



COPAKE PLANNING BOARD
JULY 13, 2011
MINUTES

Approved
August 4, 2011

Please note that all referenced attachments, comprising 19 pages, are on file with the Copake Town Clerk and in the Planning Board office. An annotated listing of those attachments appears at the end of this document.

A regular meeting of the Copake Planning Board was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Marcia Becker, Chair. Also present were Chris Grant, Gray Davis, George Filipovits and Jon Urban. Skip Pilch and Steve Savarese were excused. Lisa DeConti was present to record the minutes. Attorney Anthony Buono was also present in Town Attorney Tal Rappleyea's absence.

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS – Referrals

None

PUBLIC HEARING

None which will help as a rationale to justify

SUBDIVISION/SITE PLAN

2011-8 CELL TOWER SPR – MARINER TOWER – West Copake

Chris Ciolfi appeared before the Board. Ms. Becker informed him that she had a check list to review. Mr. Ciolfi was in agreement with this. Ms. Becker acknowledged that both she and Mr. Grant spoke with the references given by Mark Hoppe and found them to be very supportive and enthusiastic regarding his expertise. Ms. Becker then noted that a proposal from Hudsonia had been received for a bio-assessment of the project which will help to justify overhead utilities and other requirements needed to proceed with the project. Mr. Ciolfi noted that the overhead utilities would be running adjacent to the Army Corp of Engineers Wetlands and not through them.

Ms. Becker made note of the fact that Mr. Ciolfi was not in agreement with the estimate given by Hudsonia. Mr. Ciolfi explained that he believed the estimate to be somewhat high. Ms. Becker would look into the matter.

Ms. Becker acknowledged that a referral from EBI Consulting had been received from Mr. Ciolfi asking for comments from the Board regarding any historic properties that may be on the site. Mr. Ciolfi informed the Board that as part of the National Environmental Policy Act under federal requirements, EBI Consulting sends that letter out to all of the agencies in Town looking for Areas of Potential Effects (APE's) within the circle. Mr. Ciolfi went on to explain that during the Balloon Float the agency will see if there are any identified properties and will then take pictures from those locations to see if there is any impact. He went on to explain that under the federal rules, the only area they are required to be concerned with is the APE, however, the area is usually expanded in case there is a significant monument or something else that might be impacted. Ms. Becker questioned whether the Board needed to comment on these matters. Mr. Ciolfi informed her that letters will be sent out to all the various Boards as well as the Historical Society and comments could be sent if she wished, but this was not necessarily required. Mr. Ciolfi advised her that a rubber stamp with a signature is usually received stating 'no affect'. Ms. Becker tabled the matter at this point but might give it to the Conservation Resources Committee at a later date for some feedback from them.

Ms. Becker advised Mr. Ciolfi that the Agricultural Data Statements had been sent out to the neighbors and asked Mr. Ciolfi if he wished to report on what transpired at the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting. Mr. Ciolfi reported that a Height Variance and a Set-Back Variance had been requested from the ZBA. He then explained that the proposed location had been chosen because it was in a wooded area that was higher than other location possibilities but was not within the proper distance from two (2) properties. Mr. Ciolfi also noted that the Town Code stipulates a maximum height of one hundred and twenty five feet (125') and he was requesting a height of one hundred and fifty feet (150') to maximize co-location and minimize the number of towers. Mr. Ciolfi reported that the ZBA suggested moving the location to the other edge of the field to meet the Set-Back Variance and then request a one hundred and sixty foot (160') or one hundred and sixty five foot (165') Height Variance. Mr. Ciolfi informed the Board that a test Balloon Float would be held the end of the following week from both locations to see if there is visual impact from either location.

