



**COPAKE PLANNING BOARD**  
**MARCH 16, 2013**  
**MINUTES**

**Approved**  
**April 20, 2013**

---

**Please note that all referenced attachments, comprising 15 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 9:30 a.m. by Marcia Becker, Chair. Also present were Chris Grant, Gray Davis, Bob Haight, and Jon Urban. George Filipovits and Steve Savarese were excused. Veronique Fabio recorded the minutes in Lisa DeConti's absence.

**ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS – Referrals**

**1. ZBA REFERRAL/SPR – ERIC AND CAROL SOKOL – Lakeview Road [Copake Lake] – (2013-3)**

The Board reviewed the site maps for Eric and Carol Sokol's property. Ms Becker advised the Board that there were outstanding items regarding the Septic System. She entered a letter from Bill Baldwin dated February 13, 2013 into the record which states that there are two (2) large clay tanks that together equal about two-hundred and fifty (250) gallons, each of which empty into the dry wells. It was also noted that these tanks are not sized appropriately per Department of Health Code.

Linda Chernewsky who appeared representing Eric and Carol Sokol noted that two (2) other letters regarding the septic system had been presented at last month's meeting. Ms. Becker reminded her that these letters were much older than the letter received from Mr. Baldwin and there were discrepancies in the size of the tanks.

Mr. Grant questioned how far this was from the lake and Mr. Haight advised him that the house is ninety-five feet (95') from the lake. It was noted that although the tanks are one-hundred feet (100') from the lake, they are undersized for the existing two (2) bedroom house. Mr. Grant pointed out that the dry wells are closer to the lake than they should be and are also undersized. Ms. Chernewsky stated that there are five (5) fields and two tanks. She was advised that the tanks are what are undersized. Ms. Chernewsky also made note of the fact that the tanks are pre-existing and not failing. Mr. Grant advised her that the Site Plan process is to make sure that everything is what it should be and noted that the tanks are undersized. Mr. Grant pointed out that due to the close proximity of the septic system to the lake it is in everyone's best interest that it is the correct size.

Ms. Becker questioned if the Board wanted to send this to Engineer Doug Clark for review or whether they were comfortable approving this at this time. Mr. Urban questioned whether this would affect the building the homeowner is proposing. Ms. Chernewsky pointed out that without Site Plan approval a Building Permit cannot be obtained. Mr. Urban suggested conditional Site Plan approval. Mr. Haight advised that conditional approval should include the condition that should the septic system need to be updated or changed according to Mr. Clark's recommendation it would have to be done.

Ms. Chernewsky had issue with the fact that the Board is requiring two (2) tanks that are in working order be dug up and replaced. Mr. Grant advised her that the Board is not asking this and is asking that Mr. Clark review the project and advise whether the system is adequate inasmuch as the tanks are presently undersized. Ms. Chernewsky questioned why the condition couldn't be stipulated that should the septic system fail it be replaced with a one-thousand (1,000) gallon tank. Mr. Grant brought up the fact that the issue is not with the system failing but with the system being sized correctly and brought up to code which is why he is in favor of the engineer reviewing it.

Mr. Urban again suggested conditional approval contingent on Mr. Clark's review so that the homeowner can proceed with building. Mr. Grant was not comfortable with doing this inasmuch as the tank is undersized. Mr. Davis suggested sending it to Mr. Clark to review and if he feels the system is appropriate the homeowner can proceed and if he feels the system is not appropriate and needs replacement than the homeowner cannot proceed. It was Mr. Grant's opinion that Mr. Clark will not recommend this system as it is not up to code. Ms. Becker explained that Mr. Clark will make a recommendation as to whether the existing system is adequate or what can be done to make it so. Ms. Chernewsky advised the Board that she has documentation from the previous attorney stating that if the system is in working order it does not have to be dug up and replaced. Ms. Chernewsky also made note of the fact that the Board of Health will not inspect the system of a renovation and questioned who will inspect the system.

Ms. Becker acknowledged that building cannot be started with conditional approval inasmuch as the plans cannot be stamped on conditional approval they need a recommendation from the engineer before they can be stamped. Mr. Haight questioned whether a one-thousand (1,000) gallon tank can be placed on the property due to its size. Mr. Grant advised that there are several systems that can be used and it is up to the engineer to recommend what system would be best for this situation.

