

The Planning Board of the Town of Cicero held a meeting on Wednesday, January 6, 2010 at 7:00 p.m., in the Town Hall at 8236 South Main Street, Cicero, New York 13039.

Agenda:

- Pledge of Allegiance
- Approval of the 12.21.09 PB minutes (approved)
- Approval of PB Clerk (approved)
- Appointment of PB Engineering firm for 2010 (appointed Mark Parrish, P.E., O'Brien & Gere)
- Preliminary/Final Subdivision Plan, Northern Pine Meadows, Island Road, SEQR, Public Hearing, Park Fees (approved)
- Site Plan, C.J.'s Car America, 8665 Brewerton Road, Proposed used car dealership (to return)
- Determination of 2010 PB meeting dates
- Appointment of Sharon May as Deputy Chairperson (approved)
- Minimum standards for PB members

Board Members Present: Mark Marzullo (Chairman), William Purdy, Jason Mott, Robert Smith, Christopher Rowe, Richard Cushman and Sharon May.

Others Present: Judy Boyke (Town Supervisor), Steven Calocerinos (P.E., C&S Companies), Wayne Dean (Director of Planning & Development), Neal & Robert Germain (Esquires, Germain & Germain LLP), Mark Parrish (P.E., O'Brien & Gere), Doug Wickman (P.E., Town Board Engineer, C&S Companies), Jessica Zambrano (Town Board Liaison) and Tonia Mosley (Clerk)

Absent: Scott Harris, Ad Hoc Board member

The meeting opened with the Pledge of Allegiance.

Chairman Marzullo welcomed everyone to the first Planning Board meeting of 2010. He introduced himself as the Town Board's newly appointed Planning Board chair, recognized Supervisor Judy Boyke and Councilor Jessica Zambrano and noted the locations of the three fire exits.

APPROVAL OF THE PLANNING BOARD MINUTES FROM 12.21.09

Mrs. May made a motion to approve the Planning Board minutes from December 21, 2009. Mr. Smith seconded the motion. The motion was approved with the following vote:

Mr. Purdy:	Yes
Mr. Mott:	Yes
Mr. Smith:	Yes
Mr. Rowe:	Yes
Mr. Cushman:	Abstain
Mrs. May:	Yes
Mr. Marzullo:	Yes

APPROVAL OF PLANNING BOARD CLERK

Mrs. May noted that Tonia Mosley had been appointed as Planning Board clerk by the Town Board at their organizational meeting and made a motion to appoint her as the Planning Board clerk. Mr. Smith seconded the motion. The motion was approved with the following vote:

Mr. Purdy:	Yes
Mr. Mott:	Yes
Mr. Smith:	Yes
Mr. Rowe:	Yes
Mr. Cushman:	Yes
Mrs. May:	Yes
Mr. Marzullo:	Yes

The clerk thanked the Board.

APPOINTMENT OF PLANNING BOARD ENGINEER FOR 2010

Mr. Marzullo noted that the Planning Board sought proposals for Planning Board attorney and engineer and formed a committee charged with reviewing those proposals and conducting interviews. At the December 21, 2009 meeting Robert Germain (Germain & Germain, LLP) was appointed as lead Planning Board attorney with Neal Germain as backup. That happened before my appointment but I had an opportunity to sit down with them and am confident in their abilities.

Initially three firms submitted proposals for engineer: C&S Companies, Miller Engineers and

O'Brien & Gere. The Planning Board has narrowed their search down to two engineering firms: C&S Companies and O'Brien & Gere. Is there any discussion?

Mr. Smith stated that there was some interest in going into executive session to discuss this. With the advice of counsel, he made a motion that the Planning Board adjourns into executive session for personnel purposes with the intention of re-convening to conduct official business. He asked that Planning Board members, the Planning Board attorney(s), Wayne Dean, Judy Boyke and Jessica Zambrano attend the session. Mr. Rowe seconded the motion. The motion was approved with the following vote:

Mr. Purdy:	Yes
Mr. Mott:	Yes
Mr. Smith:	Yes
Mr. Rowe:	Yes
Mr. Cushman:	Yes
Mrs. May:	Yes
Mr. Marzullo:	Yes

The Board and invited personnel entered into executive session at 7:06 p.m.