Ms. Becker advised that although she believed Attorney Rappleyea had spoken with the engineer regarding the adequate coverage argument submitted at the June Planning Board meeting Attorney Rappleyea has not yet responded to this. Ms. Becker then made note of the fact that she received the preliminary review from Mr. Hoppe and questioned whether Mr. Ciolfi had a chance to review and comment on this. Mr. Ciolfi presented the Board with a packet of questions and answers he had regarding Mr. Hoppe's review and noted that AT&T had some answers as well.

He acknowledged that the first question Mr. Hoppe had was a technical one asking what the different required RF strengths were. He noted that AT&T responded by defining that the -64 dBm (green) dealt with in-building coverage and the strength needed to penetrate the different types of building materials. He then went on to explain that the -74 dBm (yellow) was the strength needed to get into typical residential construction, the -84 dBm (orange) was the strength to get into a vehicle and the -98 dBm or -84 dBm and above, is for on-the-street or open-air coverage. Mr. Ciolfi made note of the fact that the biggest concern of carriers is the in-building coverage as many people are now using cell phones instead of land lines as their primary phones.

Mr. Ciolfi then noted that 'Part B' referred to some original Federal Licenses and the response clarified that when the licenses were originally issued in the mid-1980's each of the carriers, the land line phone company and their competitor had a requirement by the FCC to cover a certain amount of area in a certain number of years or their license would be taken away and given to someone else. Mr. Ciolfi pointed out that these obligations have long been met.

Mr. Ciolfi then moved on to Item #2 which referred to the maps on the AT&T Web Site and how they differ from what is being presented as a Zoning tool. He explained that the maps on the Web Site are a little more graphically pleasing and user friendly.

Mr. Ciolfi then noted that on Item #3 Mr. Hoppe asks for Coverage Maps at different heights. Mr. Ciolfi explained that for every ten foot (10') decline in height the colors change and although it is not a dramatic change, it is a continued degradation with each decline. Mr. Ciolfi noted that they are trying to get the best balance between Town Code and what is best for the Tower Coverage.

Regarding Item #4 he noted that Mr. Hoppe questioned whether there were other planned sites. Mr. Ciolfi clarified that they are presently working on a site in Ancram as well as a site in Gallatin. Mr. Davis questioned whether Mr. Ciolfi was aware of any other companies proposing to do any towers in this area and whether they would overlap. Mr. Ciolfi explained that he was not aware of any and usually looks into this prior to beginning a project. He pointed out that he has also contacted Verizon and Sprint who did not appear to be interested at this time.

Mr. Ciolfi proceeded to note that Mr. Hoppe asked for an indication of what the Tower would look like from the other carrier locations and explained the corresponding chart elevations referring to this. Mr. Ciolfi pointed out that throughout the region the industry has adopted a ten foot (10') center-line spacing so as to minimize the likelihood of physical and electronic interference between the different companies utilizing the same tower. Mr. Ciolfi cautioned that should you decrease the ten foot (10') spacing, electronic interference issues might result.

Mr. Ciolfi then acknowledged that Mr. Hoppe went on to ask him to create propagation studies for potential future co-locators. Mr. Ciolfi noted that the law requires that future tenants come back as a modification and any information he would give regarding this would be a guess as nothing could be based on fact.

Mr. Davis brought up the fact that the Town Code stipulates a preference for a Lattice Tower over a Monopole Tower. Mr. Ciolfi believed this might be because the Lattice Type Towers are much more utilitarian inasmuch as antennas could be mounted in any location whereas on a Monopole Tower you need to know the exact location so that it could be cut at the factory for placement.

Ms. Becker acknowledged another target area in Copake that is indicated on the application. Mr. Ciolfi explained that the other location was one of the possible locations reviewed by AT&T in the site search and acquisition process. A date of September 2010 was indicated on the research sheet and Mr. Ciolfi said that target site is no longer under consideration as Mr. Link's site was chosen.

