



COPAKE PLANNING BOARD
OCTOBER 6, 2011
MINUTES

Approved
November 5, 2011

Please note that all referenced attachments, comprising 14 pages, are on file with the Copake Town Clerk and in the Planning Board office. An annotated listing of those attachments appears at the end of this document.

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

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS – Referrals

1. SITE PLAN REVIEW – GENE & KELLY THORN – Melvin Road [Copake Lake] – (2011-21)

John Haight appeared before the Board representing Gene and Kelly Thorn. Ms. Becker advised the Board that the Thorn's lot is a non-conforming lot with a non-conforming structure in the 'R-2' zone on Melvin Road at Copake Lake. Ms. Becker acknowledged that area variances were needed from the Zoning Board of Appeals, one for a twenty-one foot (21') set-back from the end of the deck instead of the required thirty foot (30') set-back on the north side and another for sixteen feet (16') on the east side instead of the required thirty feet (30'). Ms. Becker noted that the variances were granted by the ZBA to allow the roof and the screened-in porch over an existing deck subject to a Site Plan Review by the Planning Board.

Ms. Becker acknowledged that there is an undeveloped right-of-way called Winding Lane on the property that is probably accounted for on someone's deed. She pointed out that the existing lot coverage is presently thirteen point thirty percent (13.30%) and advised that the covered deck will increase the coverage to an acceptable fourteen point eighty percent (14.80%). Ms. Becker noted that the north side where the deck will be covered is all woods and will not impact anyone else in any way. She acknowledged that the well and septic separation is accounted for on the maps and made note of the fact that there will be no increase in bedrooms.

Ms. Becker reviewed the Check List with the owners prior to the meeting and acknowledged that everything was accounted for and there are no wetlands, watercourses, streams or ponds on the property. Ms. Becker referred to the garage on the property and noted that it is included in the lot coverage amount. She also made note of the fact that no County permits were required.

Ms. Becker asked the Board if there were any other questions. Being none, on a motion made by Mr. Savarese and seconded by Mr. Filipovits the Board voted unanimously to approve the Site Plan for Gene and Kelly Thorn on 25 Melvin Road at Copake Lake. Ms. Becker will stamp the maps on Saturday.

PUBLIC HEARING

2011-17 BOUNDARY LINE ADJUSTMENT – MORAN – Island Drive [Copake Lake]

On a motion made by Mr. Grant and seconded by Mr. Savarese the Board voted unanimously to waive the reading of the notice for the Public Hearing for Frederick Moran. On a motion made by Mr. Davis and seconded by Mr. Grant the Board voted unanimously to open the Public Hearing for the Boundary Line Adjustment for Frederick Moran on the Island at Copake Lake. Ms. Becker asked if anyone present would like to speak on this application. Being none, on a motion made by Mr. Grant and seconded by Mr. Davis the Board voted unanimously to close the Public Hearing.

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

Ms. Becker reminded the Board that the Public Hearing for Mariner Tower was still open from the previous meeting and asked if anyone would like to contribute to the public comment period.

BOB ROTH, ANCRAM NY: Mr. Roth made note of the fact that there are towers in Catamount and Claverack as well as one to be constructed in Ancram and believed there should be a link between the Catamount, Claverack, Copake and Ancram towers which he believes will help the people, Fire Department and EMS in the community tremendously. Mr. Roth asked the Board to consider this. Mr. Roth questioned the fact of how many companies showed interest in towers in the five years that he has been working on getting towers into this area.

CARMELA BIONDI, COPAKE NY: Ms. Biondi expressed frustration as to the delay in approving the tower. Ms. Biondi understood that the Board had rules and policies to follow and had certain things to accept but questioned when enough was enough. Ms. Becker explained that applications are deemed complete when a policy that was established by the law of the Town is completed. Ms. Biondi questioned how much longer this would take and was told that the application would hopefully be accepted at tonight's meeting.

Ms. Becker questioned whether there were any other comments at this time. Not being any, on a motion made by Mr. Grant and seconded by Mr. Filipovits the Board voted unanimously to close the Public Hearing.

SUBDIVISION/SITE PLAN

2011-17 BOUNDARY LINE ADJUSTMENT – FREDERICK MORAN – Island Drive [Copake Lake]

Jeff Plass appeared before the Board representing Frederick Moran. Ms. Becker asked if there were any changes since the previous meeting. Mr. Plass advised her that there were none.