The Board re-convened from executive session at 7:27 p.m. with the following motion: Mr. Smith made a motion that the Planning Board resume its regular session and close the executive session. No action was taken in the executive session. Mr. Rowe seconded the motion. The motion was approved with the following vote:

Mr. Purdy:	Yes
Mr. Mott:	Yes
Mr. Smith:	Yes
Mr. Rowe:	Yes
Mr. Cushman:	Yes
Mrs. May:	Yes
Mr. Marzullo:	Yes

Mr. Smith made a motion to appoint C&S Companies as the engineering firm for the Town of Cicero Planning Board and that Doug Wickman is our primary contact and that they would use the fee structure that we currently use to be compensated. Mrs. May seconded the motion.

The motion was denied with the following vote:

Mr. Purdy:	No
Mr. Mott:	No
Mr. Smith:	Yes
Mr. Rowe:	No
Mr. Cushman:	No
Mrs. May:	Yes
Mr. Marzullo:	Yes

Mr. Mott made a motion to retain O'Brien & Gere as our Planning Board engineer for 2010 with Mark Parrish being the contact person and working with the current fee structures. Mr. Rowe seconded the motion. The motion was approved with the following vote:

Mr. Purdy:	Yes
Mr. Mott:	Yes
Mr. Smith:	No
Mr. Rowe:	Yes
Mr. Cushman:	Yes
Mrs. May:	No

Mr. Marzullo: Before I vote let me say that everyone agreed in the executive session that we are in a unique and nice situation. Both firms were very capable, the contact personnel of both firms were very capable. I appreciate both of them spending the time that they did with me. To go along with the majority of the Board, I will vote yes.

Mr. Wickman thanked the Board for their consideration.

Mr. Parrish thanked the Board also stating I know that it was not an easy decision. I appreciate the opportunity to continue to serve the Planning Board. Thank you very much.

PRELIMINARY/FINAL SUBDIVISION PLAN, NORTHERN PINE MEADOWS
(PREVIOUSLY CALLED ISLAND MEADOWS), 4 LOTS, ISLAND ROAD
SEQR DETERMINATION, PARK FEES, CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING
JOSEPH MASTROIANNI

Representative: Joe Mastroianni, P.E.

Mr. Mastroianni introduced himself. The golf course is comprised of three lots. We would like to combine those into one lot and then cut off three residential lots along Island Road. Lots 2, 3 and 4 would be residential lots with the remainder as the golf course. The Board and engineer requested that we put the County approved driveway locations on the maps along with the septic systems locations for the beds.

The Board also requested that wetlands be shown. After speaking with Mr. Dean, who spoke to the Chairman, we did a 400' deep swap along Island Road and a 400' deep swap along Route 31.

Mr. Smith noted that he spoke with Mr. Dean about that. We agreed that was fair because you have 170+ acres of woodland and doing the delineation would be expensive. We are concerned because of SEQR regulations. The owner was going to give us a letter or something stating there were no plans to develop those acres so that we do not have to consider them as part of SEQR. Wayne should have that letter in the file so that we can show why we did not consider the entire parcel.

Mr. Mastroianni agreed to provide said letter.

Mr. Germain agreed with the importance of the letter stating we want to avoid sedimentation. Everything should be looked at from a large scope. With said letter you (the Board) would be covered.

Mr. Cushman referred to Diagram A. The only wetlands that do/don't need delineation would be the southern portion of Lot 2 and in the back of Lot 3, correct?

Mr. Mastroianni: None of that is state wetland, so there are no real offsets from those. The state wetlands are up along Route 31 to the western end and I believe along the eastern end.

