

The Planning Board of the Town of Cicero held a meeting on **Monday, March 15, 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 Planning Board minutes from March 3, 2010 (**approved**)
- Site Plan, Riccelli Enterprises, Inc., Totman Road, Proposed gravel parking area and driveway, CHA (**to return**)
- Informal discussion, Proposed Dunkin Donuts, 5865 Route 31 (**to return**)
- Motion to change the application process (**approved**)

Board Members Present:

Mark Marzullo, Chairman
William Purdy
Jason Mott
Robert Smith
Scott Harris, Ad Hoc Board Member
Richard Cushman
Sharon May

Absent:

Christopher Rowe

Others Present:

Wayne Dean, Director of Planning & Development
Neal Germain, Esq., Germain & Germain LLP
Mark Parrish, P.E., O'Brien & Gere
Jessica Zambrano, Town Board Liaison
Tonia Mosley, Clerk

The meeting was opened with the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF THE MARCH 3, 2010 PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

Mr. Smith made a motion to approve the Planning Board minutes from March 3, 2010. **Mrs. May seconded the motion.** The motion was **approved** with the following vote:

Mr. Purdy:	Yes
Mr. Mott:	Yes
Mr. Smith:	Yes
Mr. Harris:	Abstain

Mr. Cushman: Yes
Mrs. May: Yes
Mr. Marzullo: Yes

**SITE PLAN, RICCELLI ENTERPRISES, INC.
TOTMAN ROAD, PROPOSED GRAVEL PARKING AREA
AND DRIVEWAY, CHA**

Representatives: James Trasher, CHA
Amy Franco, CHA
Dom Cambareri, Esquire

Mr. Trasher introduced himself as the engineering representative for Riccelli Enterprises, Inc. This slide shows the existing site plan. It shows Riccelli's head quarters along Taft Road, their current parking facility and the area they purchased in the back.

About a year and a half ago the DEC came out to the site to do an inspection. They felt this area could potentially be a wetland area. Our office along with TES was retained to look at the situation. Working with the DEC and the Army CORPS we have determined that this outlined area that had been filled, minus this one little area here, could be classified as wetland area. We are in the process of going through the restoration and reclamation plan with the DEC and the Army CORPS.

To maintain operation in the facility we need to construct another parking area for the same number of trailers and trucks. We did a wetland delineation of the entire parcel. We propose to put parking in this upland area, adjacent to wetlands. We would go through the proper permitting process with the Town, the NYSDEC and the Army CORP to cross the wetlands.

At this point we have provided a site plan and drainage report while continuing to work with the other agencies. We are working in conjunction with all of the agencies involved: the Town, the DEC, the Army Corps and Riccelli because we have parallel paths to go down and we do not want any agency to not know what we are doing with the others. The Planning Office and the Town's engineers will receive copies of all correspondence between each agency.

There are certain dead lines that we need to meet to reclaim this area with the DEC and Army CORPS. In order to reclaim this area we would need the ability to park trucks here, utilizing Totman Road to Taft Road for a short duration, while the final permitting and construction of the new access road through the wetlands occurs. Based upon conversations with the engineers and others, I know that some things would need to be taken care of through the approval process. We are here to start that process. When I meet with the DEC and the Army CORPS I would like to discuss with them what you need to see and compare it with what they need to see.

Mr. Smith asked Mr. Dean if he had seen the correspondence that was going back and forth between the involved agencies.

Mr. Dean reported that he had not.

Mr. Smith: I would like to see the remediation communications before we move.

Mr. Trasher: I can't go back to the beginning of the project to say that all correspondences have been properly copied to all parties, but since we started meeting with the Army CORPS and the DEC to move through the restoration and reclamation plan I would like to keep emails, letters, etc. between all parties copied to all parties to keep the dialog going. We want everyone to be fully aware of what is going on so that we can accomplish what the Town would like to see done, plus what the DEC would like to see done, etc.

Mr. Smith agreed stating given the fact that the wetland situation is what it is and given that we have to give an approval, I would like to see that the Town knows what the DEC and Army CORPS are looking for. As you send copies to Wayne's office, they forward copies to the Board.

Mr. Marzullo agreed adding we have no intention of giving any approvals this evening.

Mr. Dean: The last time I talked with Tom from the DEC I asked him for the correspondence on this. He stated because this might be in litigation, he did not want to give me anything.

Mr. Trasher: We can.

Mr. Cushman: Is this a preliminary drawing?