Mr. Haight asked whether the Board would be in agreement to conditionally approve the plans prior to next month's meeting should the engineer say the system can remain. Mr. Grant was not comfortable with this recommendation and noted that the Board will have to agree or disagree with the engineer's recommendation at a public meeting. Mr. Urban was in agreement with conditional approval so the homeowner could proceed on the engineer's recommendation. Ms. Becker advised that everything would need to be entered into the record at a public meeting and acknowledged that variances were granted by the ZBA. It was also acknowledged that everything is acceptable with the house and the only outstanding issue is regarding the septic system. The Town's consulting engineer would be asked for a recommendation.

## **2. ZBA REFERRAL – DALTON & JESSICA SACHS – SW Colony Rd [Copake Lake] – (2013-5)**

Ms. Becker advised the Board that this is a review of a ZBA Referral for Dalton and Jessica Sachs who are proposing a very large addition to a three (3) bedroom house on the west side of Southwest Colony Road on Copake Lake which will be a two (2) level parking garage with a third story loft. Ms. Becker pointed out that there is a concrete slab between floors of the garage. Ms. Becker noted that the property is on a legal lot and is a conforming structure but a side-yard variance will be needed as they are proposing to go six feet (6') into the set-back.

Ms. Becker questioned whether this will be a private use or not. It was also questioned how the lower level garage will be entered. Ms. Becker felt it should be suggested to the ZBA that the entrance to the lower garage be designated. Mr. Grant questioned the height and Mr. Davis advised that it is thirty-three feet six inches (33'6"). Ms. Becker acknowledged that the structure is a conforming structure on a conforming lot and the third story is not being used as living quarters. Mr. Davis advised that the ZBA should be aware of the fact that should the third story be converted to living space it will need to come before the Planning Board for approval. Mr. Grant pointed out that it should be noted that the storage above the garage can easily be converted to a bedroom. Ms. Becker suggested the recommendation contain a clause that it come before the Planning Board should the storage space be converted into a bedroom.

Mr. Grant questioned whether the Board needs to review the septic system at this time. Ms. Becker advised that the system is adequate for the house and noted that plans are for the storage space to remain unfinished.

## **3. ZBA REFERRAL – JANE LANDERS – Lincoln Drive [Taconic Shores] – (2013-6)**

Ms. Becker advised the Board that the ZBA Referral for Jane Landers concerns a shed she is proposing that appears to completely conform to the Code. Mr. Grant questioned why this was before the ZBA. Ms. Becker advised him that sheds are non-conforming structures and require a special use permit.

After review it was noted that the Board will advise the ZBA that everything in this application conforms to the Code.

## **PUBLIC HEARING**

### **2012 -30 MAJOR SUBDIVISION – VIJOBA REALTY – Yonderview Road**

Ms. Becker advised the Board that the Public Hearing for Vijoba Realty remained open from last month's meeting. On a motion made by Ms. Becker and seconded by Mr. Grant the Board voted unanimously to close the Public Hearing.

## **SUBDIVISION/SITE PLAN**

### **2012 -30 MAJOR SUBDIVISION – VIJOBA REALTY – Yonderview Road**

Ms. Becker acknowledged that there were new submissions and entered into the record the driveway inspection report, the Department of Health letter for the fourteen (14) acre lot that is part of the subdivision, and the Driveway Easement Agreement.

Dan Russell was present representing Vijoba Realty. Ms. Becker acknowledged that the Driveway Easement Agreement was reviewed by Attorney Ken Dow who advised that the easement looks fine and references a map which presumably indicates the easement provides access from Parcel One to a public roadway, however the easement is not yet executed and suggested its completion be a condition of approval. Ms. Becker noted that she does not have an executed copy of the Driveway Easement Agreement. Mr. Russell will have this taken care of between Mr. Gellert and the Attorney.

Ms. Becker noted that Attorney Dow said there is some ambiguity in the agreement which he does not believe is a concern of the Planning Board stating that all costs for maintenance and repair be shared. Mr. Russell believed this needed to be stated within the easement and will have Mr. Gellert's attorney contact Attorney Dow.

Mr. Russell presented the Board with the Application Form along with a letter regarding the wetlands. Mr. Russell acknowledged the changes he made to the map which now reads as Proposed Major Subdivision. He presented the aquifer map which shows that there are no aquifers and acknowledged the additional notes one of which referred to the list of conservation analysis required by the Board. Mr. Russell also acknowledged that Attorney Dow will be drafting a note similar to the one added to Joe Flood's map which will need to be added.