Mr. Parrish noted he had not yet reviewed the wetlands as shown on this plan. He added Mr. Mastroianni did show the wetlands on Lots 2, 3 and 4 previously. They have done a calculation on the disturbance that they are expecting from residential home construction. I believe it was 2500 sq. ft. I don't believe they would need a permit from the Army Corps for that.

Mr. Mastroianni showed the Board the locations of the existing Club House, the proposed pavilion, etc. This line is the edge of the state wetland. This is the required 100' buffer. We are not allowed to build within that buffer. We are re-locating a building here, but nothing else is being done in that area. We are not impacting anything in the wetlands or in the 100' buffer.

Mrs. May: What is the building currently being erected on Route 31?

Mr. Mastroianni responded that building was originally going to be one that was taken apart and re-located. It will house golf carts, etc.

Mr. Smith: These gravel areas are parking areas, correct? The unmarked gravel area is...?

Mr. Mastroianni: Parking areas, yes.

Mr. Smith: How large is the area to the east of the new building?

Mr. Mastroianni: We had comments from the DOT. They wanted that defined more. They also wanted a drive across the street shown on the map.

Mr. Mastroianni showed the Board the site's ingress/egress locations including which drive would be closed, which drive would be for deliveries only, and which drive would be entrance only. He noted their completed traffic studies and an email from the DOT.

Mr. Dean: I believe we are getting confused on site plan issues that are not before the Board now.

More discussion occurred.

Mr. Smith: When you come in for site plan you will have something written from the State noting their approval of your plan?

Mr. Mastroianni: As soon as they get done looking at it, yes.

Mr. Marzullo: The plan makes note that you did not have an abstract when you delineated the

subdivision. Robert is there a possibility of line changes once an abstract is completed?

Mr. Germain: No, they did use deed references for books and pages for the map. Any issue that they might have is an internal issue and is not a concern for us.

Mr. Mastroianni clarified that there was never a land-locked lot.

Mr. Parrish: The only comment that I have is we had asked for an estimation of the disturbed areas to determine the need for a SPEDES permit. They have submitted information indicating that there is a little over .9 acres of disturbance in the residential portion. That calculation is for the house area, the driveways and the septic. It does not include things that will be needed such as utility connections, the establishment of lawn areas, etc. Wayne and I discussed it a little. To be on the safe side since we are so close to the one acre threshold, they should get a SPEDES permit for the project. It would still only require a basic storm water pollution prevention plan because it is a residential project with less than 5 acres of disturbance with over one acre of disturbance. They really have everything in place, except a notice of intent, certifications, etc. that is needed to comply with the SPEDES permit. We would recommend approval be contingent upon obtaining the SPEDES permit.

Mr. Mastroianni: We will definitely do what the Board and the engineer suggests. But I would like to point out the owner is not developing these lots. He is subdividing them out to be sold to whoever wants them. This is not like a subdivision where the applicant is building a road through and disturbing everything.

Mr. Dean: My concern is lawn area was not included.

Mr. Parrish: The SPEDES permit is a DEC permit and is subject to their regulations. The applicant might be subdividing the lots out and selling them to other owners. But, it is part of a common development plan for this site. Their overall disturbance between those lots is over an acre or is very likely to be. I would still recommend that a SPEDES permit be obtained.

Mr. Marzullo continued with the public hearing at 7:40 p.m. He asked if there was anyone who would like to speak in favor of the subdivision. (There was no response.) Is there anyone opposed? (There was no response.) The Chairman closed the public hearing at 7:41 p.m.