Mr. Trasher: We have a site plan package where it is to a preliminary state. It is a preliminary layout plan with preliminary grading and preliminary storm water. We would like to be able to tell the other agencies if this preliminary layout is acceptable or not acceptable so that we could move forward.

Mr. Cushman: It looks like you have a gravel drive going through Thompson Brook. How will you accomplish that, build a bridge?

Mr. Marzullo clarified the big span crossing the waterway, the floodway. How are you getting trucks across for that gravel drive?

Mr. Trasher: We would have to culvert or box culvert across and then do some type of study. It depends on conversation with the Town's engineer and the Town's flood manager, I believe that would be Wayne's office---noting what needed to be done to satisfy the Town, and then the Town could send that information to FEMA.

There is currently a culvert that goes under Totman Road, which is part of the floodway. We could work on what was needed as we move forward through the process.

Mr. Smith: You would be prepared to discuss that with us, telling us what was decided for approval?

Mr. Parrish: I can give you a little input at this point, again noting that this is at a preliminary stage. There is a floodplain and a floodway. Floodways are areas that are not supposed to be filled in order to maintain the floodplain elevations that are established by the FEMA mapping. Typically, you are not allowed to put in fill, structures, etc. in the floodway because they result in an increase in the base flood elevation. You can do it but you do need to provide a technical study showing that you are not increasing the base flood elevation. I think that is typically down to a one hundredth of a foot as the threshold that you need to show relative to the accuracy of your study. So, they will have to provide a technical study showing that they are

not increasing the base flood elevation by the filling and/or placement of this culvert within the floodway. That is usually done by a HEC 2 or HECRAS model. They will need to get the original model that was done for the original establishment of the floodway and floodplain and modify that to show what the impacts of this proposal are.

Mr. Trasher: We are willing to do that work, if it is required, before going into that in-depth detailed and time-consuming study. But because it is so costly, \$25,000 +/-, we first want to make sure that the concept for the preliminary plan would be somewhat acceptable—if we can meet the engineering requirements of the Town. We do not want to go through a study and then determine that there was no intent to allow us to cross from Point A to Point B.

Mrs. May: This parking lot is for 106 spaces. Would you utilize all of those spots?

Mr. Trasher: Yes. The parking we have in this area nearly matches the current parking in the area we need to mitigate.

Mrs. May: Do you think the applicant would need more? This company is noted for doing what they want to do and not what they are supposed to do.

Mr. Trasher: I think that is why we are here. We are trying to do this the right way. I can not speak about what was done in the past, but I can tell you that our conversations with the applicant note doing things in the appropriate manner, getting the necessary approvals and letting all involved parties know what they will do before it gets done.

Mr. Smith: You have a gravel road going north to another piece that just ends there.

Mr. Trasher: Yes. Our initial thought was to get all potential wetland impacts out of the area based upon our conversations with both parties. But that will be removed from the plan.

Mr. Dean: The road will be removed or the wetland will be removed?

Mr. Trasher: The proposed access road will not be included in future plans. All of this land here is owned by Riccelli—38.5 acres.

Mr. Smith: Didn't you file an application for a truck wash on Totman Road?

Mr. Dean: It was for a truck garage for swapping out engines.

Mr. Trasher: That engine shop has been removed from the plan. Riccelli only has a need for parking. If the applicant wants to do something else on the site, they would come back in front of the Planning Board.

Mr. Smith: Prior to being constructed?

Mr. Trasher: Prior to being constructed.

Mr. Smith: We would want to make sure that any motion or resolution would have that specifically included.

Mr. Marzullo asked for clarification. The proposed parking area is roughly the same as the area to be mitigated?

Mr. Trasher: Correct.

Mr. Smith: They have an area in the middle of the storm water that will be gravel. Trucks would leak oil onto a gravel parking lot.

Mr. Trasher: Riccelli has an entire spill response plan for their area. They have had other areas where leaks occurred where for example a 2 x 2 area of hydraulic spill had to be removed.

Mr. Smith: Can we have that included in the plan?

Mr. Trasher: If how Riccelli would deal with spills in this area is required, we can provide that information.

Mr. Smith: Given the NYSDEC and Army CORPS wetlands, we have some serious SEQR issues.

Mr. Germain: Correct. Eventually, you would have to give them a negative declaration if you wanted to move forward. Or, if they requested that you become the lead agency, you could do that as well. That would be up to them. But, at this point I think they are too preliminary to make that request.

