble asked B. Robinson if he was still interested in pursuing a bylaw amendment of the zoning regulation pertaining to pre-existing, non-conforming structures, and in revising the Site Plan Standards for Review. B. Robinson replied in the affirmative.

C. Doble informed the Board that she had re-organized the list into two categories e.g. on-going projects, and new projects. In the handout board members received, the Beach Road SUP connection to Lagoon Pond Road, the development of a Housing Production Plan, the Vision Council's projects and zoning amendments were listed under "Current ongoing Projects". The development of an area management plan, Complete Streets, Ancient Ways and Board of Selectmen's parking study were listed under the second category entitled "New Projects". She was uncertain about adding floating structures to

the second category because the Board of Selectmen, at town meeting indicated that they were pursuing the topic. D. Seidman concurred and recommended omitting the subject from the second category.

C. Doble also questioned whether she should include the formation of a parks and recreations department to the second category, since the Board of Selectmen was still in the process of re-organizing the DPW. Board members thought it would be premature to act on the project without hearing from the Board of Selectmen.

On a separate subject, C. Doble informed the Board that she was meeting with a student in Syracuse, NY to discuss with her the possibility of working with the Planning Board on developing an area management plan. It was possible that the student would be available in the spring, summer and fall to do some work, if she and the student came to some agreement.

2. D. Bellante-Holand

A. Vision Plan Goals & Objectives

B. Preliminary list of funding sources

C. Floating structures (preliminary findings)

D. Complete Streets

H. Stephenson expressed an interest in learning more about the relationship between the Planning Board's projects and the Vision Planning's goals and objectives, and the interaction between the two. She wanted to understand how they related and translated to the projects they were considering.

B. Robinson explained that the whole process began with the Vision Planning exercise, in which the Planning Board distilled six goals. Each goal was comprised of several objectives and actions. H. Stephenson indicated that she preferred a more formal relationship between the Vision Planning's goals and objectives and their projects. C. Doble noted that the ongoing and new projects were part of the Vision Plan's goals and objectives. B. Robinson also noted that that was quite a bit of data in the workshop summaries that was not included within the final report, but insightful about potential projects. H. Stephenson inquired if the Planning Board had formally discussed the Vision Plan's goals and objectives. B. Robinson replied that they've done so constantly. The newsletter they distributed at town meeting outlined the actions they've taken over the year to accomplish a specific goal or purpose. C. Doble inquired if she was asking the Planning Board to go over the plan and its recommendations in a more formal process. H. Stephenson replied in the affirmative. D. Seidman explained that the Board had met to establish the vision plan, its process and projects. H. Stephenson thought the process was much more interactive, so that the discussions on the projects would be presented at the Vision Council meetings for the community's input. She thought it was important to correlate the Planning Board's projects with the Vision Council's goals. B. Robinson concurred. H. Stephenson thought it was important for the two to be in sync. D. Bellante-Holand believed they had the opportunity to discuss the issue, given that it was on the agenda. She also thought it was important to refer to what had been outlined in the Vision Plan for the projects they were recommending for 2016/17. C. Doble thought they could bring this up at the next Vision Council meeting. B. Robinson did not think the Vision Council should be directing the Planning Board or the Board of Selectmen. He thought they might be able to glean from the Vision Council a sense of direction about the issues they want the Board to pursue.

Additional discussions ensued and M. Loberg interrupted the discussions to inquire if the Planning Board had selected a representative on the Board of Selectmen's Parking Committee. It was confirmed that H. Stephenson would be serving as the Planning Board's representative. In reference to the Board's discussions about setting goals, she thought it might be useful if the Cabinet dedicated their first meeting to discussing the participating boards' goals. She also wanted to clarify that the Board of Selectmen had asked the Planning Board on several occasions for language to regulate floating workshops. D. Seidman interrupted the discussions to conduct the public hearings scheduled for the evening.

The discussions were resumed at 7:25PM and C. Doble inquired if they agreed that the Board of Selectmen appeared to take the lead in pursuing a regulation on Floating Structures. B. Robinson thought J. Grande generated language with town counsel at town meeting. He thought the Board should clarify what the Board of Selectmen were asking of the Planning Board.

C. Doble clarified that the list contained the projects that were the Planning Board's responsibility. The Vision Council on the other hand provided a forum for the community to discuss topics of importance to them, and projects they'd like to see move forward. The Planning Board through its representatives facilitated the process and assisted community members to see that the project comes to fruition. She felt the Planning Board was being much more proactive in setting their agenda, which included projects that were discussed and raised at the Vision Plan workshops.

D. Bellante-Holand thought they should avoid getting bogged down by the details. They've discussed the list over the past three sessions. She suggested using the time to commit to a project.

H. Stephenson specifically spoke to the area management plans and the 'nefarious' gateway. She felt they should begin with the gateway because it was the entrance to the town and included the SSA property which had an impact on the district. She thought they had to look at the municipal parking lot and develop an idea about what they wanted to see in the district to address projects such as the one presented by Stop-N-Shop. C. Doble concurred and explained that area plans could encompass a large or small area. It was not restricted to a geographical scale. H. Stephenson inquired if she understood the discussions correctly, in that for the present the Board was simply just discussing the need for an area plan, not its geographical boundaries. C. Doble replied in the affirmative, noting that the boundary would be determined further on in the process. Her objective was to obtain a consensus on the priority list.

D. Bellante-Holand did not understand how new projects interacted with the ongoing projects. She found it difficult to prioritize the list without having an understanding about the framework or deadlines. If they wanted to accomplish the various objectives or goals, she felt they should assign them to board members. As a new board member she wanted to discuss the process after the project has been assigned. She wanted to know if they had access to a subcommittee, how a deadline was determined and by whom. C. Doble could not answer because the Board's never implemented a formal protocol. D. Bellante-Holand thought it important to have a protocol in place. H. Stephenson concurred. Their proposal for developing an area plan was somewhat confusing. B. Robinson explained that the geographical boundary for an area management plan could vary, depending on the complexity, number of issues, etc. It could also consist of several more detailed plans.