Ms. Becker asked if there were any other issues that needed to be discussed. Mr. Grant made note of the fact that our consultant needed to review the answers given by Mr. Ciolfi prior to acceptance of the application as complete. Mr. Becker acknowledged that when she spoke with Mr. Hoppe regarding his preliminary review she explained that the Board wished to get to a point where the application can be accepted as complete so that they could proceed with the review. Mr. Hoppe advised her that he would like to have these questions answered before the application is considered complete. Ms. Becker noted that Mr. Ciolfi has answered the questions and questioned whether acceptance of the application should be put to a vote. Mr. Grant felt that inasmuch as the next Planning Board meeting is in three weeks Mr. Hoppe should review Mr. Ciolfi's answers prior to acceptance of the application.

Mr. Ciolfi expressed his desire to move forward with the completion of the application so that the Public Hearing could be scheduled and noted that he was willing to extend any time-lines that may be needed. Ms. Becker made note of the fact that the SEQR was not complete. Mr. Ciolfi reminded her that the EBI was part of this process and needed to run on a parallel tract. Ms. Becker acknowledged that the Site Plan Review time-line is forty-five (45) days of the receipt of the application for the Planning Board to render a decision unless an extension was granted by the applicant. Ms. Becker pointed out that no Public Hearing could be scheduled by the Planning Board until the location has been chosen and inasmuch as the ZBA test Balloon Float was needed to determine this, no decision could be made to accept the application at this time. Mr. Grant questioned whether Attorney Rappleyea acknowledged that the Planning Board and Zoning Board could hold a co-Public Hearing. Ms. Becker advised him that procedures could be integrated. Attorney Buono advised that the location and the height of the Tower needed to be determined by the ZBA prior to the Planning Board's Public Hearing. It was decided that the Board would wait for Mr. Hoppe's response and the results from the ZBA's test Balloon Float prior to accepting the application as complete.

Mr. Grant questioned what decisions have been made regarding the power lines to the Tower. Ms. Becker advised him that the Board cannot approve the above ground utilities without a rational basis to do so and that is one reason why the Environmental Group, Hudsonia is being consulted.

Mr. Ciolfi will forward the needed information to Mr. Hoppe.

2010-21 SPR – RICK AND PAM BROWN – Lot #2, Island Drive [Copake Lake]

Kelly Ardoin of Meyer Davis Studio appeared before the Board representing Rick and Pam Brown. Mr. Davis once again recused himself from participating as a Board member on this application inasmuch as he is the architect on this project. A letter from the applicants is on file permitting Mr. Davis and Ms. Ardoin to represent them.

Ms. Ardoin acknowledged that an e-mail from Jamie Malcolm of the DEC regarding the original planning of the subdivision had been forwarded to Ms. Becker. Ms. Ardoin explained that there is presently a manhole access on the site that they are planning to run septic piping to. Ms. Becker referred to Mr. Malcolm's letter which stated that as long as they are following all the HOA laws, local and state codes and will receive a C of O, that is all that is needed.

Ms Becker noted that Mike Higgins of the DEC signed off on the SPDES permit. Mr. Grant requested a letter from Mr. Higgins conforming the SPDES permit, that the septic system is adequate and the building is in conformance with the original plan that was filed with the DEC.

Ms. Ardoin then acknowledged that additional screening plantings have been added to the Northwest corner of the property that will follow along to the East side of the property. Ms. Ardoin also noted that she is working with Mary Keen, a local landscape designer, who is trying to keep as much of the existing trees as possible.

Mr. Grant questioned the elevation of the plans from the lake side as it looked to him like the house has four (4) stories. Mr. Ardoin explained the venting dormers on the attic space made the drawing appear that way and this was just storage space and not an additional floor. Mr. Urban noted that the front elevation on the drawing looks nothing like the rear elevation.

Ms. Becker noted that the landscaping has been satisfied and a copy of the SPDES Permit is needed. On a motion made by Mr. Urban and seconded by Mr. Filipovits the Board voted unanimously to conditionally approve the Site Plan for the Pam and Rick Brown house on Island Drive from a Site Plan Map by Meyer Davis Studios dated July 13, 2011 subject to the receipt of the copy of the SPDES Permit by the DEC. Ms. Becker will stamp the plans when the copy of the SPDES Permit is received.

