



COPAKE PLANNING BOARD
JUNE 2, 2011
MINUTES

Approved
August 4, 2011

Please note that all referenced attachments, comprising 5 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, Skip Pilch, Steve Savarese and Jon Urban Gray Davis and George Filipovits were excused. Lisa DeConti was present to record the minutes. Tal Rappleyea, Town Attorney was also present.

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS – Referrals

None

PUBLIC HEARING

2011-11 MINOR SUBDIVISION – WONELL B. & WAYNE N. MILLER – Farm Road

Ms. Becker reminded the Board that the Public Hearing for Wonell and Wayne Miller had remained open for the past few months. Ms. Becker asked if anyone wished to speak on this application. Being none, on a motion made by Mr. Grant and seconded by Mr. Urban the Board voted unanimously to close the Public Hearing.

SUBDIVISION/SITE PLAN

2011-11 MINOR SUBDIVISION – WONELL B. & WAYNE N. MILLER – Farm Road

Wonell and Wayne Miller appeared before the Board along with Jeff Plass. Ms. Becker reminded the Millers that there were some things the Board requested at the March meeting. A map showing the location of a Perc Test done several years ago was presented to the Board. Mr. Plass advised the Board that the Perc Test was done on the new Miller's lot (Parcel -1) and pointed out the proposed house site as well as the proposed well. Mr. Plass also noted that the wording of the driveway agreement as it exists had been accounted for as well as a copy of the abutter's deed.

Ms. Becker explained that the vacant lot being subdivided has a right-of-way to Mr. Paciencia's lot behind it and the owner of the lot owns the right-of-way. Mr. Plass explained that when the right-of-way was first done years ago, it wasn't described properly. Ms. Becker made note of the fact that the maintenance agreement stated that it was the Paciencia's responsibility to maintain the road until the parties come to a different arrangement. Mr. Plass clarified that the agreement stated that once the road was being used by the Millers, maintenance would be shared by both parties.

Mr. Plass also presented the Board with a letter from the Board of Health for a one-thousand (1,000) gallon septic tank in-ground system.

After the SEQR was read, on a motion made by Mr. Grant and seconded by Mr. Savarese the Board voted unanimously to make a Negative Declaration. Mr. Savarese questioned whether the Paciencia's had any other egresses on the property. He was advised that there were none.

On a motion made by Mr. Savarese and seconded by Mr. Grant the Board voted unanimously to approve the Minor Subdivision of the property of Wonell Miller and Wayne Miller on Farm Road from a Survey Map of Plass, Rockefeller and Nucci dated May 25, 2011.

Ms. Becker will stamp the maps on Saturday. An application fee was also received

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

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.

Ms. Jansen made note of the fact that an Agricultural Data Statement, a long Environmental Assessment Form, a Stormwater Management Plan, a Drawing Cover Sheet, an Existing Condition Drawing, a Proposed Major Site Plan Drawing and a Conceptual Stormwater Management Plan had been submitted.

A discussion ensued regarding the signed Escrow Agreement and whether it had been received as yet. Ms. Sloan advised the Board that Jessica Albright, Executive Assistant of the Project, hand delivered a copy of the Agreement to the Town Hall on Tuesday and had been advised to slip the copy under the door inasmuch as the door had been locked. Ms. Becker made note of the fact that the check was not being deposited until the Agreement was received.

Ms. Jansen also pointed out that attached to the Long Form Statement was a Narrative Statement describing the Project and elaborating on some of the questions as well as a Phasing Schedule that goes into detail as to which buildings belong to which projects, a print out of all the items on the National Register in Columbia County, a report by Ecological Solutions, a Habitat Suitability Assessment for three possible Endangered Species, a letter from the DEC confirming the flagging of the State Wetlands and another report documenting the Wetland Delineation focusing

on the Wetlands that are not State Wetlands but are under the Jurisdiction of the Army Corp of Engineers were also attached.

Ms. Jansen explained that they are in the process of submitting a map covering a more extensive area of the property for the Army Corp of Engineers report. Ms. Jansen also explained that the report on threatened and endangered species makes some recommendations for what to do to protect the habitat of the Indiana Bat and this information will be noted on their Site Plan drawings. Ms. Jansen noted that a blank 'Part II' is included in the EAF. Ms. Jansen informed the Board that Doug Clark has not had the opportunity to review 'Part I' as yet and explained that they are proposing to complete 'Part II' for Mr. Clark to review. Attorney Rappelyea advised that a draft of 'Part II' is sometimes prepared by the applicant for review.