H. Stephenson thought they could start the process with a map of all of the areas, and all of the elements within those areas. An area management plan of the waterfront could include the SSA property, the municipal parking lot, the traffic circle, Cromwell Lane, etc. She offered to work with the MVC to map out the areas and list the projects were involved. They could use the maps to delineate the areas they wanted to study. D. Seidman inquired about the criteria they intended to use to delineate the geographical boundaries. B. Robinson understood that their delineation was partly based on the intent of the development plan (i.e. what needs to happen).

D. Bellante-Holand thought they could use the map as a document, once the areas were delineated to decide on the prioritization of the areas to be studied, and the delegation of responsibility. It was possible that they'd pursue different areas as a group, or individually. B. Robinson did not believe area plans had to encompass large areas, they could be developed to target specific problem areas, such as Cromwell Lane. C. Doble understood, but did not think they could manage 50 area development plans. She recommended breaking up the areas into districts, and concentrate on the physical designs that correlated with the Vision Plan's goals.

Additional discussions ensued with regards to process and it was agreed that H. Stephenson and C. Doble were both going to approach C. Seidel to request assistance with the development of an interactive map the Board would be able to use for this project. H. Stephenson believed the map would be available for their next meeting. D. Seidman recommended discussing the project in a separate planning session, and recommended May 25th and June 29th. Board members concurred.

D. Bellante-Holand asked C. Doble in the Planning Board responded to her inquiry regarding the prioritization of projects she had listed in the handout. C. Doble replied in the negative, but noted H. Stephenson agreed to work on the Board of Selectmen's parking study, and the others listed under number one were taken care of. She was concerned about the Complete Streets project. D. Bellante-Holand thought it was more of an overlay that could be part of one of the area development plans. B. Robinson noted that it was a funding source, that they could apply for once they adopted the policy. D. Bellante-Holand offered to research the subject. C. Doble asked if she would obtain a copy of the draft policy the MV Commission generated for the island towns and some background information on the funding source to a Planning Board meeting for a discussion.

Complete Streets

D. Bellante-Holand researched the subject as requested and offered to investigate the topic further to locate information about timeframes and deadlines, if they were going to apply for funds. She wanted to match the actual funds with the board's projects once the Board decided on their projects to locate potential funding sources.

Floating Structures

D. Bellante-Holand google searched regulations in various towns within the Commonwealth that included Edgartown, Falmouth, Nantucket and Seekonk. Based on her research hardly anyone was regulating the use. D. Seidman recommended contacting Woods Hole. C. Doble recommended Barnstable.

Additional discussions ensued with this regard, and it was suggested that for the present moment, they should suspend further research on the subject until they had an opportunity to clarify what the Board of Selectmen was asking of them.

3. Planning Board Committee Reports

- A. Water Street Traffic Committee's report by B. Robinson
- B. Vision Council
- C. Site Plan Review Board
- D. Land Bank Advisory Committee
- E. Tisbury Housing Committee

B. Robinson developed a draft plan to reconstitute the traffic committee the Board of Selectmen created the previous year to look at the congestion and transportation issues at the intersection of Union Street and Water Street, the traffic circle, information booth and SSA pedestrian movement.

He structured the committee to include a member from the Planning Board, the Board of Selectmen, the beautification committee, the police department, and two members at large. Some of the individuals listed had served on the previous committee.

B. Robinson explained that the once the board was structured they would be interviewing various interest groups, develop strategies, present their findings and solutions to the interest groups and public. He asked the board if he could serve as their representative on the Board of Selectmen's traffic committee for the previously stated purpose. D. Seidman moved to appoint B. Robinson to the traffic committee. C. Doble seconded the motion, which motion carried. 5/0/0

4. Annual Town Meeting Newsletter
RE: Revised Order

4. Dan Seidman
RE: Martha's Vineyard Housing Needs Assessment (Process)

CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED:

1. Tisbury Board of Appeals

- A. Hearing Notice – SBS Inc., AP 22A13.11 (Setback variances)
- B. Hearing Notice – SBS Inc., AP 22A13.11 (Commercial lumber yard)
- C. Hearing Notice – Brett Benway, AP 24D16.6 (accessory apartment)
- D. Hearing Notice – Carol Ritter, AP 11A08 (expansion of structure w/in shore zone)
- E. Hearing Notice – Daryl Willis, AP 07C2.1 (expansion of pre-existing, non-conforming structure)
- F. Hearing Notice – Sharon Strimling, AP 12C06 (expansion of pre-existing, non-conforming use)

2. Tisbury Conservation Commission

- A. Hearing Notice – Paul Miller, AP 11A12 (removing and replacing steps on bank)
- B. Hearing Notice – MV Shellfish Group, AP 11A01 + (cutting phragmites for experimental purposes)

3. MV Commission

- A. April 15, 2015 Extended Schedule
- B. Conformance of Amended Regulations for Special Ways in West Tisbury

4. Vineyard Land Surveying & Engineering Inc
RE: Notice of Application – Gannon & Benjamin Railway, Extension of pier (pumpout station)

5. Quinlan
RE: Zoning Bulletin, April 10, 2016

PRO FORM Meeting opened, conducted and closed in due form at
8:45 P.M. (m/s/c 5/0/0)
Respectfully submitted;

Patricia V. Harris, Secretary

APPROVAL: Approved and accepted as official minutes;

Date

Daniel Seidman
Chairman