

The Planning Board of the Town of Cicero held a meeting on **Wednesday, June 2, 2010** at **7:00 p.m.** in the Town Hall at 8236 South Main Street, Cicero, New York 13039.

Agenda:

- Approval of the minutes from the May 17, 2010 meeting **(approved)**
- Major Subdivision Preliminary Plan, Set Public Hearing Date, Cicero Commons, Route 11 & Meltzer Court, Pioneer Companies /L.J.R. Engineering **(Public hearing set for 6/21/10)**
- Site Plan, SEQR, Set Public Hearing Date, Loretto Health & Rehabilitation, Proposed Long Term Care Facilities, Pioneer Companies/L.J.R. Engineering **(Public hearing date set for 6/21/10)**
- Site Plan/Sketch Plan Review, Set Public Hearing Date For Subdivision, Learn As You Grow, 8381 Elta Drive, Proposed Addition, L.J.R. Engineering **(Public hearing date set for 6/21/10)**
- Site Plan, Empower Federal Credit Union, 5791 Route 31, Proposed Modification, Napierala Consulting, P.C. **(Approved)**
- Site Plan, Pathfinder Bank, 6194 Route 31, Proposed Bank and Drive-Thru, Dunn & Sgromo Engineers **(Approved)**
- Site Plan/Sketch Plan Review, Cafua Management Company (Dunkin Donuts), 5865 Route 31, Proposed Site Improvements, CHA **(To return)**
- Sign, Valero, 6190 South Bay Road
- Informal Discussion: Changes to the Code, Establish Committee

Board Members Present: Mark Marzullo (Chairman), Jason Mott, Robert Smith, Richard Cushman and Sharon May

Board Members Absent: William Purdy, Christopher Rowe and Scott Harris (Ad-Hoc Board Member)

Others Present: Wayne Dean (Director of Planning & Development), Neal Germain (Esquire, Germain & Germain), Hon. William Meyer Jr. (Legislator), Mark Parrish (P.E., O'Brien & Gere) Jessica Zambrano (Town Board Liaison) and Tonia Mosley (Clerk)

The meeting was opened with the Pledge of Allegiance.

**APPROVAL OF THE MAY 17, 2010 PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES**

**Mr. Smith made a motion** to approve the May 17, 2010 Planning Board meeting minutes. **Mrs. May seconded the motion.** The motion was **approved** with the following vote:

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

**MAJOR SUBDIVISION PRELIMINARY PLAN, SET PUBLIC HEARING DATE  
CICERO COMMONS, ROUTE 11 & MELTZER COURT  
PIONEER COMPANIES/L.J.R. ENGINEERING**

Representative: Alex Wisniewski, P.E., L.J.R. Engineering

**Mr. Marzullo made a motion** to adopt a resolution calling for a public hearing **June 21, 2010** commencing at **7:00 p.m.** local time, to consider the application of **LORETTO INCORPORATED** for subdivision approval for lands located in part of the PUD known as Cicero Commons, Tax Map Number 093.-01-03.5. **Mr. Smith seconded the motion.** The resolution was **approved** with the following vote:

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

**SITE PLAN, SET PUBLIC HEARING FOR SEQRA  
LORETTO HEALTH & REHABILITATION, PROPOSED LONG TERM CARE FACILITIES  
PIONEER COMPANIES/L.J.R. ENGINEERING**

Representative: Alex Wisniewski, P.E. L.J.R. Engineering

**Mr. Marzullo made a motion** to adopt a resolution calling for a public hearing pursuant to the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) **June 21, 2010**, commencing at **7:01 p.m.** local time to consider issues related to SEQRA involved by the application of **LORETTO INCORPORATED for Subdivision/Site Plan Approval** for lands located in part of the PUD know as Cicero Commons, Tax Map Number 093.-01-03.5. **Mr. Smith seconded the motion.**

The resolution was **approved** with the following vote:

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

**SITE PLAN/SKETCH PLAN REVIEW AND SUBDIVISION  
LEARN AS YOU GROW, 8381 ELTA DRIVE, PROPOSED ADDITION  
L.J.R. ENGINEERING**

Representative: Alex Wisniewski, P.E., L.J.R. Engineering  
Kevin & Cathy LaGrow, Applicants

Mr. Wisniewski introduced himself and the applicants noting that they have been in business for almost three years.

