



COPAKE PLANNING BOARD

MAY 2, 2019

MINUTES

DRAFT

Please note that all referenced attachments, comprising 17 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 7:03 p.m. by Bob Haight, Chair. Also present were Chris Grant, Marcia Becker, Julie Cohen, Ed Sawchuk, and Jon Urban. Steve Savarese was excused. Town Supervisor Jeff Nayer, Town Board Liaison Richard Wolf and Attorney Ken Dow were also present. Lisa DeConti was present to record the Minutes.

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS – Referrals

NONE

PUBLIC HEARING

**2019-9 BOUNDARY LINE ADJUSTMENT – MARC SCHILDER – Pond Hill Road
and Lakeview Road [Copake Lake]**

- Subdivision Map
- SEQRA Part I

Mr. Haight opened the Public Hearing and asked if anyone would like to speak on this application. Being none.

**On a motion made by Mr. Grant and seconded by Ms. Cohen the Board voted
unanimously to close the Public Hearing.**

2017-38 SITE PLAN REVIEW – GRJH INC. – State Route 23 [Craryville]
(Open since November 2, 2017)

- E-mail from Peter Watson dated April 10, 2019
- E-mail from Yoonmi Lee dated April 10, 2019
- E-mail from Nancy Wiese dated April 11, 2019
- E-mail from Meridth Glabman dated April 11, 2019
- E-mail from Amy Davidson dated May 1, 2019
- Letter from David Gordon dated May 2, 2019

Mr. Haight reminded everyone that the Public Hearing remained open and there is a two (2) minute time limit to speak. He asked if there was anyone new that would like to speak at this time.

Hillsdale Resident AMY DAVIDSON... Ms. Davidson wanted once again wanted to express her opposition to this project because and her environmental concerns as well as her concerns regarding climate change. She submitted a copy of an adopted resolution by the Town regarding climate change and asked the Board to consider this resolution.

Hillsdale Resident and Save Craryville Director JAMIE CARANO ... Ms. Carano submitted a letter from Save Craryville Attorney David Gordon asking for clarification regarding the number of fueling stations which should be limited to six (6). Ms. Carano referred to the 2016 Columbia Count Planning Board recommendation, the SEQRA done in 2016 and the 2016 ZBA Special Use Permit Application which all state a six (6) fueling position gas station.

Craryville Resident PAUL... Paul also had concerns regarding the number of fueling positions.

Hillsdale Resident MIKE DVORCHAK ... Mr. Dvorchak represented his neighbor Steve Smith who could not attend tonight's meeting and expressed Mr. Smith's concerns that the Board consider Town Code 232-21J which states that site plan should adequately protect the health and safety of the community and consider sending this application back to the governing body of the ZBA.

Mr. Haight closed the Public Hearing for the evening and noted that it will remain open.

SUBDIVISIONS/SITE PLANS

**2019-9 BOUNDARY LINE ADJUSTMENT – MARC SCHILDER – Pond Hill Road
and Lakeview Road [Copake Lake]**

- Subdivision Map
- SEQRA Part I
- Cash Fee

electrician which Mr. Haight suggested she give to the Building Inspector. Mr. Grant referred to the accessory dwelling as an apartment however Ms. Chernewsky pointed out that this was more of a mother-in-law set-up as an apartment would require an exterior entrance which this does not have.

Mr. Grant asked what the size of the septic system is and Ms. Chernewsky advised him that it is a one-thousand (1,000) gallon tanks which Mr. Heim said was sized accordingly. Mr. Haight asked what the size of the room is and Mr. Grant pointed out that it cannot be more than two-thirds (2/3) the size of the main residence. Ms. Becker added that it cannot be less than five-hundred (500) square feet and needs to have a minimum of seventy (70) square feet of habitable space excluding bathrooms and hallways and common rooms and areas etc. as referenced in the definition of an Accessory Dwelling Unit in the Town Code which reads:

ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT – One or more rooms with living and sleeping facilities arranged for the use of one family or household, contained within a one-family dwelling or a building or structure accessory to a primary one-family dwelling, containing cooking and sanitary facilities separate from those of the primary dwelling unit, which shall not be less than 500 square feet and shall have a minimum of 70 square feet of habitable area, excluding kitchens, bathrooms, hallways, and common rooms and areas, provided for sleeping accommodations for each occupant. The total square footage of the accessory dwelling unit shall be no larger than two-thirds the total square footage of the principal dwelling unit, and the primary and accessory units shall be subject, in aggregate to maximum lot coverage restrictions contained in the Density Control Schedule