2011-4 SITE PLAN REVIEW – CAMPHILL VILLAGE – Camphill Road

Jolanda Jansen, project engineer, advised the Board that new drawings have been submitted. Ms. Becker questioned the Agricultural Data Statement which stated that Camphill Village is the only neighboring parcel. Ms. Jansen acknowledged this fact to be accurate.

Ms. Becker noted that Engineer Doug Clark had done a review of the SEQR and believed it to be complete.

Ms. Jansen noted the next submission to be a letter that discussed issues that concerned the ZBA and questioned whether Attorney Rappleyea had reviewed this letter. Ms. Becker acknowledged that Attorney Rappleyea was not able to review the letter at this time. Attorney Buono advised the Board that Attorney Rappleyea asked the applicants to have the consultants prepare a narrative delineating what the uses are now, what they will be doing and how they are staying within the allowance. Ms. Becker noted that the document does state what variances are needed.

Ms. Jansen pointed out that a number of buildings that they believe will need variances have been referenced and have had applications prepared that will be submitted to the ZBA this week in the hopes of being on the July 27th agenda. Ms. Becker noted that three (3) area variances are being requested for this project. Ms. Jansen explained that the Village Green Bakery needs a front yard variance and the Greenhouse that has been put up in 2009 needs a variance. Mr. Grant questioned whether both buildings were already built and if so, why they needed a variance. Ms. Jansen clarified that they were built after the requirements were a legal requirement and wanted to bring these building into conformance with the code.

Ms. Jansen noted that the other issue had to do with parking areas and noted that they are proposing an overflow location for parking. Ms. Becker acknowledged that this had been allowed for another building in the past.

Ms. Jansen made note of the fact that they were hoping to be up to Lead Agency circulation and whether any other agencies objected to the Planning Board being Lead Agency. It was noted that any other agencies had thirty (30) days to respond to this and if there is no response than it is no issue. Ms. Jansen brought up the fact that the next Planning Board meeting is less than thirty (30) days and questioned whether they needed to appear at that meeting. Mr. Grant questioned whether the Board had declared itself Lead Agency. Ms. Becker confirmed that they had. Ms. Becker believed we were at the point where this could be circulated.

Ms. Becker questioned whether Ms. Jansen would be preparing the documents and sending them out. Ms. Jansen clarified that the cover letter was generated and signed by the Board and they would provide the Board with the number of copies needed. Ms. Jansen questioned what documents needed to be sent with the Cover Letter. Ms. Becker advised that the Application Form, Part I, the Long Form, EAF, Drawings C1, EC1, PP1, ST1 would have to accompany the Cover Letter. Ms. Becker questioned whether the County Planning Board might need additional documentation and would look in to this.

It was clarified that the purpose of the circulation is due to the fact that inasmuch as the Planning Board declared their intent to be Lead Agency they need to see if there is any objection by any other Agency. It was noted that sending a bulk of paper including all the plans is not normal course. Mr. Grant questioned the other Agencies that were being dealt with. Ms. Becker pointed out that the DEC, Army Corp of Engineers, County Planning, DOH, Highway Department, Town of Taghkanic and ZBA were the Agencies that were being dealt with. Nancy Clark, Senior Project Engineer advised that the EAF narrative was included with the Long Form and would tell the story as it is very specific as to what the site includes and what the proposed twenty (20) year plan is and that could be provided. Ms. Becker would look into what needed to be circulated to establish Lead Agency.

It was decided that the proper documentation would be sent out establishing Lead Agency and the application would be referred to the ZBA for the needed variances.