Mr. Trasher: In terms of our time table and based upon the report that the Town has copies of, the Army CORPS wants the work in this area here to commence by May 1st, plus the removal and remediation of this area. I am set to meet with the DEC tomorrow to discuss that same plan.

We give a phased reclamation plan. We want to take care of everything on the Totman Road side of the proposed gravel access at this time. Then we would work through the permitting process with all of the agencies. If we were successful we would then construct the access road to the parking lot and have the parking facility. If we are unsuccessful we would have to come in and reclaim the rest of the area. But why dig something out just to put it back in?

Mr. Smith: Currently the restoration area you have indicated is filled with trucks parked there. What will you do with the trucks in the interim if this is not built?

Mr. Trasher: If it looks like it is going to go forward with the DEC and Army CORPS on the restoration plan, Riccelli would come in and construct this area, using it temporarily while they are removing this. We are asking for that as well because the applicant needs to continue to operate at the site while this work is being done. They have 106 truck trailers that need to go somewhere and there is no room on the existing site while the reclamation is going on, temporarily.

Mr. Smith: Would you be putting truck traffic onto Totman Road and when would you be looking to do that? Traffic on Totman would be a key point to us.

Mr. Trasher: I will have a better indication of that after I meet with the DEC. If someone from the Board or your engineer wants to come to that meeting, you would be more than welcome to see first-hand what was discussed. It would provide for a better dialog.

Mr. Cushman: The road off Totman would be a temporary road to the gravel area. Can I assume that it would be removed and filled back in for normal growth after you build the parking area?

Mr. Trasher: That road would remain but it would be gated off and only used for emergency access--just to have two points of access to the area. We do not show a gate there now but we would add a permanent one.

You might notice that the road splits the property line. Our attorney, Dom Cambareri, is working on the legal paperwork needed for an access and a landscape buffer easement here. We also show a berm—half on Riccelli property and half on the adjacent property. There should not be any visual truck impacts.

Mr. Marzullo: Have you talked to the DEC about leaving the trucks where they are now and mitigating a different spot?

Mr. Trasher: Yes. We have talked about every option. Both Army CORPS and DEC said no.

More discussion occurred.

Mr. Trasher: From a conceptual level I know we have talked about floodplain, drainage and floodway at a workshop meeting. We talked about trying to keep limited access on Totman Road which we are willing to do long term. But we are asking for some assistance from the Town of Cicero for the short term to try to facilitate a coordinated removal and have a facility for the trucks while that work is going on.

Mr. Dean: Where would the fill go that you talk about?

Mr. Trasher responded it would be the base for the work done here and along the berm. Almost all of the material is old road millings or material that came from other road projects. It is good structural material that would be supplemented by new material on the top. The stuff in the wet area would have to go to a permitted fill area.

Mr. Smith: We will face hundreds of truck loads. Will you take those loads out onto Taft, down Totman and into the site? Or, will you move the truck loads after you have constructed the gravel road?

Mr. Trasher: Even if fill was not coming out of the site, we would have to bring hundreds of truck loads of material down Totman. The Army CORPS will not look at issuing a permit until this back restoration work starts. Until they see work commencing in this area, they will not give us a permit.

Mr. Smith: So, you will have to take it out onto Taft Road and bring it down Totman to drive it in this temporary road, if it is granted. That will be a lot of traffic.

Mr. Harris: Are you transitioning trucks from where they are parked now piecemeal?

Mr. Trasher: Hopefully at some point during the summer months, Riccelli will have some major construction projects that would take trucks out on the road. Some projects require trucks to be parked at the work site over night. But, we would have to start transitioning trucks from here to here. We would have to work on a plan to implement that.

Mr. Smith: Is Totman Road built to handle that kind of loaded truck traffic? Should we look at some sort of mitigation to have this road improved to handle this amount?

Mr. Dean: I would want to do an inspection of that road prior to anything being done. I would prefer to have it re-built after this is over rather than re-building it first. There are already problems with Totman Road.

Mr. Trasher: We understand the concern and can evaluate that with the Planning Department and the Highway superintendent.

Mr. Smith: I think that Mark should be involved in that.

Mr. Dean had another issue, the second connector onto Totman Road. I would prefer to have that removed when it is all done, but it does make sense to have two access points.

During the use of that road, I would like to restrict any left turns out of there and going down and getting onto Eastman to cross over to Northern Blvd. That would certainly impact that neighborhood.

The Board agreed.

