



- Consider Request for a ninety-day Extension of Conditional Site Development Plan Approval from January 18, 2011 to April 18, 2011 per Written Request.

Cynthia states that Peach Lake Commons has submitted a written request for a ninety-day extension of their Conditional Site Development Plan Approval. Their request was not timely due to the fact that they were working with the Town Board regarding a fee issue. They had to appear on a Town Board Agenda prior to a Planning Board Agenda. Cynthia states that a correction will be made on the Draft Agenda. The Extension will run from January 18, 2011 to April 18, 2011 instead of May 18, 2011.

**Chairwoman motions that the Planning Board Grant a Six-Month Extension of the Conditional Site Development Plan Approval for Peach Lake Commons from January 18, 2011 to April 18, 2011. Charlotte Harris seconds. All in favor. No opposed.**

**4. Crown Atlantic Co., LLC: Keith Betensky (owner – Croton Falls Fire District)  
Conditional Use Permit/Site Dev. Plan (location – Sun Valley Drive)**

- Consider Draft Resolution of Approval.

Cynthia states the Board has a Draft Resolution of Approval to consider tonight which may be a little premature. The Draft will help us pull all of the issues together. Cynthia states she would like the Board to discuss the few outstanding items to see if whether or not they may be resolved and perhaps move forward.

Cynthia states that first we will discuss the MDRA Completeness Review Memo which points out the issues with the Annual Reports that are supposed to be submitted.

Keith Betensky states he is here tonight from Snyder & Snyder on behalf of the Applicant.

Referring to the Memo, Cynthia states that it mentions that the annual testing is not what we require for our files. Cynthia states that the Board and Building Inspector received a cover letter and reports in May, 2010. Cynthia refers to a letter from Site Safe dated May 19, 2010, in which there is a reference to a Report dated November 10, 2003 and states the problem with this letter is that it states that everything is fine, and since no additional antennas have been added to the communications tower, the results find the tower in compliance. Cynthia would like to know why this individual does not know that antennas were added. Reviews should have taken place in 2004 when new antennas were added, and again in 2007 when they were changed. Cynthia states there is a lack of communication going on here. Cynthia asks Mr. Betensky if he would submit an up to date complete Report which reflects all of the users on the tower. Mr. Betensky states that the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) regulates radio frequency emissions strictly. All of the carriers and operators on the tower have a license from the FCC and are required to operate within certain parameters. Mr. Betensky states that the Report they submitted included all of the antennas on the tower. Mr. Betensky talks about submitting additional clarification documentation if needed. Mr. Betensky talks about the Board conditioning its approval upon the submittal of a Report based on the actual readings for the antennas as they exist on the tower today. Cynthia states that this information has been requested since day one.

Sonja refers to the Report dated November 14, 2003 and states that it was prepared in regards to the AT&T service provider. Sonja states it is surprising, because that Approval did not take place until September 15, 2004. Sonja does not understand how a Report may be prepared prior to an Approval. Mr. Betensky states that most carriers have site designs done prior an Approval when initial Plans are submitted. With AT&T there were twelve antennas initially approved, and they are only using a small fraction of those. Mr. Betensky

states that the Report that was done assumed that there were twelve antennas. The new Report will have a lower emissions level. Sonja inquires whether these Reports should be based on actual measurements, and not theoretical calculations. Mr. Betensky states that the Report will include both. The calculations are typically much more conservative than the readings. In reality, not all of the antennas are operating at 100% capacity 100% of the time. The calculations will assume the worst case. Cynthia states that information is what the Board would like to see. Cynthia refers to the Structural Reports and states that the Board only has cover letters without the backup. These Reports should also be forwarded to the Town Engineer. He will be requested to sign off on at least the initial Report. Mr. Betensky states the structural integrity of the tower is strictly regulated by the New York State Building Code. It recently received a Certificate of Compliance in 2008. If the Board would like an additional structural certification, we will do that as a Condition of Approval. Cynthia asks if this information went directly to the Building Inspector in 2008, as the Planning Board did not receive a copy. Mr. Betensky states that usually it is done in context with the Building Permit. Cynthia asks for the updated information to be resubmitted along with the back-up. Cynthia would like the file to show that for the 2010 renewal all of the ducks were in order.