Ms. Becker questioned whether there was a deed restriction declaring the land be occupied by Camphill Village forever. Ms. Jansen clarified that Camphill Village could sell the land in the future should they wish. Mr. Grant clarified that the uses and variances run with the land. Ms. Jansen made note of the fact that should another organization that took care of adults with disabilities purchased the property it would be another organization with the same use. However, if another organization purchased it and planned to use it differently it would be a change of use and they would be required to come before the Planning Board. Ms. Becker questioned whether the land could be sold to a land developer. Attorney Buono advised that should that happen they would not be entitled to all the variances if the use was changed and not used for what it is used for now and they would have to appear before the Planning and Zoning Boards to have some of the same variances, however, another organization that had a different name but did the same thing Camphill Village does than would be able to keep the variances.

Ms. Jansen questioned whether it was the policy of the Board to ask the attorney to prepare a draft for a Negative Declaration. Ms. Becker would look in to this. Mr. Davis asked whether this plan was going to be broken down into specific areas with more details to review as time went on. Ms. Jansen acknowledged that actual site plans for specific buildings would be in front of the Board for their review but they were addressing the project as a whole prior to that.

Ms. Becker questioned who would be doing the Negative Declaration and whether it would be done by Attorney Rappleyea. Mr. Grant believed it would be the Planning Board that would make the determination. Attorney Buono advised that Attorney Rappleyea would prepare language if the Board wished him to do so. Mr. Grant felt this to be satisfactory.

Ms Jansen questioned whether they needed to appear at the next Planning Board meeting inasmuch as it was shorter than the thirty (30) days needed for the Lead Agency response. Mr. Grant advised that if any amendments were being made then they should appear. Ms. Jansen questioned whether a Public Hearing could be scheduled for the September meeting prior to Lead Agency status was declared. Mr. Urban made note of the fact that Lead Agency status would be know after the next meeting and suggested scheduling the Public Hearing at the next meeting. Ms. Becker advised him that there was not enough time for this to transpire. Ms. Jansen questioned whether it was possible to decide that if there is no objection within thirty (30) days to Lead Agency a Public Hearing could be conditionally scheduled for September. It was decided that at the August meeting a Public Hearing could be conditionally scheduled for the September meeting if there was no objection to Lead Agency.

Ms. Becker acknowledged that she had spoken with the Highway Superintendent regarding the sidewalk which was an issue inasmuch as he did not believe there was room to do what was being suggested. Ms. Clark would follow up on this with Mr. Gregory.

Ms. Jansen brought up another issue regarding building parking pavement improvement work that Camphill is planning to do this fall changing the alignment of the road to restrict lights from the automobiles from shining into one of the residences. Ms. Jansen noted that there are also additional parking spaces that are being added with walkways as well as fire access routes that are being addressed at this time.

**2011-6 NEW SEPTIC SYSTEM – HHD DEVELOPMENT [PRESIDENTS ESTATES] –
County Route 7 [Copake Lake]**

Attorney Jason Shaw and HOA president Peter Chudy appeared before the Board representing HHD Development and Presidents Estates. Mr. Shaw advised the Board that after appearing before the Town Board they received a review of the proposed facility by the Town Engineer, Doug Clark, under the Transportation Corporation Law to get consent to form the Transportation Corporation. He continued that the consent was granted by the Town Board and presented to the Planning Board as well as a certified copy of the Certificate of Incorporation that has been filed with the State. Attorney Shaw acknowledged that the DEC has approved the design of the project prior to issuing the permit.

Ms. Becker advised that she had the letters from Mr. Clark but has not received anything from the DEC. Attorney Shaw did note that nothing could be done without a SPDES Permit and although it has been approved by the DEC he has not received it as yet. Attorney Shaw noted

that the Town, under the Transportation Corporation Law, had the right to have the Engineer review this system and make comments which was done and addressed satisfactorily because the Town Board gave its consent to its formation. Attorney Shaw addressed the fact that they have posted financial security with the Town.