Ms. Chernewsky acknowledged that the open area is approximately sixteen feet by twenty-one feet (16 x 21') and three hundred and thirty-six (336) square feet.. Ms. Cohen asked what the total number of bedrooms is on the plans. Ms. Chernewsky believed the plans stated four (4) bedrooms however she did check with Mr. Heim regarding whether anything needed to be done with the septic and he advised her that nothing needed to be done. Ms. Becker asked whether this included the accessory dwelling. Ms. Chernewsky acknowledged that the bonus room was included. Ms. Becker made note of the fact that the appropriate septic size for four (4) bedrooms is a twelve-hundred and fifty (1,250) gallon tank. Mr. Grant made note of the fact that a letter stamped by the engineer stating that the septic is in good working order should be submitted. Ms. Becker did not remember this application and noted that the copy Ms. Chernewsky has is not stamped. Ms. Chernewsky questioned the fact that Mr. Heim advised her that she only needed was the electrical certification, draw the room onto the plans and make sure the windows meet egress which is what she did. Ms. Chernewsky asked whether a letter from Mr. Heim stating that he reviewed this application and everything is acceptable would be sufficient. Mr. Haight advised her that the Board needs to make sure that the septic is in good working order even if it is sized accordingly.

Ms. Chernewsky will return next month to address the septic situation.

2017-31 SITE PLAN REVIEW – 13 LACKAWANNA PROPERTIES [BUILDING #1] – Lackawanna Road [Copake]

2017-32 SITE PLAN REVIEW – 13 LACKAWANNA PROPERTIES [BUILDING #2] – Lackawanna Road [Copake]

- Invoices & Bills of Sale

David Weiner appeared representing Salvatore Cascino. Ms. Becker acknowledged receipt of the receipts submitted by Mr. Weiner. Mr. Weiner pointed out that the Board requested these to show that there is agricultural activity that is transpiring. Mr. Weiner pointed out that the invoices and bills of sale he presented this month compliment the presentation he made at last month's meeting of the underlying cash flows of the farm over the past several years in being in the hay business in 2014 and 1015 and exiting that business and focusing on beef cattle in 2016 and 2017.

Mr. Haight brought up the fact that he spoke with the Town Assessor regarding the Ag Exemption for Mr. Cascino's farm which include almost two-hundred and twenty-six (226) of the total three-hundred and thirteen (313) which exclude the eighty-seven point one (87.1) of buildings and wooded areas.

Ms. Cohen acknowledged that a copy of the lease agreement with the farmer leasing the property had not been submitted. Mr. Haight questioned why the Board would need a copy of the lease agreement as farming is taking place. Mr. Grant brought up the fact that the Board is trying to determine that the purpose of the farm is agricultural activity. Mr. Haight acknowledged that at least two-hundred and twenty-six (226) acres is being farmed. Mr. Weiner questioned whether it really mattered who was farming the land. Ms. Becker explained that it would just be another form of information the Board can refer to in making their decision. Mr. Weiner did not believe it mattered who is doing the farming.

Mr. Urban made note of the fact that there were really no expenses submitted for the running of the farm and most of the receipts are not numbered and there were no references to fertilizer, equipment repair, telephone, employee, expense etc. Mr. Weiner pointed out that at last month's meeting he was asked to provide receipts showing arms-length transactions and he questioned how deep he had to go. Mr. Urban advised him that he has to go deep enough to satisfy the premise that it is a farm operation. He made note of the fact that if he was asked to provide his business receipts he could supply a large stack of them. Mr. Weiner once again questioned what he would need to supply to satisfy the Board and asked them to explain what the full picture looks like.

Mr. Grant asked whether the land in question is in an agricultural district and whether it is filed with the Assessor. He was advised that it is both in an agricultural district and is filed with the Assessor. Mr. Haight acknowledged that he received documentation from the Assessor regarding this. Ms. Cohen questioned whether this has been in agriculture for the whole time and was advised that it was. Mr. Grant questioned the fact that inasmuch as an agricultural exemption is being given by the Town does it mean the Town accepts this as an agricultural operation. Ms. Cohen also questioned whether an agricultural exemption was being given when there was no real agriculture taking place on the farm.