Ms. Becker questioned whether a SEQR would be needed for this application. Mr. Grant advised her that a SEQR would be needed if this is an unlisted action. Being an unlisted action the SEQR was read. On a motion made by Mr. Savarese and seconded by Ms. Becker the Board voted unanimously to make a Negative Declaration on the proposed Boundary Line Adjustment for Lots 3 and 4 on the Island at Copake Lake property of Frederick W. Moran from a survey prepared by Plass, Rockefeller and Nucci, dated August 16, 2011.

Inasmuch as the property will be closed on this coming Friday Ms. Becker stamped the appropriate maps. The fee was given to the Board by Mr. Plass.

2011-12 SITE PLAN REVIEW – STEPHEN M. FUTRELL AND THOMAS G. GOLDSWORTHY [MARC BAILEY]– Birch Hill Road [Copake Lake]

Architect Jason Money of Dennis Wedlick Architects and Jonathan Farber, Landscape Architect appeared before the Board representing Stephen M. Futrell and Thomas G. Goldsworthy. Ms. Becker advised that an application fee was due for this application. Mr. Money presented her with the required fee.

Ms. Becker questioned if there was anything new added to the drawings. Mr. Farber advised her that there were some new additions and presented her with the appropriate drawings. Mr. Farber informed the Board that the property was on forty one (41) acres and pointed out the proposed house, pool and garage locations as well as the driveway and septic sites. A perc test reference letter from the County Health Department was presented to the Board and the septic system was discussed.

Mr. Farber acknowledged three existing ponds and explained that there were drainage problems with two of the ponds which will be re-dug with the addition of a settling pond. Mr. Farber advised that an application was pending with the Army Corp of Engineers for the digging of the pond. Ms. Becker questioned whether a SPDES permit was needed for this as well. Mr. Farber advised her that a SPDES permit was not needed. Ms. Becker questioned whether documentation from the Army Corp of Engineers would be given to the Board. Mr. Farber advised her that State and Local documentation had been requested. Ms. Becker was trying to clarify whether the Army Corp documentation was needed for the Board to make their decision. Mr. Urban made note of the fact that inasmuch as they were existing ponds the Board had no jurisdiction over them.

Ms. Becker advised that a letter of approval would be needed detailing the design of the septic system and its approval by the County DOH. Mr. Faber also advised the Board that the only

lighting that is being proposed is an entry light as well as sconces on the garage. Ms. Becker questioned whether this would be seen by Craryville. Mr. Faber explained that the prior house was barely seen on Route 7A. Mr. Faber acknowledged that all the driveway and drainage details were accounted for and Mr. Money acknowledged that the coverage was adequate.

The plans were reviewed and it was noted that there will be three bedrooms (and an additional den or dining room which could be considered a possible bedroom), Ms. Becker believed the package to be complete and noted that no Public Hearing would be needed. The Check List was reviewed. Ms. Becker asked Attorney Rappleyea whether the Army Corp. of Engineers decision would affect the Board's decision. Attorney Rappleyea did not believe this would be cause for concern. Mr. Grant questioned whether there were Stormwater plans. Mr. Money advised him that there were and acknowledged them on the plans.

On a motion made by Mr. Savarese and seconded by Mr. Filipovits the Board voted unanimously to accept the Site Plan for 1029 County Route 7A, Copake submitted by RF Landscape Architects, Civil Engineers Crawford and Associates and Dennis Wedlick Architecture, dated August 2, 2011, revised October 4, 2011. Ms. Becker would stamp the maps on Saturday.

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

Ms. Becker introduced a detailed letter from the County Planning Board approving the project as well as a Memorandum of Law from Attorney Rappleyea regarding Adequate Coverage into the record. Ms. Becker addressed the issue of the Site clean-up and pointed out that the Environmental Consultant notified her that there seems to be some debris on the site near the proposed Tower location and the wetlands which she hoped could be cleaned up when the machines are there working on the site. Mr. Ciolfi advised her that he was aware of the debris at the site that needs to be cleared but assured her for the record that there was nothing in the wetlands. He made note of the fact that he would be working with the landowner to remove the debris.

Ms. Becker acknowledged that she had spoken to Mr. Ciolfi about reviewing the Propagation Map to see what kind of coverage is going where, based on the new Tower height and location. Mr. Ciolfi referred to Attorney Rappleyea's Adequate Coverage Memo and the definition of Adequate Coverage according to Town Law. Mr. Ciolfi explained that the term of Adequate Coverage as taken by many Boards is not really defined by the FCC and is more of a suggestive term to which a number has been designated. Mr. Ciolfi went on to explain that if the -90d Bm coverage signal, which he believes the Town standard calls for, is considered adequate then the Board could determine the site is not needed.