Mrs. May made a motion regarding SEQR. She read: Be it further resolved that the Planning Board of the Town of Cicero hereby determines that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the environment and that this resolution shall constitute a negative declaration for the purposes of Article 8 of the Environmental Conservation Law of the State of New York. Mr. Mott seconded the motion. The motion was approved with the following vote:

Mr. Purdy:	Yes
Mr. Mott:	Yes
Mr. Smith:	Yes
Mr. Rowe:	Yes
Mr. Cushman:	Yes
Mrs. May:	Yes
Mr. Marzullo:	Yes

Mr. Marzullo made a motion that the applicant be responsible for 277 Fees of \$ 475.00 per lot for four lots. Mr. Dean noted that 277 Fees usually apply to residential lots, not commercial lots. There are only three residential lots. Mr. Marzullo revised his motion to reflect three lots. Mr. Smith seconded the motion. The motion was approved with the following vote:

Mr. Purdy:	Yes
Mr. Mott:	Yes
Mr. Smith:	Yes
Mr. Rowe:	Yes
Mr. Cushman:	Yes
Mrs. May:	Yes
Mr. Marzullo:	Yes

Mr. Marzullo asked for a motion to approve the subdivision subject to the comments added by the engineer for a SPEDES permit.

Mr. Smith made a motion to approve the preliminary/final subdivision plan for Northern Pine Meadows as discussed and presented by the plan dated 10.8.09 with a revision date of 12.28.09 and the contingency that the applicant is required to apply for a SPEDES permit for the project from the DEC. Mrs. May seconded the motion. Mr. Germain clarified for the applicant

that 277 Fees should be paid before the final plat can be signed. And, the letter you spoke of providing to the Town should also be submitted before the final plat can be signed. Mr. Smith amended the motion to include the attorney's recommendations. The motion was approved with the following vote:

Mr. Purdy:	Yes
Mr. Mott:	Yes
Mr. Smith:	Yes
Mr. Rowe:	Yes
Mr. Cushman:	Yes
Mrs. May:	Yes
Mr. Marzullo:	Yes

Mr. Mastroianni: For the site plan review, the only thing we are waiting for is the DOT, correct? We have submitted everything else?

Mr. Marzullo: I am being told yes.

Mr. Mastroianni thanked the Board.

SITE PLAN, C.J.'S CAR AMERICA
8665 BREWERTON ROAD, USED CAR DEALERSHIP
CHRIS STELLAKIS

Representative: Chris Stellakis

Mr. Stellakis introduced himself giving a brief review of the project. I propose to use the existing structure and parking lot for Phase I and would like to go forward with that immediately. I would to complete Phase II in the future. Phase II includes parking out front along Brewerton Road.

Mr. Rowe: I believe we are back with the same issue of parking on tarvia versus parking on grass, how many cars you have, etc. We need to know where you are going to park and how many cars there would be.

Mr. Stellakis showed the Board graveled and black-topped areas. This is the existing driveway and existing parking lot. I don't propose to do anything except putting in stripes. There is a small triangular portion in the center that has some grass.

More discussion occurred.

Mrs. May: How many cars will you have in Phase I?

Mr. Stellakis: 10 cars in the back which are not for display purposes. Some of those would be new purchases that are not ready yet to be sold or trade-ins. They would not be standing cars or junk cars. I have a total of 31 cars,

Mr. Marzullo: No cars on grass?

Mr. Stellakis: No, all cars would be on existing gravel or tarvia.

Mrs. May: Do you do any painting or collision work?

Mr. Stellakis: I won't be doing any type of service work here. I will not be doing retail sales of tires, batteries, wiper blades, etc.

Mr. Marzullo: You indicated that all of your mechanical work would be done at your other location in Bridgeport?

Mr. Stellakis: Yes.

Mrs. May: Any oil changes?

Mr. Stellakis: No. There will not be any staff for that.

Mr. Cushman: The biggest portion of that curbed section would be Phase II?

Mr. Stellakis: Yes.

Mr. Cushman: What kind of time frame are you looking at for Phase II?

Mr. Stellakis: I was hoping to do it inside of 12 months. That is contingent upon what kind of performance I get out of the area.

Mr. Smith: Wayne, do you have any comments on how you would administer this, or any concerns?

Mr. Dean. No. This is a lot better than what we have seen in the past as far as the delineation of spaces. It is easy to go out there and count cars to make sure there is not an over abundance. I feel this is a pretty good plan.