Mr. Haight did acknowledge that the receipts do show the buying, selling and butchering of cattle as well as the sale of hay. Mr. Haight felt it was not relevant to see the names of who the applicant is doing business with inasmuch as these were blacked out. Mr. Weiner once again asked how far he would need to go to satisfy the Board and show this is a legitimate farm operation. Mr. Haight acknowledged that the receipts show that hay is being sold however Ms. Becker pointed out that these are from 2013 and 2014.

Attorney Dow acknowledged a receipt for the sale of cattle. Mr. Haight also acknowledged receipts for the purchase of sheep and the sale of cattle, the purchase of fertilizer and seed. Ms. Becker questioned what the year of these transactions is and Mr. Haight advised her that the purchase of the fertilizer is from 2015 and Ms. Becker acknowledged that the receipts for hay are from 2013.

Mr. Grant made note of the fact that the financial statements would be the documents that show the complete running of the farm operation and would show revenues and expenditures however Mr. Weiner felt this was too invasive. Mr. Weiner felt what he has presented shows the applicant has been involved in agricultural commerce for the past several years. Mr. Weiner also pointed out that there has been an agricultural exemption that has been on the property for the past several years and in answer to Ms. Cohen's question this was in effect even in the years when there seemed to have been dumping activity that the courts found to have been going on in certain areas of the farm. Mr. Weiner didn't feel he could go any further without a very definitive picture or explanation of what precisely will constitute and demonstrate to the Board that this is an agricultural enterprise operation and felt the Board should make a decision with what has been presented.

Attorney Dow agreed with Mr. Weiner to some extent as the applicant cannot keep being asked to come back and forth and unless there is a significant, relevant, specific set of other things beyond this, this really needs to be wrapped up. Mr. Grant felt a financial statement would be sufficient for him to make a determination. Ms. Cohen also brought up the fact that there is a certain amount of revenue that needs to be realized in order to keep an agricultural exemption. However Mr. Weiner acknowledged that more than that is shown on the invoices and receipts.

Ms. Becker made note of the fact that there were only four (4) receipts submitted for 2017 and 2018 and most everything else is from 2013 and 2014.

Mr. Sawchuk asked what the issue was with the agricultural exemption and was advised by Mr. Grant that if there hasn't been any agricultural activity going on should he be receiving an agricultural exemption. Mr. Sawchuk asked if this was within the purview of this Board. Attorney Dow noted that Mr. Grant was referring to this as if an agricultural exemption has been granted by the Town, the Town has already looked at this and the Board is questioning on what basis the Town did this and whether documentation has been provided to back this up. Ms. Becker brought up the fact that every year it is renewed if nothing has changed. However Ms. Cohen added that every five (5) years a new five (5) year lease has to be resubmitted if you are leasing land to someone else and the long form has to be completed which asked a number of questions. Mr. Grant asked whether the Assessor should have this information and if so the Board should review it. Ms. Cohen acknowledged that the Assessor should have all of this.

Mr. Weiner made note of the fact that he brought up the issue of the agricultural exemption months ago and the Board did not feel this was not an adequate qualifier. Mr. Haight pointed out that there is an agricultural exemption and the Town has acknowledged this. Mr. Sawchuk once again questioned whether this was within the power of the Board to question the Town on their findings. Ms. Cohen made note of the fact that the Board is only trying to get information. Mr. Sawchuk felt that if the Town issued an exemption the Board shouldn't challenge it. Ms. Becker noted that the Board is not challenging it but is merely fact finding at this point.

Mr. Haight questioned what else could be needed to determine this is a farm operation inasmuch as the Town acknowledged an agricultural exemption, receipts have been received for the sale of hay, the purchase and sale of cattle, the purchase of fertilizer, corn is presently being farmed on the land and cattle are seen on the land.

Attorney Down did bring up the fact that all the hay sales are all from 2013-2014 with nothing shown for this since then, there is a Seedway statement from July 2014, a Malafy's Meat Processing statement from 2013, a statement from Carovail in 2015, and sales receipts for cattle from 2013 however, there is a lone sale of feeder cattle in January 2017. Mr. Weiner did state that a sale of cattle took place in 2016 for \$36,000 but he could not find the corresponding receipt for this nor could the auction house.

Mr. Urban questioned the fact that there were only 50 receipts and invoices submitted for six years of farming with no documentation of expenses being submitted. Mr. Haight questioned where the receipts are for the approximately forty (40) head of cattle presently on the farm. Mr. Weiner explained that most of these cattle were all born on the farm. Mr. Haight questioned whether there are any vet bills for the existing cattle.