Mr. Ciolfi then referred to the Coverage Map and pointed out that the coverage was not adequate throughout the different areas of the Town. Mr. Ciolfi referred to the fact that the coverage is considered to be in technical compliance with Town Law but noted that the Law also talks about providing additional coverage. He and then pointed out on the map what is being added at the -90dBm level to be in compliance with the Law so if the permit is approved and was ever challenged it could be demonstrated that Mariner is compliant because they are providing the new coverage to areas of Town at the Mg 90 level. Mr. Ciolfi did make note of the fact that in

today's standards the -90 Standard is not really adequate and pointed out that -98 and -94 levels are being added which he believed will be a dramatic improvement.

Ms. Becker questioned how that is related to Martindale Depot and Taghkanic towers. Mr. Ciolfi pointed out the Claverack and Catamount sites on the map. Ms. Becker questioned which towers are operational. Mr. Ciolfi advised her that the Catamount site is operational but the site in Claverack which has been built and ready for some time is still in need of Verizon Landline to connect the site. Ms. Becker questioned whether the coverage will change again once the Ancram tower is operational. Mr. Ciolfi advised her that this would be the case as additional coverage would be added. Ms. Becker asked the Board if they were happy with the Adequate Coverage proposed by Mr. Ciolfi. The Board was in agreement.

Ms. Becker then brought up the subject of the Electromagnetic Radiation impact and referred to the submission in the application book. Mr. Ciolfi explained that the Propagation Studies are an engineering tool to see what the signal looks like and are a zoning tool to help the Boards decide if the coverage is where they would like it to be throughout the Town. Mr. Ciolfi then referred to the radiation topic and explained that the Federal Government, the American National Standards Institute and the IEEE Board have developed standards to say what a safe level of radiation the facilities can transmit.

Mr. Ciolfi noted that there are different level and measurement standards for Radio and Television Stations as well as other types of things that omit radio wave signals. He continued to say that because a Cellular Facility of this type is at such a low level and is so many times below what the Federal Government will allow as an acceptable level, when the antennas are mounted above ten (10) meters [thirty-two feet (32')] from the ground they are exempt from demonstrating compliance because they are assumed to be so low. In this case, even with that exemption, he still asked AT&T to talk about how they comply and are many times below the level that they are allowed to be at. Mr. Ciolfi advised the Board that the proposed Tower is not an issue for the general public as it is one-hundred-and-sixty-five feet (165') in the air on a one-hundred-and-fifty foot (150') parcel of private property.

Ms. Becker acknowledged that the submission in question talks about a nine (9) panel antenna on a Monopole Tower at one-hundred-and-forty-five feet (145') and questioned whether that was an issue. Mr. Ciolfi explained that the higher the Tower is, the less radiation is on the ground. Ms. Becker acknowledged that she spoke to the RF Engineer about how to deal with this and was advised to ask for a letter signed by a professional RF Engineer and noted that this was what the submission was. It was clarified that the Monopole Tower was not an issue.

Ms. Becker then addressed the decision regarding the Lattice Pole vs. the Monopole. Mr. Ciolfi explained that the only difference between the Lattice Pole and the Monopole Towers is that the Lattice Tower is open so you can see daylight through it and the Monopole Tower is a solid structure and is initially shiny which will weather and become a dull gray. Mr. Ciolfi pointed out that the Lattice Tower allows for the movement and addition of antennas whereas the Monopole Tower has to have the holes cut in the Tower at the factory locking you into those positions and the only way to change that would be to run the cables on the outside of the tower rather than on the inside of the Tower which would be visually unpleasing. Mr. Ciolfi believes that the Lattice Tower offers more flexibility and would minimize the number of towers needed by the Town in the future. Mr. Ciolfi's opinion was that given the location and the fact that the main view is at

least a mile away with only the top being visible, the Lattice Tower would be best but did note that it is a personal preference of the Board.

The Board reviewed the pictures submitted after the Balloon Float. A discussion ensued regarding the benefits and drawbacks of each Tower. Mr. Grant believed the Monopole Tower was better and Mr. Filipovits believed the Lattice Tower would be better inasmuch as it could be added to in the future. The Board voted on their preference for a Lattice Tower vs. a Monopole Tower. Mr. Grant and Mr. Davis believed the Monopole Tower would be a better choice whereas Mr. Filipovits, Mr. Savarese and Mr. Urban believed the better choice would be the Lattice. Ms. Becker abstained but was advised by Attorney Rappleyea that in order for a vote to be successful there needed to be a minimum of four (4) votes on a Board of seven (7) members. Ms. Becker voted for the Lattice Tower inasmuch as it is in the Town Code.