Ms. Becker questioned whether the conservation easement had been reviewed last month. Ms. Becker checked the map to see if everything was accounted for. Ms. Becker noted that the conservation analysis needed to be added. Ms. Becker acknowledged the Draft Decision by Attorney Dow dated March 11, 2013 and Mr. Davis read it into the record. Mr. Russell advised that the total acreage in the Draft Decision is incorrect and the correct acreage is three-hundred and seventeen point (317.7) acres and includes the fourteen (14) acre parcel which is being subdivided. It was noted that the calculations would need to be amended to reflect the correct acreage. The SEQR was reviewed.

On a motion made by Ms. Becker and seconded by Mr. Grant the Board voted unanimously to make a Negative Declaration.

On a motion made by Mr. Davis and seconded by Mr. Haight the Board voted all in favor to approve the Major Subdivision for the Vijoba Realty Corporation LLC on Yonderview Road consisting of subdividing a single lot of fourteen (14) acres from three-hundred and seventeen point seven (317.7) acres from a Survey Map by Daniel Russell dated March 13, 2013 subject to map revisions by Mr. Russell, the execution of the Driveway Easement and the revision of the calculations in the Decision.

**2012 -29      SITE PLAN REVIEW – YONDERVIEW LLC – Yonderview Road**

Ms. Becker advised the Board that although this Site Plan was previously conditionally approved in October 2012 some changes had been made which require an amendment and final approval. Ms. Becker acknowledged a new Department of Health letter.

Julia Sedlock and Mark Rowntree appeared representing the applicant and noted that some changes were made since the approval had been granted. Ms. Sedlock presented the updated Site Plan and the revised floor plans and elevations. Ms. Sedlock pointed out that the major change is that the partial basement is being eliminated and the house will now be built on a slab and the house is being increased by a few hundred square feet making the house one-hundred and twenty four feet (124') long. Ms. Sedlock acknowledged that Erosion Control notes were added to the map noting the addition of silt fences or straw bales and the Garage noted as Phase two (2) will be done at a later date.

Ms. Becker acknowledged receipt of the Health Department approval for the Septic System which was the other outstanding item and noted that the only amendment is the increase in the size of the building. Ms. Becker questioned whether a Driveway Specification letter had been received and acknowledged that it had as part of the earlier lot subdivision approval.

Ms. Becker also brought up the fact that there had been a question as to whether the fee had been paid. Mr. Rowntree acknowledged that the fee was due the Planning Board and presented it.

On a motion made by Mr. Grant and seconded by Mr. Haight the Board voted unanimously to approve the Site Plan for the Edward Merrill house amended, based on the Cosmo Design Factory and dated March 7, 2013. Ms. Becker will stamp the maps when an additional copy is given to her.

**2013 -1      SITE PLAN REVIEW – MARIA ZADRIMA – Golf Course Road**

Andrew Aubin from Crawford Associates appeared before the Board representing Maria Zadrina. Ms. Becker acknowledged receipt of the Erosion Control Inspection Report, a new landscaping plan dated March 6, 2013 and a comment from Doug Clark who recommended that a version of a SWPPP be made for the site along with a regular monitoring recording of the remediation until the site is completely restored.

Mr. Aubin informed the Board that the size of the trees has been increased to twenty feet (20') and some evergreen and conifer trees have been added on both the lake side and the road side to provide year round coverage. Mr. Davis acknowledged that he had previously discussed this with Mr. Aubin and approved of the changes. Ms. Becker questioned whether Mr. Aubin had a horizontal view of the landscaping from the lake and was advised by Mr. Aubin that the landscaper was not able to provide an updated version for the meeting.

Mr. Aubin noted that Mr. Clark reviewed the existing erosion sediment control plans and approved of them. He acknowledged that the matting is the only thing from that plan that has not yet been implemented but he plans on encouraging the owner to implement this within the next

week or so and he will inform the Board and Mr. Clark when this is completed. Mr. Aubin noted that a SWPPP includes a plan of action which has been provided and monitoring on a long term basis which does not apply in this case as there are no structures to be maintained. He did feel that regular documentation until the project is complete would apply in this instance to make sure the site is remediated. Mr. Aubin noted that the contractor who is qualified as an inspector by the State of New York will be onsite documenting the progress and a qualified individual such as himself or other certified individual can make monthly documentation or documentations after significant rainfall.

Ms. Becker requested that the house location is pinned by the surveyor. She also made suggestions that the Board could consider for approval, such as the planting along the lake be completed before a building permit be issued, all plantings and site remediation that will not be damaged during construction be done prior to the issuance of the building permit or all landscaping be completed before a C of O is issued. Mr. Davis felt completing the landscaping before issuance of a C of O made the most sense. Mr. Aubin acknowledged that this choice is pretty customary.