Ms. Jansen expressed concern regarding the two different wetlands and noted that the State has a protective zone of one-hundred feet (100') around their wetlands with restrictions in terms of what can be done in that area. She then noted that the Army Corp wetlands are much smaller and are often little strips along the stream without a specified buffer area for their wetlands in their federal regulations. Ms. Jansen pointed out that they are proposing to create a vegetarian buffer along the stream and noted that most of the wetlands are along that stream.

Ms. Jansen advised the Board that they are proposing building and parking areas within ten, fifteen or twenty feet (10-15-20') of some of these wetlands and have had discussion with the applicant who would like them to consider replacement wetlands to create increased flexibility. Ms. Jansen noted that they will be laying out everything that would be involved in the process of doing that but no decisions have been made regarding this as yet. She explained that they will be considering two side-walks and one driveway across one piece of Federal Wetlands with a goal of not disturbing the Army Corp of Engineers Wetlands.

Ms. Jansen noted that they are proposing Rain Gardens and systems which collect water from roofs and gutters and will be replacing other systems close to gardens so that they can be used for irrigation.

Ms. Becker questioned whether Mr. Clark's preliminary review had been received and asked whether they would be dealing with Mr. Clark directly. Ms. Jansen acknowledged receipt of the review and questioned whether it would be best for her to deal directly with Mr. Clark or deal with him through the Planning Board. Ms. Jansen questioned how soon Mr. Clark could get a detailed review to them and whether or not they would have a preferred date to make changes and respond to his comments. Ms. Jansen also questioned how soon Mr. Clark would need a submittal so that his review could be provided at the July meeting.

Ms. Becker advised Ms. Jansen that it would be best to deal with Mr. Clark and the Planning Board simultaneously and discuss schedules with Mr. Clark directly. Ms. Jansen expressed her intent to speak with Mr. Clark about whether he would be able to provide detailed comments by June 10 and whether he would be able to have his comments ready for the July meeting if they resubmitted a revised plan by June 24th.

It was Ms. Jansen's belief that once Mr. Clark is happy with the EAF Part I and doesn't ask for changes, they can circulate the Lead Agency. Ms. Jansen noted that Mr. Clark suggested that they contact the County and State Health Departments about the waste water. In reference to Mr.

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.

Ms. Becker questioned what approvals the applicant is asking for in the immediate future or whether they are asking the Board to approve all the work through the next twenty (20) years. Ms. Jansen clarified that they are asking for the overall Stormwater Plan and the overall traffic plan for the whole site plan for Phase I. Ms. Jansen advised that the Planning Board's level of approval could be made contingent on the fact that the applicant has to return. Ms. Becker acknowledged that much of the construction requires variances. Ms. Jansen agreed that any variances would need to be addressed. Ms. Becker questioned if these will be addressed by Phase or as a whole for the next twenty (20) years.

Mr. Grant did not believe any use variances would be needed. Ms. Becker pointed out that parking and highway variances would need approval with each Phase. Ms. Jansen noted that there is one activity in the public highway that would require approval which they would like to obtain at this time. Mr. Grant believed that it had previously been determined that any uses currently there have been grandfathered as there are no proposed new uses. Ms. Becker pointed out that the uses are classified as 'care' facility uses and would require a special use permit. Mr. Grant questioned whether this would be an existing rehabilitation facility or new facility. Ms. Becker advised that there would be both existing and new facilities. Ms. Jansen clarified that the whole campus is a 'care' facility and every building serves the community being cared for. Ms. Becker questioned whether the whole plan could be looked at as a 'care' facility rather than a residential unit within the 'care' facility. Attorney Rappleyea advised that as one parcel the answer is 'yes' because it is an existing on-going use.

Ms. Sloan acknowledged the fact that most of the new buildings being constructed will be a replacement of the present older buildings. Mr. Grant clarified that there will be no change in use. Attorney Rappleyea noted inasmuch as the property is one parcel the use is pre-existing and use variances do not appear to be needed. However, he advised that an analysis may need to be made regarding the level of increase as there is a pre-existing non-conforming use and therefore may require a use variance if the percentage exceeds the use allowed. Attorney Rappleyea made note of the fact that the increase of percentage above the required 33% could be an increase in non-conforming use, area of use or income and the ZBA would need to make that interpretation. Mr. Grant was not sure whether our Zoning Code allowed for any increase in use. Ms. Jansen pointed out that the non-conformity may be a use that had previously been granted because within the zone they are dealing with hospital use as one of the allowed uses. Ms. Jansen clarified that the Board is questioning whether the process of obtaining a special use permit would be needed for the facility as a whole or is it grandfathered. Mr. Grant added that an expansion in the use would also need to be considered.