Attorney Dow also acknowledged that the records submitted by Mr. Weiner are incredibly thin for the past three (3) years and only show a couple of transactions. Mr. Weiner explained that when Mr. Cascino was in jail a good portion of the herd was sold off however he cannot find the receipts for this. Mr. Weiner once again questioned what was needed. Mr. Grant once again requested the Financial Statement for the LLC as well as the internal records regarding the agricultural exemption that were provided to the Town Assessor. Ms. Becker added that the lease agreement for the farm should also be there. Ms. Becker also noted that she would like to see more current information. Mr. Haight also noted that the farm operation didn't stop when Mr. Cascino was in jail. Mr. Weiner explained that most of the farm was leased at that time. Ms. Cohen once again advised him to submit the lease agreement. Mr. Haight also asked how many farm hands work on the farm. Mr. Weiner noted that this depends on the season. Mr. Grant suggested submitting payroll records. Mr. Haight asked what portions of the farm the applicant planned on planting this year. Mr. Weiner noted that he was not aware of the schedule at this time.

Mr. Weiner concluded that the Board would need to see the whole picture as is done for an audit. Mr. Haight acknowledged this fact. Mr. Grant once again referred to the submission of a financial statement. Mr. Weiner felt that there has been adequate documentation submitted to show that the applicant is engaged in agricultural activity. Mr. Haight pointed out that this is not the case for the past three years as there were only four (4) receipts submitted for that time period.

Mr. Grant asked Attorney Dow whether the Board had the authority to request financial statements from the applicant. Attorney Dow explained that as previously noted this is an unusual situation due to the history of the applicant as there is a real credibility issue which is the reason it is being treated the way it is. He added that last time there was a consistent inability to put together anything coherent that led to the denials back in 2008 /2009. Attorney Dow pointed out that it seems to be looking like the same thing is happening all over again as there are only a couple of transactions for the last four or five years which is not a very persuasive argument. Attorney Dow brought up the fact that even when Mr. Cascino was in jail there was a lot of things that still had to go on.

Mr. Weiner addressed the fact that if the Board wishes to see the total commerce of the farm then whatever the tenant is selling from what they produce should be factored in as well. Ms. Cohen once again stated that a copy of the tenant's lease be submitted. Attorney Dow agreed as no evidence or documentation that there is a tenant has been presented to date. Mr. Weiner questioned whether the Board is looking at Sal Cascino or the farm. Mr. Haight advised him that they are looking at the farm and who is running it and from what Mr. Weiner is putting forward is that it is a combination of both Mr. Cascino and a tenant so the Board needs to see both sides.

Mr. Weiner questioned whether rental income from the tenant is viewed as agricultural activity or does the Board need to review the tenant farmers revenue from the farm. Mr. Haight explained that the activity on the whole farm needs to be considered which would include the work Mr. Cascino does as well as the lease of the farmer renting the farm and what is being done by him.

Mr. Haight also brought up the fact that an area to the right of the farm market has been staked and dug out and he questioned what is being done there. Mr. Weiner was not aware of this. He did explain that Mr. Cascino received approval for a septic. Mr. Haight questioned why a septic would be put in that location. Mr. Weiner clarified that the farm stand did have a septic. Mr. Haight did bring up the fact that the farm market is not supposed to be operational. Mr. Haight will discuss this with the Building Inspector.

Mr. Weiner asked for clarification of what is needed for the next meeting. Attorney Dow acknowledged that a copy of the lease for 2016, 2017, 2018 and 2019. Mr. Haight asked whether the Board would like to do a site visit. A date will be determined for this.

The issue of privacy was discussed regarding any financial information submitted. Mr. Grant questioned the issue Mr. Weiner had regarding the submission of financial documents. Mr. Weiner did not feel these should be public knowledge and he felt this was overstepping the process. Attorney Dow did make note of the fact that the Board is working off the history and a New York Supreme Court upheld the Board's decision that the applicant had not shown this to be an agricultural operation. We have a precedent that has to be overcome with clearly established information. Mr. Weiner thought he was providing the information he needed and more is being requested from him. Attorney Dow pointed out that there was almost no documentation that isn't five or six years old.