Mr. Trasher: We have given defined areas where trucks could go on other projects and could do that here.

Mr. Dean: During your meeting tomorrow, I would like you to convey to the CORPS and the DEC that we would prefer to have that gravel road constructed first, before the other lot is rebuilt. That would keep people from using existing roads and creating problems.

Mr. Parrish: Has the CORPS indicated that they will permit that?

Mr. Trasher: They can not give indication until you begin remedy. They are in an enforcement situation. They need to enforce the situation and then permit future impacts.

Mr. Parrish: There is no certainty that this will be permitted.

Mr. Trasher: That is the catch twenty-two.

Mr. Parrish: I wanted the Board to hear that because this might end up with the temporary traffic pattern becoming permanent because the applicant could not get their permits.

More discussion occurred.

Mr. Marzullo: Have you considered parking the trucks elsewhere, until you get all of the permits?

Mr. Trasher: That has been considered. Riccelli has other facilities. The big thing is maintenance. Truck maintenance is done at this location and so having said trucks closer to home is desirable.

Mr. Smith suggested parking trucks at the Air Park where there is a lot of pavement.

Mr. Purdy suggested using Running Ridge Road for truck traffic as opposed to using Totman Road. Running Ridge runs all the way over to Northern Blvd. You could come out of your existing lot, go down to Northern Blvd. turn left and go by Swift Transportation. That goes to Totman where you would just cross the intersection onto your property. If you went via Running Ridge you could eliminate the concern for tearing up Totman Road.

Mr. Dean reminded the Board that Taft Road would be re-constructed this summer. Traffic wise, it will really be a mess.

Mr. Marzullo: I think that you should look at temporarily parking the trucks in a different spot until you get the permit. I would hate to see you build the secondary parking lot, not get permit approval and then have to come back before this Board. We will not want to make that a permanent drive.

More discussion occurred.

Mr. Cambareri: As far as zoning, parking trucks is an allowable use under Section 210-12C6 of the code. About a year and a half ago I sent a memorandum to Wayne's office, the DEC and the Army CORPS describing the whole situation and how we wanted to approach it correctly. In the last year we have made some progress and are now about to embark on the remediation and reclamation part and simultaneously do the new permit application for the disturbance for the proposed row. For them to consider the permit process we have to show that we are making progress. That is where the Town comes in.

We recognize all of the issues raised tonight, especially the temporary use of Totman Road. We would rather use the site internally but we must first get the blessings of the Army CORPS and the DEC. We are trying to coordinate between all of the agencies. We are trying to keep Wayne and Mark involved. That is why we came to the work session earlier.

I tell you this because you made it clear that you want to see an applicant who is up front and is trying to do the right thing. That is why for the last year and a half we have been trying to make those efforts. We did not bring in applications sooner because the DEC and the Army CORPS

were not ready.

As long as the Board gives us a general okay about the location of the new parking lot, without committing itself further, then when Jim goes into the meeting tomorrow we can say that the Cicero Planning Board has a general okay about the relocation of the parking lot but they have some concerns. They have a concern about the use of Totman Road and its condition if we have to go outside of Taft, come back around and go down Totman in order to bring this stuff back around. We would say that the Board suggested we find another location to temporarily park trucks, but I am not sure that we have another location. We will explore that.

You mentioned the use of Running Ridge. Although these roads are clearly designed to be able to take our truck traffic, it does raise a safety concern for other drivers on the highway. My clients have an excellent reputation for safety when it comes to the operation of their trucks on a public highway. If we can find the easiest transfer route without jeopardizing the public, we want to do it.

That is why we said if the Army CORPS and the DEC give us a right for this internal roadway, is it possible for us to do some of that transfer internally onto the new site. That is what we would like to have some acknowledgement on from the Board--on a preliminary approval as to where we want to relocate the parking.

Mr. Purdy: The safest way is not Totman Road. The safest way is to go up to Northern Blvd. If you go Taft Road you are pulling out a tractor trailer in front of two lanes of traffic to turn right.

Mr. Cambareri: We will consider it. It makes sense to take that as an alternative. But we know from driving experience, the longer our trucks are on the road the greater the potential safety issue becomes.

Mr. Purdy: That is not necessarily the case. A four lane road is better than a two lane road even if you are on the four lane road longer.

Mr. Cambareri: We will look at it. We want to emphasize safety. Transferring internally is the best option in terms of safety, if we can do it. We are posed to do the things that the DEC and Army CORPS want us to do.