Ms. Becker made note of the fact that the original Site Plan needed to be reviewed and Mr. Aubin advised her that the location of the building is the same and none of the other components have changed. Mr. Davis questioned whether anything is planned for the other side of Golf Course Road as a lot of work was done there. Mr. Aubin acknowledged that the relocation of the culvert was done just prior to the trees being cut and was not part of Mr. Zadrina's property.

On a motion made by Mr. Davis and seconded by Mr. Haight the Board voted unanimously to approve the landscape plan from a drawing by Pouter Design Group dated March 6, 2013

Ms. Becker read a Decision into the record. On a motion made by Ms. Becker and seconded by Mr. Urban the Board voted unanimously to approve the Site Plan to the Zadrina residence based upon the original map with the landscaping overlay already noted, dated March 16, 2013, subject to the following conditions: a version of a SWPPP document is provided to the Planning Board and the Town Engineer which will include a monitoring inspection schedule, the house is pinned by a surveyor and coordinates with the Site Map before a building permit is issued, landscaping plan is approved and all landscaping must be completed before a C of O by the Code Enforcement Officer.

Mr. Aubin acknowledged that the four (4) major point corner pins will need to be place on the property before building can begin. Ms. Becker and Mr. Aubin will clarify the description of the SWPPP with Mr. Clark. Three full size drawings will be provided for Ms. Becker to stamp.

## **2012 -28      SITE PLAN REVIEW – LAWRENCE AND KATHRYN HOUSE– Pine Street**

Andrew Aubin and appeared representing Lawrence and Kathryn House. Ms. Becker acknowledged the ZBA decision granting the variances, the Doug Clark letter from Erin Moore, an Escrow account has been established, a letter from Mr. Aubin dated March 4, 2013 and an application fee. Ms. Becker read the letter from Erin Moore of Clark Engineering into the record acknowledging a Septic Holding Tank is acceptable and suggesting a letter in writing from the

engineer that it is of the opinion that neither a conventional or alternative technology system can be successfully installed on this parcel.

Ms. Becker then read Mr. Aubin's response in the record stating he feels there is no other acceptable system that will work at this site and Clark Engineering agrees that this is likely the only option. Erin Moore's letter also noted that this system is the least favorable option as it will protect the lake from contaminants that result from a failing septic system but pointed out that there is a significant concern that over time homeowners may get tired of paying for its pumping and illegally install a pipe discharging the flow elsewhere. The letter acknowledged that if the house was occupied full time Department of Health guidelines indicate a design flow of two-hundred and twenty eight (228) gallons per day should be assumed for a two (2) bedroom house and at this flow rate the house would need to be pumped every eleven (11) days equating to thirty three (33) time a year at a cost for each pumping of four-hundred dollars (\$400.00) for a two-hundred and fifty (250) gallon tank. This would equate to a cost of thirteen-thousand three-hundred dollars (\$13,300.00) a year. This letter also pointed out that Crawford and Associates has included methods that should go far in discouraging a tank overflow but acknowledged that little can be done from a design perspective to ensure that sometime in the future these methods are disconnected. Suggestions were made in the letter such as the Planning Board require a multi-year contract between the parcel owner and the septic hauler but Clark is not sure what process is appropriate to ensure this contract is renewed; the Town require submission of receipts annually to ensure the system has been pumped and/or inspected; the Town inspect the tank annually to confirm no pipe has been installed.

Mr. Aubin's response was also read into the record stating that a conventional or alternative technology septic system is not feasible for this parcel and noted the cottage will not be occupied full time by the owner. Mr. Aubin's letter also acknowledged that the owner is aware of the cost and is planning on contracting a hauler with long-term service. Ms. Becker requested a copy of the hauler contract.

Mr. Aubin advised the Board that the homeowner plans on occupying the residence approximately eight (8) months a year on a weekend basis at a cost of approximately eight-hundred dollars (\$800.00) a season. Mr. Haight questioned how often the system will be pumped and was advised by Mr. Aubin that this will probably need to be pumped once a month.

On a motion made by Mr. Grant and seconded by Mr. Davis the Board voted unanimously to approve the Site Plan for the Diane Riemer House project at Copake Lake based on the Site Plan from Crawford and Associates dated January 28, 2013 as well as a ZBA supplied Site Map dated May 28, 2004 subject to receipt of a copy of the multi-year contract between the parcel owner and the septic hauler; and that the Town has the right to inspect the tank annually and confirm that no affluent pipe has been installed.