Mr. Grant asked whether there was any way financial data could be protected. Attorney Dow pointed out that under FOIL this could not be done. Mr. Grant asked whether financial statements could be redacted. Attorney Dow questioned what exactly could be redacted on documents such as these and still be coherent. Attorney Dow suggested Mr. Cascino's account

could possibly submit a letter verifying that certain parameters are being met and that there has been consistent activity above a certain level for the past several years. Mr. Weiner asked whether Profit and Loss statements from the past several years showing ongoing activity would suffice. Mr. Haight acknowledged that this would be quite helpful. Attorney Dow once again made note of the fact that the Board has no documentation that there is an existing tenant which is why a copy of the lease would be helpful. He added that this should cover the last four (4) years, 2016, 2017, 2018 and 2019 as the lease period is usually five (5) years. Mr. Haight made note of the fact that there should also be receipts for 2019 as we are five (5) months into the year.

Mr. Weiner clarified that the lease, Profit and Loss Statement and some kind of presentation that paints the whole picture as suggested by Ms. Becker would be what is needed. Attorney Dow made note of the fact that an LLC has to file a specific form to the IRS similar to a person's personal tax form and questioned whether the applicant's account would be able to furnish a letter acknowledging the activity that is taking place on the farm. Attorney Dow clarified that something with verifiable numbers to show what is going on would be helpful.

Mr. Weiner asked if Ms. Becker could clarify what she meant by submitting something that shows the whole picture. Ms. Becker explained that something is needed to prove to the Board that Lackawanna Farms LLC is a legitimate farming operation. Ms. Becker added that the more information that is provided will give the Board a better picture of what is transpiring. Attorney Dow also made note of the fact that there needs to be many more transactions that took place between 2016 and the present than was presented. Attorney Dow also pointed out that in a six (6) year period the vast majority of the activity surrounds hay sales in 2013 and since that time the submitted documents show almost nothing transpiring.

Attorney Dow made note of the fact that there has been a consistent representation that Mr. Cascino is farming the land and if he is farming the land and is engaging in business there have to be more than three (3) receipts for a five (5) year period of time. Attorney Dow also noted that the account should have all the receipts and invoices pertaining to this. Mr. Weiner will see if he can get the accountant to produce something that would be acceptable. Mr. Haight suggested Mr. Weiner ask the accountant for the receipts for the past three (3) years. Mr. Grant brought up the fact that the big picture that Ms. Becker is referring to is what the operation is and that can be disclosed in the financial statements which is why the Board is asking to see them. Mr. Haight added that descriptions of what the existing buildings are being used for will also help to see a complete picture of what is being done.

Mr. Urban asked whether quarterly labor reports to NYS 45 are being filed. Mr. Weiner acknowledged that they are. Mr. Urban noted that these should be submitted along with sales tax forms. Attorney Dow made note of the fact that a sampling of everything that transpires, such as vet bills, tractor repair, pesticides, fertilizer should be compiled into a package and submitted.

2017-38 SITE PLAN REVIEW – GRJH INC. – State Route 23 [Craryville]

- E-mail from Bobbi Trudel P.E. dated April 16, 2019
- Letter from Hydrogeologist Jean Patota dated April 23, 2019
- E-mail from Lance Gorney P.E. of NYS DOT dated April 25, 2019
- E-mail from Joseph Visconte of NYS DOT dated April 28, 2019
- Letter from Hydrogeologist Jean Patota dated May 2, 2019

Alicia Metz appeared representing GRJH. Mr. Haight addressed the Board and apologized for the fact that the presentation by Geologist Jean Patota took as much time as it did and they weren't able to discuss other issues.

Mr. Haight acknowledged that the Department of Transportation (DOT) made their decision regarding the traffic study and no traffic light is required and the Craryville Road and Route 23 intersection. Addressing the Stormwater SWPPP, Mr. Haight brought up the fact that the DOT and GRJH's engineers have been discussing a few issues. One such discussion is to have GRJH change the size of the pipe that goes under Route 23 from the existing twenty-four inches (24" _ to an increased thirty inches (30") with an alternative solution being the use of detention ponds. Ms. Metz clarified that the DOT has approved the project 'as is' subject to GRJH making these changes. Ms. Metz also brought up the fact that the installation of a thirty inch (30") pipe under Route 23 would be incredibly disruptive so the DOT was in agreement with GRJH coming up with an acceptable plan for detention ponds on the property. Ms. Metz also explained that the Engineers just received this information and will be addressing this in the next week. Mr. Haight made note of the fact that once these plans are completed the DOT will then have to give their final approval for them.