Mr. LaGrow stated that they were a locally owned and operated child care center. We service children from 6 weeks until 12 years of age. We are growing quickly. Our clients have requested more space to allow for more school age children. We also work the North Syracuse School District and their pre-k program. We need space for that also.

We need to move quickly to open by the day after Labor Day.

Mr. Smith asked if paving would be increased.

Mr. LaGrow: At this point we do not intend to do that. We have ample parking and the bus entrance/exit works beautifully. There have not been any traffic issues. But, we have the ability to increase parking, if that was needed. I really don't think that is necessary but if the Board wants it we would add it.

Mr. Smith: It seems like the site is working well and I do not want to give the impression that we would be approving additional parking spaces. We are not looking to add impervious paving/parking unless it was necessary. Run-off is a big problem.

Mr. Cushman: Is the area where the addition would go currently green space?

Mr. LaGrow: It is primarily parking.

Mr. Wisniewski: The plan you are looking at represents existing conditions, the demolition and the proposed 4,000 sq. ft. addition. There are 43 parking spaces and two access points to the site. There is a full access driveway on the circle and an out bound exit for buses only which is located closer to Route 31. From a traffic standpoint, the site works well. The hatched area shows the portion of the parking lot to be demolished for the proposed addition.

The proposed addition would be on the south face of the building and would extend to the east. The LaGrows have a contract with Nate Marra the property owner regarding Lot 1. The intent is to buy approximately one acre of Lot 1 and combine that with their existing lot. There are no proposed access changes. Per the NYSDOT, there will not be an access point to Route 31.

We reconfigured the site parking so that we are not touching the front field. Parking is expanded along the south wall with a greenspace between the drive isle and the building addition. The goal was to keep the current amount of parking spaces, as the owners feel that would be adequate.

We show a possible expansion area, but the LaGrows have no intention of using it now. If the Board wants that taken off the plan, it is not a problem.

Mr. Wisniewski explained how buses move through the site, where employees park, and where children are dropped-off and picked-up. He also discussed the dumpster's location.

Mr. Parrish: Will the new parking area encroach into the access easement?

Mr. Wisniewski: It will encroach into the existing easement. There is a 30' access utility easement which was intended to provide access to Lot 1 under its current configuration of two acres. With the new subdivision, the LaGrow's section becomes a two acre piece, with a residual one acre piece remaining. With the expansion the parking lot needs to shift to slightly to the south. We propose reconfiguring the access easement so that there is a 5' offset on the

LaGrow's piece and a 25' offset on the other.

Mrs. May: Will there be an increase in the children's playground area?

Mr. Wisniewski: That will remain as is. The only proposed change is a double swing gate here that would be used to maintain the playground area.

Mr. Wisniewski detailed the floor plan.

Mr. Parrish: If you put a 24' wide access drive in the easement area, between the edge of the access drive and the new parking area you would have maybe 5-8 feet? You might want to think about completely shifting that to the other lot. A five foot area between two plowed areas does not seem sufficient.

Mr. Wisniewski offered to take that suggestion back to the land owner. He also asked the Board to consider scheduling a public hearing on the 21<sup>st</sup> for the subdivision plan that was submitted.

Mr. Smith: Regarding school buses, will we see a significant number of trips in and out of the facility with the increased number of children?

Mrs. LaGrow: There should not be any more. We currently have a small number of school aged children. The number of buses should not increase. The number of children on those buses should increase.

Mr. Wisniewski: The exterior features would remain the same. There is no additional signage proposed. Site lighting would be consistent to what is already there, but we would re-locate one of the parking area poles and add one more to the rear. The building would have a partial basement for storage.

Mr. Smith: Would you occupy the basement area?

Mr. Wisniewski: No, it would be for storage strictly per State Department of Health regulations.