Ms. Becker will stamp the appropriate maps.

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

The applicant's representative did not appear at this meeting.

**2012 -33 MAJOR SUBDIVISION/BLA – SCOTT COHEN REALTY – High Meadow Road [Copake Lake]**

Michael and Eileen Cohen appeared with Attorney Francis Roche. Ms Becker acknowledged receipt of a proposed map on January 13, 2013 and noted that she contacted Mr. Cohen advising him that it appeared to be a Major Subdivision and is subject to the Flexible Lot Subdivision Regulations. She also acknowledged that two driveway location reports were received as well as two more maps. Ms. Becker made note of the fact that there was a misunderstanding between Scot Cohen and Ed Ferratto as to whether he had to subdivide prior to building on the property, however this was clarified not to be the case.

Ms. Becker then brought up the fact that at a previous meeting it was noted that although two (2) lots had been removed from the parcel, two (2) lots were also added. Ms. Becker spoke with Attorney Dow regarding this who advised clarifying whether the two (2) lots had been merged with the parcel. It was noted that they were. Ms. Becker acknowledged the assessors records confirming this. Ms. Becker noted that Attorney Dow advised her that the Board had a lot of discretion to classify this as a minor subdivision inasmuch as two (2) lots had been removed and replaced with two (2) lots bringing the total subdivisions under the requirement for a Major Subdivision.

Mr. Grant questioned whether the intent was for no further subdivisions and questioned whether Mr. Cohen would be willing to put this in a deed restriction. Attorney Roche said that might be a possibility for the back two lots but not the front lots. Attorney Roche interpreted the Town Code to read that you can have as many accessory buildings or houses as can fit the property and questioned whether this was the case. Ms. Becker acknowledged that this is what it seems as long as the proper set-backs are met.

Ms. Becker reviewed the purpose of the Flexible Lot Conservation Subdivision Code 232-26.1.A(2) which reads: *Flexible lot subdivisions allow design flexibility while preserving important natural attributes of the land. The purpose of flexible lot subdivision development is to ensure that environmental resources are protected and that development occurs on the land that is best suited for development.* Ms. Becker brought up the fact that this land has been identified by the Conservation Resources Committee as one of the important scenic features in the Town and in one of the open space features of the Town.

Mrs. Cohen pointed out that this is not being divided into small little lots, it will be large parcels and be organically farmed.

Attorney Roche's opinion is that this can only be viewed as a Minor Subdivision and referred to Town Code 197-5(G) which reads: *Any subsequent minor subdivision of any lot approved under this chapter must be submitted to the Planning Board for approval, and the number of additional lots shall be added cumulatively to the number of lots approved since 1972. At the discretion of the Planning Board, it may determine that a subsequent minor subdivision plus the earlier minor subdivision result in a number of lots that would require application as a major subdivision. In such event, the Planning Board may require that the new subdivision application be considered a major subdivision and all requirements and limitations of a major subdivision must therefore be met.* Attorney Roche believed this is not pertinent in this instance and pointed out that after the addition of the two (2) lots this lot is bigger than it originally was.

Ms. Becker questioned whether there were site locations. The maps were reviewed. Ms. Becker noted that a Conservation Subdivision would assure that a house is not put in the middle of a farm field. Attorney Roche noted that Mr. Cohen will be putting up a barn on the property. Ms. Becker questioned whether the property had been perc tested and Attorney Roche advised her that Mr. Cohen did not have the property perc tested but it might have been tested previously.

Ms. Becker asked the Board if they had any comments. Mr. Urban felt this should be classified as a Minor Subdivision. Mr. Grant made a point of noting that if Mr. Cohen would be willing to place a deed restriction on the two upper lots the Town would be very much in favor of this as the intent of the Conservation Flexible Lot Subdivision is to preserve open land.

A discussion ensued regarding whether this should be classified as a Minor or Major Subdivision. Mr. Grant's opinion was that this had to be looked at with the intent in mind and the intent is to have a large lot subdivision however he would like to see the uplands conserved in a deed restriction if possible.

On a motion made by Mr. Davis and seconded by Mr. Haight the Board voted unanimously to classify this subdivision as a Minor Subdivision based on the research and history, and applicant's plans for proposed future development.

Ms. Becker advised that an application will need to be filled out when the applicants return for the subdivision process.