Mr. Harris: When you meet with them leverage our view of when that internal road gets built.

Mr. Smith: Mr. Chairman are you asking us to say what we would like to see?

Mr. Marzullo: I don't think that we will make a formal motion. I think that we have stated what we would like.

Mr. Cushman agreed. We would like to see the internal road.

Mr. Trasher: That is what we will try to do. We will come back once we hear what the other agencies have to say.

Mr. Marzullo spoke Mr. Tim Murphy in the audience. Tim I see that you have raised your hand. I have been advised by counsel that we really should not be taking public input on items that are not at a public hearing. It is really not fair to the rest of the public because we did not give notice for someone else to be here to listen to you. Maybe, if they knew it was a public hearing, they would want to be here a well.

Typically site plan does not require a public hearing, but we can have one, right?

Mr. Germain: Sure you can.

Mr. Marzullo: So, I will consider that. You can always give comments to the Board in writing. Did I state that properly?

Mr. Germain introduced himself to Mr. Murphy in his position as Planning Board attorney. What the Chairman is trying to say is the problem with having a public hearing without notice is that there might be people who would like to hear what you have to say and comment. They would not have notice and therefore would not have the ability to comment, to hear or to be present to express their views if they wanted to. And so if the Board allows your comments as part of the public, in is not fair to the other people who might want to listen to what you have to say.

It is also not fair to you. You would be stating your comments without the parties you want to have said dialog with present.

Mr. Marzullo: If you have some suggestions, submit them to us in writing. As I have said, I will consider making this site plan a public hearing.

Mr. Murphy: At the beginning of the meeting you used to say that you liked public input.

Mr. Marzullo: I did not say that this evening.

**INFORMAL DISCUSSION: DUNKIN DONUTS
PROPOSED LOCATION: FORMER WAFFLEWORKS BUILDING, 5865 ROUTE 31**

Representatives: James Trasher, CHA

Mr. Trasher: We are here representing Cafua Management Company who has an option on the old Waffleworks piece. They are currently located in this triangle at the intersection of Route 31 and Lakeshore. They lease that property. Due to their current size and location they are looking for a new facility. We have a sketch plan for the proposed site. As we move through the process we would like to know what the Board would be looking for.

We would not be generating any new traffic.

Mr. Smith: What will you do with your old location? That could potentially generate traffic.

Mr. Trasher: The old facility is not owned by Cafua Management Company. They are the franchisee for Dunkin Donuts in this area.

Mr. Smith: Who does own it?

Mr. Trasher did not know. The property would have to come back to the Planning Board for any new facility for traffic, etc. In conversations with different transportation departments, this intersection is a problem that they have looked at trying to reconfigure.

Mr. Marzullo: So they are losing their lease?

Mr. Trasher: They are not losing their lease. They just prefer a better facility for their

customers. The new site would be better for stacking.

Our proposal shows the current ingress/egress in this location. The drive through lane would loop around and come all the way back here. We show an escape lane. We show the stacking area.

We are trying to reuse the existing facility. A new retaining wall would have to be constructed in this area along the property line allowing the construction of the drive through lane with access out.

We understand that traffic is a concern and have talked to the NYSDOT. They see the benefit in removing Dunkin Donuts from their current location to the proposed one. They stated a traffic study was needed. Again, we are not putting a true generator of traffic here. If you have failing intersections you look at the driveway location, etc. We would talk to your engineer and the NYSDOT engineer about what kind of traffic study they would like. In counting intersections where everyone knows the volume is not beneficial, it really gets into a gap analysis where if you were heading eastbound on Route 31, what types of gaps do you have to have to be able to make a right-hand turn. We know that right-hand turns can be easily accomplished along with right-hand turns out when cars are stopped.

We are here to get your overall opinions and thoughts. We are trying to reclaim an existing facility and make it a benefit to the Town.

Mr. Harris: Is there a blue sign on Route 81 that shows the exit for Dunkin Donuts?

Mr. Marzullo did not think so.

Mrs. May: Would you consider a right-in, right-out only—no left turn?

Mr. Trasher: I am not sure that I can speak for my client about that, but I assume that they would want a full access drive. Maybe we could restrict left-hand turns during certain times of day.

Mr. Harris: It is not far from the Route 81 exit to this property. Because of the popularity of

Dunkin Donuts I could see the possibility for stacking close to the exit. That would depend upon the time of day.

Other Board members felt that there would be more of a stacking problem trying to get onto Route 81 South from the proposed site.