Referring to the Draft Resolution, Cynthia states the only issue that remains is in relation to the road. Cynthia states that the Town Attorney could not be here tonight. She has been working with him on trying to come up with a way to resolve the issue regarding the lower part of the road being so difficult. There are ATV's tearing up the road when crossing. Cynthia states that we know the maintenance has been done, as well as an inspection passed. There is a maintenance program in place. Cynthia states that when a Site Inspection took place with the Building Inspector, Engineer, as well as representatives from Crown, there was a discussion about paving the bottom section of the road, which would solve the maintenance problems. That is the fall back position to keep this road from falling apart. Language has been built into the Draft for the potential recommendation from the Building Inspector to have the bottom section of the road paved depending on the outcome of his inspections. One of the suggestions from the Town Attorney was to request a Performance Bond from Crown Atlantic so that if there is failure with the maintenance, there would be a Performance Bond in place. Cynthia states that the requirement of a Performance Bond for the lower portion of the road is a condition that the Town Attorney recommended be added into this Draft. Cynthia states that one option would be to have the client pave now. Mr. Betensky states that it is his understanding that representatives from Crown met at the Site with the Building Inspector and received a scope of work, which did not include paving or it would have been done. Cynthia states that paving was not in the scope of work, but everyone at the Site Inspection agreed that the easier route would be to go ahead and pave it. Cynthia reminded the representatives that would be part of the Site Plan and would need to be discussed at a Meeting. We were trying to move the renewal forward. Cynthia talks about the Board moving this item forward with the condition of a Performance Bond in place. The Building Inspector will be making Reports from his visits during the next year. Cynthia states that she believes that is the only remaining issue, other than the receipt of the requested Reports being the Emissions and Structural. Mr. Betensky states that the only issue regarding the paving is that it is speculative. We do not know if the Building Inspector is going to make that requirement. So far he hasn't because he has determined it is not necessary. Mr. Betensky again states that paving was not in the scope of work. Mr. Betensky does not want to hold up the renewal request. Mr. Betensky states that the Town Code is very clear that if there is no change with respect to the facility, the renewal shall be granted without any review. Mr. Betensky states that at this point they have been very courteous and responded to all of the comments. They have submitted a thick amount of documentation with multiple Reports. They have bent over backwards to provide the Board everything they wanted. At this point, we would like to move forward and have the renewal granted. If the Board wants a condition of approval to be the submittal of the Structural Reports and FCC Compliance Reports, we have no objection. Cynthia states that the Resolution will be worded in such a way that if the Board approves it tonight, she will not sign the Resolution until the condition of the submittal of the two reports has been met. Cynthia states the other question is to whether the Board would like to follow the recommendation of the Town Attorney and ask for a Performance Bond. Cynthia states another condition will be a Removal Bond. Cynthia states she received a

phone call from the Town Engineer today. While the additional information provided by the Applicant was not completely what he was hoping to receive, he stated to her that he would send over a recommendation that the amount is sufficient. Cynthia states that she will not sign the Resolution until the Removal Bond process moves through the Town Board and comes back to the Planning Board. Cynthia states that if the Board moves the Resolution tonight there are several issues that would hold the Applicant up. By her not signing, that would place a hold on the Applicant to make sure these items are fulfilled. Sonja states that she understood that the scope of work from the Building Inspector was in reference to what was approved on the Plans. When a meeting was held in the field for the final check after the work was complete, the maintenance was done according to the scope. However everyone including the Building Inspector and representative from Crown agreed that the work had been done, but it would not last. Cynthia states that under the Site Plan Approval the client has to keep the road maintained. They may try to keep the road maintained this year and then go back to the Building Inspector because paving would make the maintenance a lot easier. Cynthia states that the Applicant would not have to come back before the Planning Board unless there is the need for a field change. The Planning Board has given the Building Inspector authorization through the inspections. The Board is trying to move this forward. If we start to knock heads and this becomes a huge headache for the Building Inspector because the Site Plan fails, there may be a condition that if the Site Plan fails, the renewal fails. The Board has to protect the Town because there is a history here. The client has a history of not keeping up with the maintenance of the road. We are all trying to work together so this is not a Site Plan issue.