Ms. Becker acknowledged that the last letter from Mr. Clark (May 5th) to the Town Board was about the estimate for the bond and how much should be posted should there be any problems. Ms. Becker noted that some suggestions were made by Mr. Clark for some changes made to the system which he wanted to look at again. Attorney Shaw pointed out that the permitting authority for this system is the DEC inasmuch as the Corporation is on the verge of getting a permit from the DEC they are not making any changes to the system at this time. Ms. Becker questioned whether the plans that she had are the same plans that the Town Engineer has previously seen. Attorney Shaw was not sure if this is so but noted that there were some revisions made on June 20, 2011 and the last revision before that was January 14, 2011. He was not sure what these revisions were. He did note that these are the plans the DEC has and will approve.

Ms. Becker referred to the latest e-mail from Mr. Clark (July 13th) which stated that he reviewed the estimate for O&M necessary for approving the Transportation Corporation and noted that the DEC wanted this result before completing their review. He noted that he had not received their comment and most of the issues have been worked out with one exception and that is what level of treatment is required. He also noted that the Single Pass Sand Filter meets the normal required level of treatment but enhanced nutrient removal nitrogen and phosphorous would be more protective of the lake. He would hope the DEC would favor this in when they issue the required discharge limits. It would be his opinion that the Planning Board would have some discretion to ask for more than what is normally required and suggested changing the local law or regulations to do this rather than on a case by case basis. He would like the opportunity to review the final plan to make sure his previous comments have been addressed. Mr. Chudy advised the Board that he was not aware of this letter. Ms. Becker acknowledged that she received this as an e-mail today and would supply him with a copy.

Attorney Shaw stated that the Engineer could see whatever he wanted but no changes would be made because this is what the DEC is reviewing. Attorney Buono clarified that the Engineer needed this information so that he would be able to figure out whether the amount of the bond was still correct. Ms. Becker questioned who the Engineer on the project was. She was informed that it was Andy Audin of Crawford and Associates and suggested that Doug Clark contact Mr. Audin for the final version. Attorney Shaw pointed out that the security amount was determined by the Town Board and felt that if there is anything that needed to be changed it would have to be directed to the Town Board to make that change.

Ms. Becker questioned what pipes the Transportation Corporation owns and what is the responsibility of the individual homeowners. Mr. Chudy noted that the Transportation Corporation does not own the pipes to the homes but does own the main lines. Ms. Becker questioned whether this will remain this way. Mr. Chudy believed it would but noted that the homeowners own the whole system now. Attorney Shaw clarified that the shares of the Transportation Corporation will be owned by the Homeowners Association and the individual connections to the main are the responsibility of the homeowners and the main is the responsibility of the Transportation Corporation.

Ms. Becker questioned how many open lots there were left in the Sub-division as she believed there was one open lot. Mr. Chudy did not believe there were any open lots. Ms. Becker expressed concern that most of the cottages at Copake Lake are being modified and turned into full time homes with added bedrooms and bathrooms. The Board needs to know what kind of increases and modifications the septic system can handle and what capacity is built in. Mr. Chudy advised that what is required and reviewed is the capacity for conversion to full-time residencies. Ms. Becker questioned whether this allowed for expansions. Attorney Shaw noted that there is a margin for expansion but the SPDES permit will be issued for so many units and for example if ten (10) houses were to be added the SPDES permit would need to be modified to make sure the additional units could be accommodated.