#### **2011 -24      SITE PLAN REVISION – MARK FRANK – Island Drive [Copake Lake]**

Ms. Becker acknowledged the revised submission which needs to be approved by the Board. She made note of the fact that after inspection by the Code Enforcement Officer it was noted that the retaining wall had to conform to the thirty foot (30') set-back or a variance would be needed. A letter from Miguel Sostre acknowledged that the retaining walls were made to conform.

Mr. Davis noted that the Ejector Pump Grinder on the property is approximately ten feet (10') above the existing grade and pointed out that this will have to be lowered or dealt with so that the swale can be created given the pump grinder's location. He suggested this be a condition of the approval. It was noted that landscape grading must not compromise the function of the swales to keep run-off on the Franks property.

On a motion made by Mr. Davis and seconded by Mr. Haight the Board voted all in favor with Mr. Grant abstaining to approve the revised Site Plan for the Frank property on 239 Island Drive, Copake Lake based on a map dated August 27, 2012, received by the Planning Board on January 23, 2013, subject to a condition that the elevated Pump Grinder and landscape grading does not disturb the maintenance and existence of a swale designed to effectively keep the water run-off on their own property.

## MINUTES

On a motion made by Ms. Becker and seconded by Mr. Haight the Board voted unanimously to approve the February minutes.

## ADMINISTRATIVE

**SALVATORE CASCINO:** Ms. Becker advised the Board that Mr. Cascino continues to build without a building permit and acknowledged that Mr. Cascino will be going to court on March 27, 2013. Mr. Davis informed the Board that there is steel going up on Mr. Cascino's property and it looks like he will be enclosing the grinder. Ms. Becker advised to keep e-mails going to the Code Enforcement Officer's office and copied to the Town Board. Ms. Becker made note of the fact that the Code Enforcement Officer and the Town Board are aware that Mr. Cascino continues to build without permits in violation of the Court Orders. It was Mr. Haight's understanding that the people installing the extension by the grinder of the concrete wall where the forms were set up, went to the Building Inspector for an inspection and was informed that there was no permit but the building continued despite this.

**POLICY MANUAL:** Ms. Becker advised the Board that they are all supposed to sign a paper stating that they have looked at the Policy Manual.

**DOUG CLARK:** Ms. Becker advised the Board that Doug Clark was put on retainer by the Town and she has all the rates should anyone want to see them.

**ZONING CODE REVISIONS:** Ms. Becker informed the Board that Susan Sweeney made a recommendation to the Town Board that Attorney Dow review the Zoning Code, edit it and take out inconsistencies so as to clarify a few things inasmuch as the ZBA is struggling with the definitions of the non-conforming lot references. Mr. Grant made note of the fact that the zoning code will be reissued. Ms. Becker believed Ms. Sweeney was concerned with any immediate issues and was not making changes but is more concerned with eliminating inconsistencies. Mr. Haight suggested consulting Attorney Dow with any decisions that need to be made rather than have him take the time to review it at this time. Mr. Grant agreed.

## CARRY OVER

The following matters were carried over to the next meeting:

**2012 -4        MINOR SUBDIVISION – MICHAEL FREED – Woodchuck Road  
[Copake Lake]**

**2012 -14       SPR/BLUESTONE & TRAFFIC CIRCLE – CAMPHILL VILLAGE – Camphill  
Road [Copake Lake]**

**2011-18        SITE PLAN REVIEW – DOMINICK SINISI – Lakeview Road [Copake Lake]**

## **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 12:00 p.m.

---

Marcia Becker, Chair

**Please note that all referenced attachments, comprising 15 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**

### VIJOBA REALTH

December 5, 2012	DOH to Vijoba (1)
January 8, 2013	Gregory to Vijoba (1)
February 20, 2013	Crawford to Becker (1)
March 6, 2013`	Ken to CPB (1)
March 16, 2013	Dow to CPB (2)

### YONDERVIEW LLC

October 2, 2012	DOH to Vijoba (1)
-----------------	-------------------

### MARIA ZADRIMA

February 4, 2013	Nichols to Aubin (1)
Marcy 16, 2013	Zadrma Decision to CPB (2)

### LAWRENCE & KATHRYN HOUSE

February 26, 2013	Moore to Becker/CPB (2)
March 4, 2013	Aubin to Becker/CPB (1)

### SCOT COHEN

October 16, 2012	DOH to Cohen (1)
October 16, 2012	Gregory to Cohen (1)