Ms. Jansen acknowledged that they do need to appear before the ZBA and what needs to be determined is how many issues need to be identified. Ms. Jansen questioned whether they can proceed with Mr. Clark's review and approval of the EAF and circulation of it to the other agencies advising them that the Planning Board is the Lead Agency. Ms. Jansen also

acknowledged that they can proceed with identifying what needs to be done with the other agencies including the ZBA as Site Plan approval cannot be granted without an appearance before the ZBA. Mr. Grant clarified that Ms. Becker was questioning whether the Applicant should proceed with ZBA approval for all four (4) Phases or each Phase individually. Ms. Jansen made note of the fact that parking needed to be reviewed for the whole site as it would be quite difficult to decide this on a Phase by Phase basis. Ms. Becker advised that Site Plan approval is valid for three years but could be renewed after that.

Ms. Becker questioned whether they are ready to have the Highway Department review what is being done with the road improvements. Ms. Jansen advised her that this is ready to be reviewed. They will be able to move forward with this. It was noted that the Highway Superintendent expressed a concern that the proposed roads will be gravel and it was decided that pavement would be placed on either end going into and out of the round-about so as to anchor it into the space. Ms. Becker also noted that the Highway Superintendent had some concerns about the proposed sidewalks and whether the road width would accommodate them. It was pointed out that the sidewalks will be placed on Camphill property separate from the roads. Ms. Jansen clarified that the Highway Superintendent is not being asked to maintain the sidewalks within his right-of-way.

Mr. Grant made note of the fact that in the past a variance had been granted for parking of a previously approved building on this site on the condition that land would be dedicated to accommodate future parking should the ownership change. Ms. Jansen questioned which building he was referring to. Ms. Becker believed it was near the pond and clarified that this was only a flat area of land set aside for future use. Ms. Jansen acknowledged that a variance will most likely be asked for as it was not in their best interests to create a number of flat areas for extra parking they believe they will not need. Mr. Urban suggested the land could be dedicated somewhere else. Ms. Jansen agreed that this could be considered a possibility.

Ms. Jansen acknowledged that the Orchard House is within the seventy-five foot (75') set-back from the center of the road and is in violation of the zoning, however, this building is planned to be taken down in Phase three. Ms. Jansen made mention of the fact that an area variance would be needed for this. Mr. Grant did not believe an area variance would be needed inasmuch as the building is pre-existing and would be grandfathered. Ms. Jansen informed the Board that none of the new buildings will be placed within the seventy-five foot (75') buffer. Ms. Jansen also pointed out that removal of the interior lot is in the process of being done so there will be no set-back variances required. Attorney Rappleyea advised that the fire-code separation between buildings will need to be complied with. Ms. Jansen will discuss this with the architects.

Ms. Jansen made note of the fact that a one-hundred foot (100') buffer line from the stream had been drawn. Ms. Jansen pointed out that parking could be approached by showing a possibility that extra parking could be provided for so that the Planning Board could approve the plan without having to go to the ZBA. Ms. Grant advised that the previous process needed to be reviewed before considering this. Ms. Jansen questioned whether non-conforming was the same as not having the required special use permit. Attorney Rappleyea advised that this is the case as a Special Use Permit would be needed for something to be allowed in the zone.

Mr. Grant questioned whether any signage would be needed. Ms. Jansen questioned whether a permit would be required for a new more legible sign. Ms. Becker advised her that this would be

done by the Building Inspector as long as the sizes were in conformance with code. A variance would be needed if this is not the case.

Ms. Becker questioned the different uses of the buildings as some are commercial in one respect and part of the care facility in another respect. Ms. Sloan clarified that they are a purely therapeutic use. Ms. Jansen added that all of the clients are capable of productive activity suitable to their skills and work within the facility. Ms. Becker was unclear as to whether the commercial aspect of these building would complicate things. Ms. Jansen pointed out that the community as a whole receives funding from New York State per client, including capital improvement funding and maintenance funding with some income generated by the products made in the workshops. Mr. Grant questioned whether the existing store will remain as is or will it be expanded. Mr. Urban pointed out that the uses of the facility are not changing and the size of the facility is not being increased, only modified and enhanced. Ms. Jansen pointed out that the homes within the Village are in compliance with State regulations of when they were built forty years ago and many of the aspects of the homes are too small. Mr. Grant acknowledged that the only issue with the use is that there are regulations in the code for parking for commercial use but he was not sure whether the buildings meet code. Ms. Jansen assured him that each building will be studied to see what appropriate code would be applied to each specific building. The Board agreed that this would be quite helpful.