Ms. Becker questioned whether there was an easement for the Access Road. Mr. Ciolfi advised her that there is an access way and noted that there is a Right-of-Way in the Lease Agreement to utilize the Road. Ms. Becker advised Mr. Ciolfi that the Board usually asks to see an Easement. Mr. Ciolfi pointed out that the requested documentation was included under Tab 1 of the submission.

Ms. Becker noted that the generator is not committed to in the application but acknowledged that Mr. Ciolfi committed to it at a previous meeting. Mr. Ciolfi explained that Mariner would not be providing a generator but advised that AT&T typically does install a generator and have made provisions and requested approval to place a generator. Mr. Ciolfi was not aware of when it would be installed however. Mr. Becker acknowledged that it is on the Site Map.

Ms. Becker questioned the fact of the Access Road always being open. Mr. Ciolfi explained that whether they are propane or diesel fired generator, provisions are usually made to fuel them when a storm is anticipated and if not they will be fueled by snowmobile or whatever way is needed.

Ms. Becker asked if there were any other matters that needed to be addressed at this time. The application was reviewed and Ms. Becker questioned the location of the power line utility poles. She asked if there is supposed to be some caution as to how much of the canopy was being removed. Mr. Ciolfi advised her that when he met with NYSEG he told them that the intent was to clear a minimal amount and although it would only affect the landowner he did not want any more trees cut than were necessary. Ms. Becker questioned whether they could be put along the road and Mr. Ciolfi explained that the landowner requested that they stay off that area. The landowner advised the Board that there was not much to be cut down as he has used a lot of the trees there for firewood. Ms. Becker made note of the fact that the Environmentalists advised them to be aware of cutting a lot of large trees as it takes the canopy of the trees away and impacts the rain run-off, forests, and wildlife. Mr. Ciolfi advised her that there are mostly overgrown fields in the area and there is not a lot of new growth there.

Ms. Becker advised that in the event that this application was brought up for a vote she had asked Attorney Rappleyea to draft a form to follow and he suggested the Board proceed with a resolution and not just a normal motion to accept the application. Attorney Rappleyea acknowledged that the form is a very rough suggestion and can be modified or changed and has

obviously not been pre-judged as it is just his rendering of his thoughts of what may be coming down the road with Marcia's input.

Attorney Rappleyea read the form which stated that *'Whereas the applicant, Mariner Tower II, LLC submitted an application dated February 23, 2011 and was amended on August 28, 2011 and whereas the ZBA granted a height variance on August 28, 2011 and whereas the Copake Planning Board hereby determines and finds the applicant has submitted all documentation from which the ZBA and Planning Board finds is adequate and complies with the application materials required in the Town's Zoning Law including all portions of sections 230 of the Town Zoning Law including but not limited to a Balloon Fly and submission of visual resource assessment and whereas the Planning Board finds that the requirements that the utilities being located underground pursuant to Chapter 230-7 b is impractical at this location contrary to the wishes of the landowner therefore that requirement is waived, whereas the Planning Board also further acknowledges that the Columbia County Planning Board as pursuant to Section 239 reviewed this application and issued its determination of approval dated September 21, 2011 and the Planning Board further finds and accepts and includes by reference in this resolution the opinion of the Attorney for the Town, Tal Rappleyea, as it related to the adequate coverage issue as addressed in the Town Code, now therefore the Planning Board hereby approves the application of Mariner Tower II LLC subject to compliance with Sections 230-7-10-11-14-15-16-17-18-19-20 relating to project site requirements monitoring evaluation, compliance, co-location and Town services, fee scheduling and bonding insurance and indemnification, abandonment and discontinuances of uses duty to remove, failure to remove, any penalties and other violations or offences inseparability of the Code itself.'* Attorney Rappleyea made note of the fact that he believed he should do an addendum that the Tower be constructed in the lattice type style.

Ms. Becker questioned whether a motion and vote was to be made at this time. Attorney Rappleyea advised that a motion and second should be done at this time. On a motion made by Mr. Davis and seconded by Mr. Savarese the Board voted unanimously on a motion to accept this resolution as prepared by Attorney Rappleyea with modifications.