Mr. Mott: You will be doing a two phase plan. The first part is the area here with front parking and the back. It is my understanding that Phase II would be the front where the majority of the cars are. You would come back in for Phase II? If we drive by there and we see cars out front we will call Wayne. All of us on the Board will be upset because maybe this should have been done as one site plan. That might be the answer.

Mr. Dean: My understanding is, he could have cars in that area, for example in three months, if he paved that and went ahead and developed it in accordance with this plan.

Mr. Stellakis: This is all one site plan.

Mr. Smith: I think that we should require that Phase II be paved. It would be the most visible.

Mr. Dean: Paved or graveled, as long as it is not grass.

Mr. Mott clarified. I don't want him coming back 12 months from now for Phase II. If we are going to approve this as one site plan, let's approve this as one site plan. His business may pick up three months from now and then he would put cars out there. I don't want cars on grass either. We should approve the site plan with gravel or pavement, and then he can move forward.

Mr. Dean agreed.

Mr. Smith: My concern with allowing this to be gravel---I am considering the fact that we are

working with the applicant, accommodating the applicant by letting him park cars that are for sale, on gravel in the back. He is moving this up front. This will be a car dealership with proposed lights, etc. and should be paved. We have required every other car dealership in Town to pave. It will be right out by the highway and is an appearance issue. Gravel will settle and have grass growing through it. In my opinion, the front should be paved.

Mr. Stellakis: The proposed lighting is there because at our last meeting, the Board said that they wanted lighting. I was told then that I could have gravel or blacktop. Obviously, I would like blacktop. My current location has all blacktop. I don't want to work on gravel because it is additional work for me—vehicles get dirty as people get in and out of them and I have to clean them over and over again.

Mr. Marzullo: Section II is rather large. Even if you did that in three sections if you needed to, you would have to go with pavement in any of the improved areas

Mr. Mott: He could build it out any way that he wants. But, before he moves cars out here—Bob is saying he would like to see it paved.

Mr. Dean: I don't feel that it is proper to vote on this tonight. We just got this application in and it has not gone to the County. We should wait for the County's referral to come back.

Mr. Cushman agreed with Mr. Smith noting another site that the Board did not specify needed to be paved that has grass and mud all over it.

Mr. Stellakis: My intention is to make the site look nice. I put this on one site plan to show the maximum, the optimal development that I would like to have. My plan was to put in gravel, work with that a little while and then add the blacktop. As long as this is approved, then perhaps I could build in sections, perhaps this section in front of the facility first with blacktop. Then if I needed additional parking later I could add this wing.

Mr. Dean: I don't have a problem with that.

Mr. Marzullo: Wayne, do you want him to co-ordinate that with you—when he is going to start the work?

Mr. Dean agreed as more discussion occurred.

Mr. Mott asked about greenspace up front. He noted there was approximately 20' available there.

Mr. Stellakis agreed. Plus the highway right-of-way which is approximately another 20-30 feet between the blacktop edge and the road right-of-way.

Mrs. May: You do understand that there is to be no parking on the greenspace?

Mr. Stellakis is responded yes. The sign is located on the plan here, near the entrance. It is a minimum of 20' from the highway edge.

Mr. Mott noted the sign is 40 sq. ft.

Mr. Smith: Is it pole mounted? How high up in the air would it be?

Mr. Stellakis: It would be mounted on two poles. My intention was to have it about 8' at the top.

Mr. Parrish: We should get sign details so that there won't be any questions.

Mr. Dean: I believe sign specifications include a 24' height maximum and 6' beneath the sign. Square footage depends upon the size of the building's frontage. I believe that he is well within that. The sign would require Board approval if he was exceeding the maximum square footage allowed.

Mr. Stellakis: The sign would be internally lit. I can get images of it for the Board. I don't plan of having any type of scrolling now. My sign in Bridgeport contains a LED/message board.