Ms. Sloan provided the Board with an updated plan for their records.

2011-8 CELL TOWER – MARINER TOWER – West Copake

Chris Ciolfi appeared before the Board. Ms. Becker informed the Board that there are three submissions that needed to be entered into the record, the Rescue Squad letter of support, the Radio Frequency Engineer, Mark Hoppe's resume and a package from Mr. Ciolfi referencing the coverage regulation objecting to the Town's definition of adequate coverage. Ms. Becker acknowledged that she would need Attorney Rappleyea's advice in dealing with the last submission.

Mr. Ciolfi advised the Board that throughout the County many of the Town's have the same definition within the older by-laws that were filed in the Town and they need to be address inasmuch as they are in the law even though standards have changed. Mr. Ciolfi noted that this would be addressed by the consultants. Ms. Becker questioned whether the Board needed to wait for feedback from the consultants before proceeding. Mr. Ciolfi advised that he would explain his position in the meantime but the Town's consultant would need to review it as well. Mr. Ciolfi noted that he will point out his compliance within the code.

Mr. Pilch reported on the Board's site visit to the proposed Cell Tower Site. It was Mr. Pilch's opinion that the site is as unobtrusive and practical a site as could be found within the Town. He believed it could comply with much of the Town's requirements, however, he noted that there were a few issues that Mr. Ciolfi would need to address. Mr. Pilch pointed out that one of the Town's requirements is underground service and the inspection of the site found it to be very ledgy. In Mr. Pilch's experience with construction he acknowledged that if this site were to be trenched, some water problems might be created. Mr. Pilch agreed with Mariner Tower's request to put the power above ground.

Ms. Becker referred to 230-7 (b) of the code regarding the utilities: *Utility or service lines shall be buried underground. The Planning Board may request input from the Town Highway Superintendent regarding the adequacy of emergency access for the planned drive or roadway to the site. The Planning Board may waive the underground requirement at its discretion.* Attorney Rappleyea informed the Board that should the Board decide to waive this they would need a rational basis in exercising this discretion. Ms. Becker pointed out that it is a long haul up to the planned site and is through and adjacent to Army Corp. of Engineer regulated wetlands and there could be some environmental impacts. Attorney Rappleyea acknowledged that this would be a rational basis. Ms. Becker encouraged all Board members to make a site visit. Mr. Ciolfi would schedule future visits with the land owner.

Mr. Ciolfi referred to the reproduction of the maps presented to the Board referencing the designated signal strength and explained the different signal strength areas. Mr. Ciolfi pointed out that the Town's standard is -90 DBL whereas the Mariner Tower proposed coverage is -64/-74 DBL and is stronger than the Town standard. Mr. Ciolfi acknowledged that although he could comply with Town standards, the coverage would not be a good quality by standards today. Mr. Ciolfi advised that the frequency consultant will be very familiar with this and could advise the Board accordingly. Mr. Ciolfi explained that standards are set for a national footprint as Town codes differ.

Ms. Becker referred to the TOWAIR Determination Results notice of Tab 6 and noted that a license is not required and stated that the NEPA checklist is not complete. Ms. Becker questioned whether the application can be sent to the ZBA prior to completion of the first part of the EAF. Attorney Rappleyea did not see any objection to this and noted that they would not be bound by any determinations as the Planning Board is the lead agency. Attorney Rappleyea believed that the ZBA might see some other issues early on and might see some issues that will help through the environmental review.

Ms. Becker questioned whether the Board was at a place whereas the application could be deemed complete. Mr. Grant brought up the fact that a consultant was not present at this month's meeting inasmuch as his contract had not been completed. He added that the Consultant would not be available to review the application until the end of June. Mr. Grant's preference was to wait until the consultant reviewed the application. Mr. Grant pointed out that Mr. Ciolfi was waiting for an environmental review to complete 'Part I'. Mr. Ciolfi advised the Board that these processes usually run parallel and noted that there are so many other things needing to be addressed and even if the application were to be deemed complete the Public Hearing process could begin and they could get impact feedback from the public. It was Mr. Ciolfi's wish to begin the process so he could proceed forward as they are pushing up against the winter at this time. Mr. Grant expressed concern that once the application is deemed complete, the clock starts ticking. He noted that the Balloon Float is within a time frame. Mr. Ciolfi noted that he would be willing to grant extensions if the Board agreed to move forward with the application.