Attorney Buono assumed that the number of units, bedrooms and flow were taken regardless if the residents are weekenders, year-round residents or summer residents and questioned how much expansion was included in the calculation. Mr. Chudy acknowledged that the system was built for expansion but gave no amount of the expansion that was allowed for. Mr. Chudy noted that the DEC will monitor the flow rates and if the flow rates go up they will make them expand the system. He acknowledged that the plan for expansion is in the plans. Attorney Shaw clarified that additional flow can either be additional usage or infiltration whereas ground water gets into the system increasing the flow and in that case the cause would need to be determined and corrected. Attorney Shaw noted that there are monthly reports that have to be filed with the DEC to indicate how much flow is passing through the system with a meter that shows this. Mr. Urban made note of the fact that he has a system like the one being proposed and acknowledged that it is based on the number of bedrooms and doesn't take into consideration what the flow is and figures three-hundred and sixty-five (365) days a year for how many bedroom there are. Mr. Grant clarified that the Board needs to know what expansion is built in so that they will be able to deal with applications in the future. Ms. Becker believed that the homeowners should be aware of what expansion is built in for the system. Mr. Chudy advised her that they are aware of this.

After review of the check list on a motion made by Mr. Davis and seconded by Mr. Grant the Board voted unanimously to accept the President's Estates Waste Water System Design prepared for HHD Development Corp by Crawford and Associates revised June 20, 2011 as a Preliminary Sketch.

Ms. Becker questioned whether a SEQR would be needed. Attorney Shaw advised her that a Short Form had been done for the DEC. It was Mr. Grant's belief that any time the Board takes an action approving Site Plan, a SEQR needs to be done. Ms. Becker advised that County Planning Board referral was also needed inasmuch as the property is located within five-hundred feet (500') of Highway Route 7. Attorney Shaw expressed concern that this would delay the process. Ms. Becker acknowledged that the Planning Board cannot make a decision on this application until they hear back from the County Planning Board.

MINUTES

Ms. Becker had two corrections to the Minutes of June 2, 2011.

On Page Two (2) SWIPP should read **SWPPP**

*Jolanda Jansen, project engineer and Alex Sloan, project architect appeared before the Board representing Camphill Village. Ms. Becker advised Ms. Jansen that although she had reviewed most of what had been submitted, the remainder of the Board did not receive their copies early enough to review them due to the Memorial Day Holiday weekend. Ms. Jansen pointed out that only the first eighteen (18) pages of the **SWPPP** needed to be reviewed.*

On Page Four (4) Ms. Jansen pointed out that there is presently an outside **licensed** operator

*Clark's preliminary review, she noted that they are working on everything Mr. Clark suggested regarding Fire Protection. Ms. Jansen brought up the fact that financial and management planning regarding the maintenance systems has not been discussed as yet but will be discussed with the applicant shortly. Ms. Jansen pointed out that there is presently an outside **licensed** operator and staff and their maintenance department takes care of the heating facilities for all the buildings, roads, snow removal, etc.*

No motion was made at this time.

ADMINISTRATIVE

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN; Ms. Becker reminded the Board that they are supposed to make recommendations to the Town Board about whether they are in support of or have any criticisms or disagreements regarding the Comprehensive Plan. This would be done at the next meeting.

TRAINING SESSION; Ms. Becker informed the Board that there is Training Session information in the packet.

CARRY OVER

The following matters were carried over to the next meeting:

2010-2 SITE PLAN REVIEW CONSULTATION – AMERISTOP – Route 23

2008-21 MAJOR SUBDIVISION – MICHAEL B. & BARBARA S. BRAUNSTEIN – Off Golf Course Road

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, on a motion made by Mr. Davis and seconded by Mr. Grant , the Board voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 9:20 p.m.

Marcia Becker, Chair

Please note that all referenced attachments, comprising 19 pages, are on file with the Copake Town Clerk and in the Planning Board office. The referenced attachments are filed in the individual project files. An annotated listing follows:

ADMINISTRATION

MARINER TOWER

May 24, 2011	Ciolfi to Becker (10)
June 23, 2011	Courselle to Becker (4)
June 23, 2011	Kiviat to Becker (1)
June 27, 2011	Becker to Ciolfi (1)
July 8, 2011	Ciolfi to Hoppe (2)

PRESIDENT'S ESTATES

May 5, 2011	Clark to Crowley (1)
-------------	----------------------