2011-20 SITE PLAN REVIEW – HILL-OVER HEALTHY & FRESH – Route 22

Hope Barringer appeared before the Board with Fred Barringer. Ms. Becker reminded the Board that this is an application for a Farm Stand on Route 22 just this side of the Citgo Station. Ms. Becker acknowledged that Ms. Barringer was given approval from the ZBA for a Special Use Permit subject to County Planning Board approval [which it turned out she did not need because it is exempt as a second business entity on an active farm operation], Copake Planning Board approval and New York State Department of Transportation approval.

Ms. Becker acknowledged that Ms. Barringer completed a Site Plan Map which has all the elements the Board looks for in a Site Plan and there are two things outstanding. Ms. Becker noted that Ms. Barringer told her that Ag and Markets advised that she did not need a license and she presented that documentation in writing which stated that inasmuch as she will only be selling milk from their production at her store for which she has a license to proceed through the dairy division, no license is needed for the store.

Ms. Becker addressed a letter from Michael DeRuzzio of the Board of Health which stated that their office has no jurisdiction as Ms. Barringer's business is not defined as a food service establishment that would be permitted by this department.

Ms. Becker asked Ms. Barringer if she had gotten anywhere with the Department of Transportation as she explained that there are presently three entrances off of Route 22 and questioned whether DOT permission was needed. Mr. Barringer advised that someone from the DOT would be visiting the farm to make this decision. Ms. Becker referred to a letter she wrote to the DOT asking whether a DOT review of the Farm's current Route 22 access was required and whether the existing entrances can be used inasmuch as they are adding a Farm Stand to their location. Ms. Becker referenced the response which stated that the owner/operator of the Farm should direct all questions regarding curb cuts to Mr. Joseph Visconti. Mr. Davis questioned whether this was needed inasmuch as this is an existing condition. Ms. Becker advised him that she explained this. Mr. Barringer advised that Mr. Visconti would visit the Farm to review the situation.

Mr. Davis questioned whether this could be approved conditionally. Ms. Becker questioned whether they can operate and the Board did not see any reason that they could not. Mr. Grant questioned whether the SCOZ needed to be reviewed. Ms. Becker believed that this was not necessary as Agriculture is exempt from design guidelines. Mr. Grant believed that this was considered necessary as the Farm Stand is considered commercial and all commercial structures requiring a Special Use Permit need to follow the SCOZ Guidelines. [232-26. B.(4)].

The SCOZ was reviewed. Mr. Grant questioned whether there was any new lighting. Ms. Becker advised that the lighting was referenced on the maps. It was questioned whether the lights are spotlights or light bulbs and Mr. Barringer explained that it is a Flood Light. Ms. Becker asked the Barringers whether they would object to modifying the lights if they are too bright. Ms. Barringer explained that the light is a motion light and Mr. Barringer explained that there is presently an existing Flood Light by the Barn. Inasmuch as this is a motion detector the Board did not believe this to be an issue.

After review of the SCOZ, on a motion made by Mr. Davis and seconded by Mr. Filipovits the Board voted unanimously to approve the Site Plan for Hill-Over Healthy and Fresh Farm Stand at 7441 Route 22 Copake subject to receipt of the Department of Transportation letter. Ms. Becker will stamp the maps on Saturday.

Ms. Becker acknowledged that Ms. Barringer reviewed the signs and noted that there is presently a sign at the Farm. Mr. Barringer advised that another sign would be added to the existing one making a total of 3 new signs and one existing sign. Ms. Becker referred to the sign regulations which stated that two (2) signs are allowed. Mr. Barringer explained that they wished to add a third sign, having one at each entrance. Mr. Grant advised that they would need to go back to the ZBA for a variance. Mr. Davis advised that two signs can be put up before the third was approved. Ms. Becker suggested adding to the bottom of the existing signs. Mr. Barringer did not believe this was a possibility as it would not be able to be seen.

Ms. Becker advised that a building permit would be needed for the signs and noted that the first sign could be fifty (50) square feet and the second sign could be thirty-six (36) square feet. Mr. Grant noted that one attached and one free-standing sign are permitted. Mr. Grant noted that this

is on properties that are two-hundred feet (200') long. "A second freestanding sign may be permitted on corner lots, where a business is located more than thirty feet (30') from the front property line or where the property is more than two-hundred feet (200') long." (232-14. G). Mr. Davis pointed out that Hill-Over Farm is over two-hundred feet (200') long. It was agreed that a variance from the ZBA would be needed for the third sign.