Mrs. May: If that is approved it can only scroll every 15 seconds. It can not have any flashing, florescent lighting, etc. If you do have a reader board would you allow it to contain Amber alerts?

Mr. Stellakis: Yes.

Mr. Marzullo asked about access to the back of the property which is south of the Campus. Should we require an easement for future use?

Mr. Parrish: Let me look at how it fits in with the surrounding properties and whether that makes sense. I will come back with information.

Mrs. May asked about dumpsters.

Mr. Stellakis: Eventually, if I build this out, I would probably get to the point where I would need one. Currently, I do not intend to use one.

Mrs. May reminded the applicant that the dumpster would need to be enclosed by stockade type fencing.

Mr. Marzullo referred to another issue important to the Board, sidewalks. I am not suggesting that you put sidewalks in at this location.

Mr. Smith noted the Board has not gone that far north.

Mr. Dean explained the procedure for submitting applications to the County. If a plan is within 500' of a state route, the plan needs to be submitted to the County for their review as to how it fits within their overall plan and to make sure that there are no conflicts with other projects. I don't believe they will have any problems with this project.

More discussion occurred.

Mr. Parrish: We received the lighting plan tonight. We will review the plan and get a comment list to Hal Romans so that he knows what needs to be addressed. We will also take into account tonight's comments from the Board. In the mean time this can go down to the County for review.

Mr. Smith: As we discussed, will you be able to scan the major plan if you make comments on it

and pdf it to all of us like you do with your comments—attach it?

Mr. Parrish: Yes, if Toni forwards me a copy of these pdfs.

Mr. Dean: We will submit the plan before us tonight to the County. I think that it is example enough of what they want to look at.

Mr. Rowe recommended submitting the LED/message board sign permit now. You do not have to build it yet. It is better to get it out of the way now so that you will not have to mess around with it later.

Mr. Stellakis: I think that I prefer to pass on the reader board. The technology for those signs changes rapidly. I don't know when I would be purchasing it. It would at least be a couple of years because I am going to spend all of my money on the parking lot.

More discussion occurred.

DETERMINATION OF 2010 PLANNING BOARD MEETING DATES

Mr. Marzullo noted Planning Board meeting dates would stay the same as they were last year-- the first Wednesday and third Monday of the month at 7:00 p.m. We have two conflicts, the first of which is January 18, 2010, Martin Luther King's Day.

The Board agreed to re-schedule that meeting to Monday, January 25, 2010.

Mr. Marzullo: The next conflict is February 15, 2010, President's Day.

The Board agreed to re-schedule that meeting to Monday, February 22, 2010.

Mr. Marzullo noted there would be a work session held here the Wednesday before each scheduled Planning Board meeting at 10 a.m. I understand that might be difficult for every Planning Board member to attend.

Mr. Smith: Because those are open to the public, do we have to advertise these meetings so that we don't have any quorum issues? Do we need to make that a motion and assure that no action will be taken?

Mr. Marzullo: Yes. It would be advertised once just like our regular meetings.

Mr. Germain recommended advertising it as a work session.

Mr. Marzullo made a motion to hold work sessions here each Wednesday before a scheduled Planning Board meeting at 10 a.m. No actions will be taken. These meetings should be advertised as work sessions once like our regular meetings. Mrs. May seconded the motion. The motion was approved with the following vote:

Mr. Purdy:	Yes
Mr. Mott:	Yes
Mr. Smith:	Yes
Mr. Rowe:	Yes
Mr. Cushman:	Yes
Mrs. May:	Yes
Mr. Marzullo:	Yes

APPOINTMENT OF SHARON MAY AS DEPUTY CHAIRPERSON

Mr. Marzullo made a motion to appoint Sharon May as his Deputy Chairperson. Mr. Cushman seconded the motion. The motion was approved with the following vote:

Mr. Purdy:	Yes
Mr. Mott:	Yes
Mr. Smith:	Yes
Mr. Rowe:	Yes
Mr. Cushman:	Yes
Mrs. May:	Abstain
Mr. Marzullo:	Yes

MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS

Mr. Marzullo: I reviewed the minutes for the last 12 months along with those from the last organizational meeting. I noticed that the Planning Board adopted a minimum attendance standard. Through my readings I realized that it is not the Planning Board that has that authority but the Town Board. The Town Board has the authority to set minimum standards to include training. As you know the State requires four hours minimum for training. I thought that it would be in our best interest to have the Town Board actually set the standards so that we knew what our obligations were. My purpose for putting this on the agenda was to get some feedback from the Planning Board.