Drainage from the site would be accommodated by the stormwater facility that runs behind my office. Currently the site has 18 employees. The applicants would be adding 6 more. I request that if the subdivision and site plan applications have not been sent yet to the County, that they be sent. Secondly, I would like the Board to schedule the public hearing for the subdivision on June 21<sup>st</sup>.

**Mr. Marzullo made a motion** for the adoption of a resolution calling for a public hearing on **June 21, 2010** commencing at **7:02 p.m. local time** to consider the application of **Learn As You Grow for subdivision approval**. **Mrs. May seconded the motion**. The resolution was **approved** with the following vote:

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

Mr. Dean noted that the Zoning Office could send the applications to the County by Friday for their June 16<sup>th</sup> meeting. The Planning Board would then receive the County's responses by the Planning Board's next meeting----June 21<sup>st</sup>.

**SITE PLAN, EMPOWER FEDERSL CREDIT UNION  
5791 ROUE 31, PROPOSED MODIFICATION  
NAPIERALA CONSULTING, P.C.**

Representatives: Matt Napierala, P.E. and Neal Zinsmeyer, P.E., Napierala Consulting P.C.  
Gordon Stansbury, P.E., C.T.O. Engineer, GTS Consultants  
Dan Todero, Director of Facilities, Empower Federal Credit Union

The Chairman noted that there was a public hearing at the last meeting and that the public hearing was closed. Since then we have received four letters. The first one was from former Supervisor Joan Kesel that included five items and basically stated that she was in favor of the proposal. The second letter was from Carol Pardee, another person in favor of the proposal.

The third letter was from Jim Napoleon and Associates. He was hired by William Meyer. The letter expressed five comments that Mr. Napoleon wanted the Board to consider and suggested modification and/or denial of the application. I also received a letter from Attorney Robert Ventre, also hired by Mr. Meyer. His letter contained six items that he wanted the Board to consider.

The Planning Board submitted a number of questions to Mark Parrish who forwarded those on to the applicant. I presume that you are ready to address those?

Mr. Napierala: Yes I am. The Board asked us to address drainage, snow storage, etc. Here we show the existing drainage outlay as it is today. We have identified drainage areas according to topography and the existing contributory drainage areas. The lower half of this slide shows the proposed drainage solution. We would be introducing a new dry well at the advice of Mr. Parrish. That is the current drainage solution for the existing site conditions. Therefore we know that it is applicable and could accommodate runoff. The areas-of-runoff would be reduced to areas north of the driveway itself. That new area is just less than 7,000 square feet. The proposal will reduce the rate of runoff, contributory or tributary to the Meyer's property.

The next question dealt with snow storage. The intent would be to have the maintenance staff directed to push snow east and west of the low depression area to minimize snow piles on the north side. Depending upon the amount of snow from a snow storm, there would be a small storage pile area here. There is approximately 10 feet of shoulder width from this north curb line to the proposed evergreen line. We feel that is adequate snow storage. Again, the primary snow storage would be directed to these spaces here east and west of the low depression area. We would be able to accommodate the snow without impacting sight lines as well.

More discussion occurred.

The next item of concern was for car lights and their impacts on the Meyer's property. We have proposed a row of evergreen trees to screen/block those lights. We would rather include a vegetative cover rather than some sort of structure. We would plant something that is 3-4 feet high to block headlights.

Mr. Cushman: Have you had any communication with the strip mall regarding the driveway?

Mr. Napierala: Earlier, there were several correspondences/discussions with them regarding the right of access as a part of the DOT's requirements---allowing the access point here and the future easement and access here. We are willing to provide that. The easement right to the north will be there but it will not be paved at this time.

Mr. Cushman: The strip mall has been there for sometime. We know that they push snow on Dr. Black's property, the Condon property and the driveway area. If the strip mall was a party to this action, we could get a chance to address that. As you know, this area is completely paved.

Mr. Napierala: Unfortunately, they are not a party to our action. I believe that both parties have a shared easement.

Mr. Marzullo: One of the points that Mr. Ventre asked about in his letter was if there was an agreement for snow removal with the strip mall.

Mr. Napierala: This is the first time that question has come up in our discussions. We are still in the proposal stages for easements/agreements. We are waiting for approvals and then the final legal descriptions will be prepared.