Regarding the hiring of an Engineer by the Planning Board Mr. Haight explained that the current Escrow Agreement was outdated and Attorney Dow updated it to comply with the new Town Zoning Code. However it now needs to be approved by the Town Board at their next meeting on Thursday, May 9th and once approved, he will give a copy to Ms. Metz and once agree on an escrow amount he will hire an engineer.

Mr. Haight met with Ms. Becker and Mr. Grant to discuss what needed to be addressed by the Town Engineer and they thought the Engineer should review the lighting, the storm drain oil/water separator on the property, the gas distribution safety system and all the tanks and monitors included with them and the reports by Hydrogeologists Jean Patota and Paul Rubin.

Ms. Metz made note of the fact that she submitted a letter from Hydrogeologist Jean Patota regarding the location of an aquifer at the site of the proposed gas station/convenience store. Mr. Grant asked for clarification regarding how the Town Engineer would be dealing with the aquifer reports. Mr. Haight clarified that he would be reviewing both reports to see if they are consistent and give his own evaluation and/or opinion as to anything else that might need to be considered and whether everything to date is satisfactory.

Ms. Becker brought up the fact that the issue of the Phase I report was also discussed when she met with Mr. Haight and Mr. Grant. Mr. Haight explained that the original Phase I report was

only for the building and he was satisfied with the report from the recent ground radar. Mr. Haight made note of the fact that it was discovered that there was no previous gas station in that location and the ground radar showed that there were no tanks in the ground. Ms. Metz did note that there was evidence of a prior well that wasn't connected to the building. She also said she will have that investigated however they would not be able to use this well as it is located too close to the building. Mr. Grant added that there was nothing to indicate the need to proceed to a Phase II review.

Ms. Becker addressed the fact that there was also discussion about whether or not the Town Engineer should review the DOH findings on the septic system. Mr. Haight clarified that they acknowledged that the DOH Engineers reviewed and approved the septic system and the Stormwater SWPPP is being reviewed by the DOT Engineers so it was decided that there was no reason to have the Town Engineer review this as well. Mr. Haight added that he discussed this with Attorney Dow who also felt there was no need for the Town Engineer to review this. Mr. Haight also mentioned that there is no need for the Town Engineer to review the DOT Traffic Study findings. Attorney Dow did make note of the fact that the Board should make sure they have everything the DOT said about the Traffic Study as this is one of the biggest concerns.

Mr. Haight asked whether anyone could think of any other issues the Town Engineer should look at. No one could think of anything else at this point but will give it more consideration in the coming days. Mr. Haight did make note of the fact that he has been in contact with the Engineer who will be representing the Town and this firm deals with other Towns and all transactions will be between the Engineer and himself. He also noted that this includes any Board members as well as the public as the firm advised him that they will deal only with him.

Ms. DeConti reminded Mr. Haight that the Board previously agreed to cancel the July meeting as the Fourth of July falls on the meeting date. No other date has been set as yet and if a meeting is scheduled a notice will be put in the newspaper and on the website.

Ms. Metz brought up the fact that her engineers responded to the questions that were raised at the Special Meeting Workshop on April 13th about the on-site treatment of the run-off water.

MINUTES

The Minutes of April 4th meeting were approved by the Board. Mr. Sawchuk had comments for the April 13th meeting so they will not be approved until the June meeting.

On a motion made by Ms. Becker and seconded by Ms. Cohen the Board voted unanimously to approve the minutes of the April 4th meeting minutes.

ADMINISTRATIVE

GRJH: Mr. Haight made note of the fact that he has mentioned several times that the GRJH application is limited to six (6) fueling stations. Mr. Haight addressed the fact that the applicant is allowed to have 6 pumps but only allowed to have 1 nozzle on each. Mr. Haight brought up the fact that this has already been discussed with Ms. Carano. Mr. Urban suggested clarifying this with the applicant at the next meeting.

CARRY OVER

The following matters were carried over to the next meeting:

2019-8 SITE PLAN REVIEW – COPAKE CAMPING RESORT – County Route 7A
[Copake]

ADJOURNMENT

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

Bob Haight, Chair

Please note that all referenced attachments, comprising 17 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

GRJH INC.

April 16, 2019 Short Environmental Assessment Form (5)

GRJH INC.

April 16, 2019	Trudel to Metz (2)
April 23, 2019	Patota to Metz (5)
April 25, 2019	Gorney to Trudel (1)
April 28, 2019	Visconte to Haight (1)
May 2, 2019	Patota to Metz (3)