Ms. Becker pointed out that the SEQR is the only aspect that is not complete as all documents have been checked in. Mr. Ciolfi noted that the SEQR can be typically conducted during Planning Board Review. Ms. Becker clarified that the SEQR can be part of the review. Ms. Becker acknowledged that any documentation from the consultants is also part of the initial review. Attorney Rappleyea advised that the Board is not required to make a determination with respect to environmental aspects and advised that substantial compliance with the list of items is

needed to proceed. He added that the fact that the Board does not have a report on wildlife does not mean it is an incomplete application is his opinion. Ms. Becker questioned what the time frame would be if the application would be deemed complete and noted that the application still needed to be referred to the ZBA. Mr. Grant pointed out that the ZBA must make a determination within an amount of time. Ms. Becker noted that they have sixty (60) days after their Public Hearing.

Mr. Grant again expressed concerns that he would like a consultant to review the application prior to deeming it complete as the adequate coverage presented by Mariner Tower goes against Town Code and needs to be reviewed by Attorney Rappleyea. Mr. Ciolfi made the argument that Mariner Tower is complying with Town Code inasmuch as they are adding the proper additional coverage. Attorney Rappleyea explained that this is part of the Mariner Tower review and analysis of the application and not necessarily whether the application is complete or not. Mr. Ciolfi believed inasmuch as there would be much discussion regarding this issue during the review process it was not necessarily needed for the application to be deemed complete. Ms. Becker questioned the Town's time frame. It was noted that the Balloon Float needed to be scheduled within forty-five days after the application is deemed complete. Mr. Grant questioned whether the Balloon Float had to be scheduled by the Board. He was informed that it is the Board's responsibility and Mr. Ciolfi was prepared with a list of possible dates.

Ms. Becker questioned whether the Board believed the application was complete. Mr. Pilch believed it was as complete as it could be for the moment and believed it could be accepted. Mr. Grant expressed regret that the Balloon Test could not have been done before there were leaves on the trees and suggested scheduling it when the leaves are off the trees. Mr. Ciolfi believed that the Balloon Test would show that where you will see the Tower it won't make a difference whether leaves are on or off the trees and the plans show that the closest adjacent homes are very well treed and their consultant will do a map that predicts visibility due to topography and/or blocks due to topography or vegetation, however, the test needs to be done before those reports can be made available.

Mr. Urban expressed concern that the EAF would be needed prior to the Public Hearing as the public's only opposition would be part of the EAF as well. Ms. Becker noted that this is another scheduling issue and questioned when Mr. Ciolfi could be sent before the ZBA and whether the ZBA Public Hearing is the same one the Planning Board will hold. Mr. Urban noted that a Public Hearing cannot be held until the Board has all the information they needed. Attorney Rappleyea advised that the Code does allow for integration of processes and potentially if it works out in that fashion you could have a Public Hearing the same night for both matters. He also noted that this could be a gamble for the applicant as without a variance the applicant would have spent his time and money for nothing. Ms. Becker noted that if the application is deemed complete at this meeting they can get the consultants working.

Mr. Ciolfi expressed concern that the application might not be deemed complete as he has not been asked for anything new. Mr. Grant explained that contracting the consultant took more time than anticipated as there were issues with the contract. Mr. Ciolfi also expressed concern that the engineer is quite a distance out of town. Mr. Urban brought up the fact that there are things missing from the report. Mr. Ciolfi again explained that the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) Report Mr. Urban was referring to, runs in parallel and is not required by the code that this is a submission. Mr. Urban also questioned the fact that part of the EAF is missing. Mr.

Ciofli explained that one part of the EAF needs one item from the NEPA Review which is the endangered species list. Mr. Grant believed that to be fair to the Town of Copake the clock should not be started. Ms. Becker suggested putting this to a vote.