Mr. Germain: One of the things that the Board requires is cross access easements to various neighbors.

Mr. Marzullo: Mr. Ventre's question was about the maintenance of the proposed driveway, in particular snow removal. Could that be covered in the easement agreement?

Mr. Germain: Could it be? Yes, if you had agreement from the party who owns the strip mall.

Mr. Marzullo: Empower plans on maintaining it, correct?

Mr. Napierala: Our driveway? Yes, Empower would maintain our driveway.

Mr. Marzullo: As a Board we want to make sure that the strip mall has access to the driveway.

Mr. Germain: That would be part of the access agreement. You can cover what is on the application and what the applicant is trying to address. The Board can ask the applicant to have cross access agreements with their neighbors and to maintain those easements.

Mr. Marzullo: The proposed action would improve the strip mall's traffic as well. We want to make sure that the drive is plowed so that the mall can continue to use it during the winter months.

Mr. Germain: If the Board would require final approval of those cross access easement agreements. They would be subject to legal review. One of the things we would look at is the maintenance of those easements.

Mr. Napierala: We don't have a problem with that. The next question was in regards to a guardrail system along the northerly edge of the proposed driveway. We looked at DOT documents regarding roadside protection for guidance and determined that a guardrail system is not warranted or needed on this site. Safety always comes first, but we are trying to balance that with aesthetics at the same time.

I am going to ask Mr. Dean for his response to the next question---the separation distance from the driveway to the signalized intersection.

Mr. Dean: If the edges of the property are extended, you have 189' from the point of intersection of the street lines to the center line of the driveway. I reviewed some of the old variances, but it was not clear how those were measured. I feel comfortable with the driveway where it is. I do not feel a variance is required.

Mr. Smith: This is consistent with what you have done in the past for measuring?

Mr. Dean: Yes.

Mr. Marzullo: It is well over the 150' required by the Town.

Mr. Napierala: The next question dealt with moving the driveway further south. There were some proximity issue between the proposed driveway and Mr. Meyer's driveway. Since the

last meeting we have had further discussions with the DOT. Our first goal is safety for the traveling public. We want to have as much stacking room as we can for the intersection. This location is the best that we can do. The DOT has approved it. They feel pushing the drive as far north as possible is the best solution for the site.

Mr. Smith: How much distance would there be between your proposed driveway and the adjacent property?

Mr. Marzullo: About 12-13 feet?

Mr. Napierala agreed. The DOT requested that a paper easement be established. The last question from the Board was in regards to wetlands. Terrestrial Environmental walked the site. Mr. Bernie Kar of TES rendered an opinion. His opinion is that there are no jurisdictional wetlands on the subject site. I believe that answers the Board's questions. Our team is here to answer any other questions that you might have. We hope that the Board agrees that our solution, although it is not perfect, is the best possible solution for the traveling public.

The Chairman asked the Board and their professionals if they had any more questions and/or input.

Mr. Parrish: I think they have done what was suggested relative to drainage to minimize or reduce the impacts as much as possible. I think that there are still some open issues relative to easements but I am sure the attorney can take care of those to make sure that they are proper and get in place.

Mr. Smith: We have focused on the traffic. We have focused on drainage. The general consensus seems to be that both are improved. As a Board we also have to consider land use. That parcel of land is not suitable for residential use. It is also not big enough for a lot of commercial uses. The parcel would be combined with another commercial piece. From a land use point, it is an improvement. **I make a motion** for the adoption of a resolution that the application of **Empower Federal Credit Union** for a **Site Plan** is an unlisted action with a completed EAF and involves no other permit granting agency outside of the Town. The proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment and therefore does not require the preparation of an EIS. **Mrs. May seconded the motion.**

The resolution was **approved** with the following vote:

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

**Mr. Smith made a motion** for the adoption of a resolution approving the application of **Empower Federal Credit Union** for a **Site Plan** with a last revised date of May 28, 2010. Said approval is conditioned upon the applicant granting cross access easements to run in favor of the adjoining property owners to the north and to the east of the applicant's property. This approval is also subject to the approval of the Planning Board attorney of said cross access agreements as to form and content before recording as well as satisfactory proof of recording with the County Clerk after approval is granted. Mr. Germain noted these lots are to be consolidated as a condition for approval. **Mrs. May seconded the motion.** The resolution was **approved** with the following vote:

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

Mr. Marzullo: Motion carried. Neal, I want to ask that when you review the easement agreements that maintenance is discussed.