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

Dominick Sinisi was not present but Ms. Becker advised the Board that when Mr. Sinisi appeared before the Board he told them that there was presently an office attached to the restaurant. Ms. Becker clarified that it is more than an office and is presently an apartment which is a zoning violation, inasmuch as an apartment is not allowed in the R-2 zone. Attorney Rappleyea questioned therefore, that it is not that he is becoming more conforming with his request to convert some of his structure, but more non-conforming. Ms. Becker was not sure of Mr. Sinisi's plans but questioned whether the Board should just say this cannot be done or the present apartment could be traded for the new one. Mr. Grant advised that Mr. Sinisi just be made aware of the regulations and make his decision accordingly.

Attorney Rappleyea advised that the most expeditious way to deal with it is to reconvert the present apartment to an office and then apply for an apartment on the other side.

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

Ms. Becker acknowledged new submissions from Camphill Village who had no one present to represent them. Ms. Becker entered into the record, Sloan Architect's answers to the Lead Agency circulation letter responses, the Highway Superintendent's letter regarding the sidewalks, the Project Engineer's response to the Lead Agency circulation letters and the Fire Chief's comments.

Ms. Becker advised that the SEQR declaration must be done in order to submit the Camphill Village application to the County Planning Board. Ms. Becker acknowledged that this application needed to go to the County as part of the project is in Taghkanic. Ms. Becker informed the Board that she reviewed all the work that Engineer Doug Clark did on the EAF and noted that he reviewed it twice before his final sign-off. Ms. Becker acknowledged that Mr. Clark received the most recent Site Master Plan and the revised EAF submitted. She noted that the revised information submitted addresses his comments in the Board's previous letters of June 2nd and June 15th. Ms. Becker advised that the SEQR is good to go and a Negative Declaration could be made.

On a motion made by Mr. Urban and seconded by Mr. Savarese the Board voted unanimously to make a Negative Declaration for the Camphill Village Site Plan.

MINUTES

Ms. Becker asked if there were any changes to the Minutes of September 1, 2011. No changes or corrections were needed. On a motion made by Mr. Davis and seconded by Mr. Grant the Board voted unanimously to accept the minutes of the September 1st meeting.

ADMINISTRATIVE

ZONING REVIEW COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Ms. Becker advised that two people needed to be recommended to serve on the Zoning Review Committee and she and Mr. Grant have already submitted their letter of interest. Mr. Savarese expressed an interest depending on what day they would meet. Ms. Becker questioned whether Mr. Savarese would like to be recommended by the Planning Board to participate. Mr. Savarese said he would like to be included if the meeting date coincides with his schedule. Ms. Becker noted that there would be three names submitted. Attorney Rappleyea believed they would take all three candidates as members as long as it did not constitute a quorum.

On a motion made by Mr. Davis and seconded by Mr. Grant the Board voted unanimously to submit Ms. Becker, Mr. Grant and Mr. Savarese's names to the Zoning Review Committee.

CATAMOUNT RESORT HOTEL: Ms. Becker informed the Board that she, Mr. Grant and Mr. Davis would be meeting with the new Catamount Resort Developers on October 21st to see what they have in mind before they come back to the Planning Board.

UTILITY EASMENT: Ms. Becker acknowledged a memo from Central Hudson reminding the Planning Board to refer applicants who are seeking approval for Subdivisions, Site Plans or other development properties that may be subject to the easements.

CARRY OVER

The following matters were carried over to the next meeting:

- 2010-2 SITE PLAN REVIEW CONSULTATION – AMERISTOP – Route 23**
- 2008-21 MAJOR SUBDIVISION – MICHAEL B. & BARBARA S. BRAUNSTEIN – Off Golf Course Road**

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, on a motion made by Mr. Grant and seconded by Mr. Davis, the Board voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

Marcia Becker, Chair

Please note that all referenced attachments, comprising 14 pages, are on file with the Copake Town Clerk and in the Planning Board office. The referenced attachments are filed in the individual project files. An annotated listing follows:

ADMINISTRATION

MARINER TOWER

September 21, 2011 Stalker to Becker (2)
October 4, 2011 Rappleyea to CPB (3)

CAMPBILL VILLAGE

September 13, 2011 Clark to DeRuzzio (3)
September 16, 2011 Sloan to Becker (3)
September 23, 2011 Gregory to Becker (1)
October 1, 2011 DeRocha to CPB (2)