On a motion made by Mr. Pilch and seconded by Ms. Becker the Board voted three (3) to two (2) against deeming the application complete with Mr. Grant, Mr. Urban and Mr. Savarese against and Ms. Becker and Mr. Pilch in favor. Mr. Ciofli questioned what is needed before the application can be deemed complete. Mr. Grant advised him that the Radio Frequency Engineer review is needed to make sure that no information is being missed. Mr. Ciofli made note of the fact that the scope of the Town Law is so limited where it comes to what is required to be submitted. Mr. Grant advised him that the Board has a say in where the Tower is to be located and noted that the ZBA would also need the Radio Frequency Engineer for their review. Ms. Becker referred to the NEPA Check List and noted that a full EAF Environmental Assessment be filed with the FCC before beginning operation. Mr. Ciofli noted that if you look at the Check List in Tab 6 and they come back in the negative, it is not that Mariner Tower cannot proceed, it means they need to file more information.

Mr. Grant reminded him that he expressed a desire to review the Town consultant. Mr. Ciofli advised him that he had reviewed the consultant and believed it was unusual to use a consultant that far away when there are many much closer. Mr. Ciofli was not familiar with Mr. Hoppe and noted that AT&T is also not familiar with Mr. Hoppe. Mr. Grant questioned whether Mr. Hoppe had been engaged as yet. Ms. Becker acknowledged that Mr. Hoppe has not yet been engaged.

Ms. Becker questioned whether that application could be referred to the ZBA at this time. The Board was in agreement with this. Ms. Becker pointed out that the application needs a height variance to one-hundred and fifty feet (150') as requested by the applicant and location to within the fifteen hundred foot (1,500') horizontal set-back to two neighboring residences. Ms. Becker acknowledged that the Board had the power to allow for the above ground utilities. Mr. Ciofli noted that a waiver for this request appears in the application. The Board agreed to engage an Environmental Consultant to review the environmental impacts of the application.

Mr. Ciofli asked whether the application can be amended if the ZBA does not grant the proposed variances without starting the process again. Attorney Rappleyea advised him that the only difference would be that the RF science would be different as the height would be different.

Mr. Ciofli questioned whether he needed to return next month and whether the report from the consultant will be prepared by then. Ms. Becker advised him that Mr. Hoppe informed her that he should be able to start the review by the end of June. Ms. Becker advised Mr. Ciofli that the ZBA will need to begin an initial meeting with him on the fourth Thursday of the month. Mr. Ciofli asked the Board if there was anything else needed from him. Mr. Grant advised him that there was nothing needed at this time.

MINUTES

Ms. Becker asked if there were any changes to the Minutes of May 5, 2011. No changes or corrections were needed. On a motion made by Mr. Savarese and seconded by Mr. Pilch, the Board voted unanimously to accept the minutes of the May 5th meeting.

ADMINISTRATIVE

FREED APPLICATION CORRECTION: Ms. Becker reminded the Board that she met with Zoning Board Chair, Jeff Nayer regarding a building permit needed by Scott Decker for Alan Freed and a letter. Ms. Becker noted that the Board agreed to approve the Site Plan and acknowledged that a motion should have been made regarding this. The matter was discussed and a motion was made but not finalized.

CJL REALTY CORP: Ms. Becker advised the Board that CJL Realty Corp. had Site Plan approval in 2008 which expired at the end of April. Ms. Becker informed the Board that she received a letter from them expressing a desire to extend the approval for another three (3) years. On a motion made by Mr. Savarese and seconded by Mr. Pilch the Board voted unanimously to extend Site Plan approval for the next three years.

TRAINING SESSION: Ms. Becker informed the Board that there is a Training Session for the Introduction to Planning and Zoning at Columbia-Greene Community College on June 22, 2011.

COLUMBIA COUNTY GIS: Ms. Becker advised the Board that Columbia County is proposing a GIS Program for all of the County enabling people throughout the County to use their GIS map reading skills in Community Planning.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN DRAFT: Ms. Becker presented the Board with a draft of the Town's Comprehensive Plan which will be presented on Saturday and advised them that the Planning Board needs to review it and make comments, if any, to the Town Board by their July meeting.

COLUMBIA COUNTY DPW TOWN BOARD LIAISON: Linda Gabbaccia, Planning Board Liaison informed the Board that she has been appointed the Town Liaison of the Columbia County DPW and if any one has any questions regarding the Brown's Dam project they can direct them to her.

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

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, on a motion made by Mr. Grant and seconded by Ms. Becker, the Board voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

Marcia Becker, Chair

Please note that all referenced attachments, comprising 5 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

CAMP HILL VILLAGE

June 2, 2011 Clark to CPB (2)

MARINER TOWER

May 26, 2011 Community Rescue Squad to CPB (1)

May 2011 Hoppe to CPB (2)