Mr. Germain: I understand.

**SITE PLAN, PATHFINDER BANK  
6194 ROUTE 31, PROPOSED BANK WITH DRIVE-THRU  
DUNN & SGROMO ENGINEERS**

Representative: Greg Sgromo, P.E., Dunn & Sgromo Engineers  
Tom Snyder, President and CEO, Pathfinder Bank  
Ed Murvine, Esquire

Mr. Sgromo: We have submitted the information that the Board requested at the last meeting. I noted the changes to the by-pass lane in the back and the addition of five parking spaces. We have also changed from an above ground detention basin to a below ground detention basin. I am here tonight to answer any questions that the Board might have.

Mr. Cushman: What is the reason for that change?

Mr. Sgromo: We added a by-pass lane. We also noted the neighbor's concerns about an above ground detention basin, and keeping as many trees as possible.

Mr. Parrish: I was able to review the plan and am satisfied with it.

Mr. Smith: Are there any changes to the building's façade?

Mr. Sgromo: Those photos still reflect what we are planning.

Mr. Smith: What about the sign out front?

Mr. Snyder: Traditionally this graphics board would contain scrolling marketing messages and perhaps community event messages.

Mr. Smith: Would you agree to use the message board for Amber Alerts?

Mr. Snyder: Yes. The sign package is exactly the same as presented before.

Mr. Cushman: In the past we have had concerns about scrolling signs. We do not want people driving down the road to be distracted by trying to read a scrolling message.

Mr. Dean: The code does not allow scrolling signs.

Mr. Parrish: I think that the Board typically allows sign changes no more than every 15 seconds.

Mr. Marzullo: Was a cross access agreement discussed with the property to the west, the gas station?

Mr. Parrish: Not with the property to the west, but there was to the east.

Mr. Murvine: As you can see the Union's property to the east has an access point to Route 31 as well, which is also directly across the street from the mall. We have been in negotiations with them. I received a call that at their meeting last week they voted to allow the closure of their entrance to Route 31, and to take an access easement from us. We don't have the actual documentation yet, but that issue has been resolved.

More discussion occurred about access to the gas station and access via the former Bragman property.

Mr. Parrish: I think that things are consistent with the previous plan. We had some comments about drainage, but again, this is not making it any worse. There is a low lying area in the back of this property that will remain. They have added a ditch there to try to drain it as best as they can. And they are not adding anymore water to it. Lighting is also the same as the previous plan.

**Mr. Smith made a motion** for the adoption of a resolution that the application of **Pathfinder** for a **Site Plan** is an unlisted action with a completed EAF and involves no other permit granting agency outside of the Town. The proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment and therefore does not require the preparation of an EIS. **Mr. Marzullo seconded the motion.** The resolution was **approved** with the following vote:

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

**Mr. Smith made a motion** for the adoption of a resolution approving the application of **Pathfinder** for a **Site Plan** as proposed with a last revised date of May 26, 2010. Given the drainage issues of the site said approval is conditioned upon satisfactory site inspection by the Planning Board engineer to determine substantial compliance with the proposed site plan prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy by the Town. There would be an additional fee

that has been approved by the Town Board which would have to be paid by the applicant.

**Mrs. May seconded the motion.** The resolution was **approved** with the following vote:

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

**SITE PLAN/SKETCH PLAN REVIEW**  
**CAFUA MANAGEMENT COMPANY (DUNKIN DONUTS)**  
**5865 ROUTE 31, PROPOSED DRIVE THRU & SITE IMPROVEMENTS**  
**CHA**

Representative: Brian Bouchard, CHA

Mr. Bouchard distributed handouts to the Board and introduced himself. He gave a brief review of the site and its location. The site is currently zoned General Commercial and was occupied by a similar restaurant use.