Mr. Smith: Have you explored getting McDonalds to exit using the non-named road? Then we could have two businesses using one driveway.

Mr. Trasher: We can provide the ability for a future connection. But, I don't think that a McDonalds franchise will want to share a drive with a Dunkin Donuts franchise.

Mr. Harris: I am up and down that road all the time and see near misses all the time. Drivers get frustrated waiting. It is a tough section.

More discussion occurred.

Mr. Trasher: There would not be much change in the amount of impervious area. We believe that a drainage report would not be required by the Town's engineer. The building does not sit parallel with Route 31 or parallel with the property lines. There might be a need to change the building's front corners for a better traffic flow.

Mr. Smith: What if Dunkin Donuts moved down the street and we end up with another donut chain taking over the old location. Do we get a chance to try to mitigate something there?

Mr. Cushman: If it is not a change of use and it has been less than one year, they could move right in.

Mr. Dean: Any development with issues can be brought in for site plan approval. That site certainly would have issues.

Mr. Germain: You might have a hard time with this unique situation.

Mr. Smith: If Wayne wanted to bring it in it might be difficult?

Mr. Germain: You would find a way. You might get some objections if someone came in with an identical plan.

More discussion occurred.

Mrs. May: Is there enough room for a fire truck through your drive through area?

Mr. Trasher: We don't think that a fire truck would want to fight fires from this side of the building when they have access to the remaining three sides of the building.

Mr. Ed Fry, Brewerton Fire Department: You would never put a fire engine in a collapse zone, especially a trapped collapse zone which you have here with the retaining wall. I can't imagine any fire chief doing that.

Mr. Smith: When you come back, could you include more landscaping details? You have that greenspace out front. It would be nice to see that area looking nice.

Mr. Marzullo: Along with the typical things needed for site plan approval.

Mr. Trasher agreed. We will try to inject more greenery around the building as well. Do you have any other considerations? I think access is the biggest thing along with the traffic study.

Mr. Parrish: I think access is the issue. Although this might not be generating more traffic in a global point of view, it certainly increases the amount of traffic at that intersection. It is frequently blocked with the stacking, particularly in the morning on Route 31. Getting in and out of the site will not be easy. The restaurants operating there since the Waffleworks have been more of an evening traffic generator.

Mr. Cushman: Your client needs to understand there is a reason why this location has been vacant for so long and a reason why the gas station located next door has been vacant for years. The problem is the traffic at that intersection.

Mr. Trasher: We have a lot of stacking in the proposed site. We will do whatever we can to get a lot of people through the site.

More discussion occurred.

Mr. Purdy: We would also need to know how high the guardrail on the drive through side would be.

Mr. Parrish: It is probably a 6'-8' drop there.

Mr. Purdy: Instead of coming up with a plan for a 6" curb to keep someone from going over, you would need a guardrail.

Mr. Trasher agreed a guardrail would be needed in that area.

**RECOMMENDATION FROM THE ZONING OFFICE
REGARDING PLAN SIZES**

Mr. Marzullo: The Board received an email from Heidi LaLone from the Zoning Office making a recommendation that applicants provide Planning Board members with an 11 x 17 copies of plans instead of the full sized plan.

Mr. Smith: 11 x 17 and a pdf. If they provide us with a pdf you can put it on your computer to view or print. There is no reason to not provide a pdf. Everyone uses them.

The Board agreed.

Mr. Marzullo: Neal, what do we need to do to make a change in the application? Is that something that is done internally in the Zoning Office?

Mr. Germain: Yes.

Mr. Dean: You just change the application. How would you like your copies if an applicant emails us the drawings? I have been trying to get pdf copies for our file.

Mr. Germain: You want to do some type of motion to confirm the change in the application in line with Heidi's suggestion.

Mr. Smith made a motion that the Planning Board makes changes to the application process. The applicants will provide plans in a pdf format that can be forwarded to each Board member in place of forwarding the paper that we already receive. We are making this motion as a green statement to save on paper and trees and to cut down on waste. Those plans should be available for projection at Planning Board meetings for us to proceed. **Mr. Marzullo added** applications should be complete. The Zoning Office, our engineer and our attorney will still receive full sized copies. **Mr. Harris seconded the motion.** The motion was **approved** with the following vote:

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

Mr. Cushman made a motion to adjourn. **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 8:30 P.M.

Dated: March 28, 2010

Tonia Mosley, Clerk