Mr. Betensky states that the road is really a gravel driveway that is used for access to the facility. Mr. Betensky states that Drew Outhouse from the Fire Department has indicated they have had no issues accessing the facility. Crown is not aware of any issues with respect to the carriers accessing the facility. Mr. Betensky refers to the illegal use by trespassers on the ATV's and states that Crown has installed boulders to address that issue. Cynthia states that boulders have only been installed at the top portion of the road. Cynthia states an issue with not being able to keep the ATV's off the lower part. The issue is that when the road fails the materials come down onto the public road which causes an icing hazard to two of the neighbors. Cynthia states that this now becomes a problem for the Town as the Town has to maintain the client's Site Plan failure. Mr. Betensky states that Crown has worked to crown the road and clear out the swales in accordance with the scope of work. Cynthia states they had to do this a couple of years ago and may have to do it every spring and fall. Mr. Betensky refers to the bi-annual inspections documented in the Resolution. Mr. Betensky states that the way the Resolution is worded now, if the Building Inspector requires the paving, we will not have to come back before this Board. If the Building Inspector requires something that is not done, he is the Code Enforcement officer who has the ability to issue violations.

Gary states that the Applicant should put the Performance Bond in. Mr. Betensky asks how much would the Performance Bond would be. Cynthia states that the Applicant will be asked to have their Engineer submit a number for which our Engineer would sign off on. Cynthia would like to hear what the rest of the Board has to say. Gary states that it is simple, the Applicant submits a Performance Bond, or paves. Robert agrees with Gary. Cynthia states that another condition will be added that a Performance Bond be required for the maintenance of the lower portion of the road. If the Board moved this Resolution tonight, that would be a condition prior to the signing of the Resolution. Sonja asks if this Performance Bond will be for maintenance, or paving. Cynthia states both. The Performance Bond is better because it will require the Applicant to pave. Gary asks what happens if they don't pave. Cynthia states that the Town will use the Performance Bond to pay for it. Gary asks if Bruce has demanded the paving of the road. Cynthia states he has had very strong recommendations. Gary asks then why would we want a Performance Bond. Cynthia states that if over 2011, the road fails during the spring, and it takes the Applicant long to fix it, it may happen again in the fall. Bruce would be able to request the paving. There is a lot of time and money associated with Bruce going out for these inspections. Bruce can ask for paving, but what if they don't pave it? If there was a Performance Bond in place and the paving does not take place, the Town would access the Bond. Gary states that the Board

would want both a Performance and a Maintenance Bond. Cynthia states no. The maintenance schedule is set up as part of the Resolution. Gary asks what if the Applicant does not maintain the road. Cynthia states that Bruce would issue a violation. Cynthia states that a Maintenance Bond means that the Town goes out and does the maintenance and charges the Applicant. There is a discussion about asking for both Bonds. Cynthia states that normally when a new road goes in, a Performance Bond is taken out to make sure the road is built to full specifications. When it is built to full specifications a Maintenance Bond is taken out to make sure it is maintained properly. Cynthia states that in this case the road is already built to specifications. Cynthia states that if we only take out a Maintenance Bond the road will not be paved unless the Applicant agrees with the Building Inspector that it should be paved. If we take out a Performance Bond the road will not be paved unless Bruce states it must be paved and the Applicant fails to pave it. Charlotte asks how long the Performance Bond is in effect. Cynthia states for the length of the Permit. In this case it would be ten years. Gary states that we are making the Applicant agree to perform something we haven't asked them to perform. Cynthia states it is a fall-back position for security. Cynthia states that Bruce did ask for the paving in the field. He did not require it because he was inspecting the Site Plan that stated the road to be gravel. Cynthia states she is trying to protect the Town. How long should we tolerate failures?