This site plan is similar to the one we discussed at the work session. As you enter the site via the existing access drive, there are two entrances to the parking area. Some improvements would be made to the curbing in the parking area to establish the 22' required by code. There is a one lane drive thru loop at the back of the property. We have reduced the width of that lane to 12'. The drive thru has a significant length. Reducing it to a 12' width reduces the amount of pavement needed for construction considerably. There is a short stretch of drive thru lane that would be 11' wide along this property line here. That would provide for the retaining wall.

Mr. Smith: The only escape route for cars from your drive thru lane would be this area here?

Mr. Bouchard: Correct. Dunkin Donuts wanted to show five cars in queue between the menu board and the drive thru window.

Mr. Smith: It looks like your drive thru lane would hold close to nine cars. So if there was an emergency in car #8, they would be stuck in line?

Mr. Bouchard: Correct.

More discussion occurred.

Mr. Bouchard: Again, the pavement at the end of the islands because the existing conditions do not allow for your required 22' drive width. So we are pushing that curbing up to bring the site into compliance.

Mrs. May: The area between the two green spaces here---will that be green or paved?

Mr. Bouchard: It currently exists as paved. The plan is to leave it as paved.

Mrs. May noted cars would be cutting across that area to get to the drive thru window quicker. That is a safety hazard.

Mr. Bouchard agreed but noted one objective of the project is to minimize the efforts needed to bring the site into compliance. If the Board would like, we could investigate closing off one of the three existing access points to the parking area. The building is wrapped on three sides by retaining walls. Unfortunately, there would not be much of an opportunity to park cars up against that without bringing in almost 4' of fill.

Mr. Smith: In the interest of consistency, in the past we have approved a drive thru with a 15' minimum pass thru area. We have almost never approved a drive with this much stacking area, without one. How would that work with this building being so close to adjoining properties? What about setbacks?

More discussion occurred.

Mr. Smith suggested approving the site without a drive thru portion. He noted that it would be hard for him to approve this site plan unless changes were done to make the drive thru consistent with others approved by the Planning Board.

Mr. Bouchard discussed the landscaping plan.

Mr. Parrish: This is an existing site and I understand the desire to minimize the amount of work that needs to be done to utilize the area. But, it is chopped up by the existing islands. The drive closest to Route 31 could be made into a one way drive. That way you would not have traffic crossing close to Route 31. There is no greenspace towards the front, but you could do something there to make traffic flow better. You need to look at where the loading spaces would go and how they would work. I think that there is a lot that could be done to make the site better than it currently is.

The Board asked Mr. Bouchard to go back and re-work the site.

#### **SIGNS: VALERO, 6190 SOUTH BAY ROAD**

Mr. Dean noted the applicant would not be here tonight. They applied for a sign with a reader board on it.

Mr. Marzullo: What about the dumpsters?

Mr. Dean: I have not talked to him about that yet, but I will. Am I correct in saying that is an issue with the Board and that he should come in for site plan approval?

Mr. Marzullo: We have applicants put dumpsters behind shielded fences. He has them all over the lot and I don't think that was a part of site plan approval.

#### **INFORMAL DISCUSSIONS: CHANGES TO THE CODE, ESTABLISH COMMITTEE**

Mr. Marzullo: We have had some discussions about making some updates to the code relative to things like parking, lighting, cross connections, cross accesses, etc. We have formed a committee made up of two Town Board members---Jessica Zambrano and Vern Conway along with Bob Smith, Wayne Dean and me. If anyone is interested we would like to have one more Planning Board member.

Mr. Smith: The first issues we would be looking at are lighting and parking.

Mr. Marzullo: The Town cannot afford to do a complete overhaul within one year. So, we want to piecemeal it, taking to the Town Board what we feel are the most important issues. Then we could get some money into the budget for next year.

Mr. Smith suggested saving costs by going on line to review what other Towns already have for codes.

Mr. Marzullo: If there is another Board member that is interested in joining, please let me know. With that, **I make a motion** to adjourn. **Mr. Mott 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: June 14, 2010

-----  
Tonia Mosley, Clerk