I have talked with the Supervisor. She has asked that I give the Town Board a recommendation for minimal standards. So, I am looking for feedback and input from all of you as to what those minimum standards should be.

Mr. Cushman commented we have the Onondaga County Planning Session each year at the Oncenter. That has always been six hours. We have already exceeded the State's minimum requirement for training by 50%. There is a carry over rule that allows us to carry over two hours. Four hours is not a lot of training.

Mr. Smith: Our attorneys agreed that they would conduct some training on for example SEQR issues. I think that the law allows us to count that time towards our training requirement.

Mr. Marzullo: The Town Board determines if that would be acceptable training. We would suggest to them what should be included in the minimum standards. It would be up to them to approve those standards.

Mr. Germain: You are an administrative board not a legislative board so you can not set the rules. You can certainly make recommendations.

Mr. Marzullo: I would ask that over the next few weeks the Board gives it some thought, and gives me their input. I will put something together for the entire Board to review. Then we will forward that to the Town Board via our liaison.

Mr. Smith: Last year when we re-organized we passed a resolution requiring any communications that were email-able be distributed to Board members. Those who wish not to read them can delete them. We discussed during the interview sessions that communications such as NYSDOT driveway approvals should be sent out as soon as they are received. Basically this would include any communications between our professionals and the Board that deal with issues before the Board. That information should be copied and sent to give us a chance to review them. We would be better informed.

I would like to see us continue that policy and make it a requirement. For the professionals there should be no question that is an expectation of the Board.

Mr. Marzullo agreed. I spoke with both counsel and engineering firms. If anything comes to me I want it sent out to the Board.

Mr. Smith made a motion to reaffirm last year's resolution that all communications between our professionals and the Planning Board pertaining to issues before the Planning Board be forward through email to all members of the Planning Board. Mr. Cushman seconded the motion. The motion was approved with the following vote:

Mr. Purdy:	Yes
Mr. Mott:	Yes
Mr. Smith:	Yes
Mr. Rowe:	Yes
Mr. Cushman:	Yes
Mrs. May:	Yes
Mr. Marzullo:	Yes

Mr. Marzullo noted attendance requirements would be included in the minimum standards for Board members.

Mr. Mott: I would like to officially welcome Mark. We spoke on the phone. I am looking forward to working with you. It should be fun.

Mr. Marzullo: I am looking forward to it as well.

Mrs. May: I would like to say that I was very pleased with the amount of participation that we had from our Board tonight. We have never had this much conversation between members in the 13 years that I have been on this Board.

(Audience applause)

Mrs. Boyke: I would also like to commend all of you. This was probably the most pleasant Planning Board meeting I have attended within the last year. It is nice to see all of you speak your comments. It felt comfortable in this environment.

Mr. Smith: You have sat through some of the meetings and you probably heard resolutions from the Planning Board. Some have been ignored. We are looking forward to working with the new Town Board on Planning issues. The State charges the Planning Board to advise the Town Board on all issues related to planning, not just site plans. Maintaining sidewalks would be wonderful.

Mrs. Boyke: Your treatment of the applicants was commendable.

Mr. Marzullo thanked the Supervisor. He made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mrs. May seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

IN AS MUCH AS THERE WAS NO FURTHER BUSINESS BEFORE THE BOARD, THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 8:15 P.M.

Dated: January 16, 2010

Tonia Mosley, Clerk