Mr. Betensky states that the Permit is conditioned on many different facets including the maintenance of the road. On top of that the Board is adding a new condition which was not there before regarding the bi-annual inspections take place. On top of that we have given Bruce a contact number for Crown which has someone available 24 hours a day 7 days a week in case there are any issues regarding icing. There are procedures in place. Also, Bruce is the Code Enforcement Officer. Mr. Betensky does not think a Bond is an appropriate tool for this type of situation. We don't even know that Bruce is going to require paving of the driveway. Cynthia states that all of this will depend on how diligent the Applicant is on maintaining the road. It might require monthly maintenance. Bruce is not supposed to have to pick up the phone because he has a complaint from a neighbor who has icing due to a washout from the access road. The Applicant is supposed to make sure the road is maintained in accordance with the Site Plan. Bruce may say that the first time the road fails, that is it, and he issues a violation. The violation may nullify the Special Permit. Cynthia states the Board is trying to work with the Applicant. Cynthia states that the Board may have to hold this over until they have an opportunity to have both Bruce and the Town Attorney here, or move forward with language that will best protect the Town. Cynthia talks about the suggestion from Roland regarding a Performance Bond for the paving. A Maintenance Bond may also be imposed. Cynthia understands the Board may put as many conditions as they want on a Special Permit. Bernard feels the Board should wait until the Town Attorney tells them exactly which way to go. Cynthia states she met with the Town Attorney last night and he suggested the Performance Bond. Cynthia did not bring up the idea of using both Bonds. Charlotte suggests having a window of time for the Performance Bond and states that ten years is a long time. Cynthia likes that suggestion. Charlotte states that we may know after a year or two whether the road needs to be paved. Mr. Betensky states that makes sense. Cynthia likes the idea of having a Performance Bond for a short period of time and states that hopefully the client will demonstrate they are staying on top of the maintenance. Cynthia states that the next step would be a violation. Mr. Betensky states that the duration could be subject to Bruce's determination as well as a recommendation by the Town Engineer.

Cynthia states the Resolution will be modified to add in a condition for a Performance Bond. The client's engineer will submit a recommendation for our Engineer to review. Cynthia states the Performance Bond will be in place for two years unless an alternate date is provided by the Building Inspector. Cynthia states that we could make it a final condition that the Chair and Secretary will be authorized to sign this Resolution once Item 6, regarding the submittal of the Reports/Certificates, Item 3 concerning the Removal Bond, as well as adding a new Item 8 regarding the Performance Bond have been made.

**Robert motions that the Planning Board Grant an Approval of the Draft Resolution of Permit Renewal, Conditional Use and Final Site Development Plan as Amended, for Crown Atlantic Company, LLC.**

**Charlotte Seconds. All in favor. No opposed.**

5. **Total Energy:** Tim Allen (owner – Robert Armentano)  
**Amended Site Development Plan** (location – 2 Hardscrabble Road)

- Consider Completeness of Application.

Cynthia states that Tim Allen is here tonight. We are trying to move forward in order for this Application to be considered complete. Cynthia states a review Memo from Sonja Teichmann at MDRA dated February 8<sup>th</sup> has been circulated. In the memo Sonja lists corrections and clarifications she would like to see. Mr. Allen states that he and Bruce Thompson have discussed the property setbacks, as well as what has occurred at the Site over the past few years. Mr. Allen states his client is looking to have a total clean slate on this property. Mr. Allen refers to the Plan highlighted in red which shows the front yard setback. Mr. Allen refers to a building in the front of the property that was constructed with a 15 yard setback. Mr. Allen states that when Dan Betterton issued the Building Permit back in 1985, he considered the setback to be 15 yards. Mr. Allen states that Bruce has been consistent over the years with calling the road frontage, as well as a DOT right-of-way which has a 30 foot setback. Mr. Allen talks about the Planning Board referring his client to the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA), regarding variances for Building A which is under reconstruction, as well as the parking lot. Mr. Allen states that Bruce has strongly recommended the ZBA approve the variances. Mr. Allen states he would make the argument the area is existing non-conforming. Cynthia states that the setbacks under the old Zoning Code need to be looked at. Cynthia states it was 15 for the business use, but the residential was 30. Cynthia states this was an oversight and does not believe the Board would have a problem referring the Applicant to the ZBA. Cynthia refers to the parking lot. Mr. Allen states that they will need a variance for the parking lot. Cynthia asks Mr. Allen if his client honestly needs all of the parking spaces. Mr. Allen states yes. Mr. Allen shows the various buildings and states his client is adamant about the parking spaces. Cynthia asks if the Applicant knows the parking is only for office workers, and parking of trucks and commercial vehicles is not allowed. Mr. Allen states that his client would not do that. Mr. Allen states that the only truck that may come through would be a Federal Express truck. Cynthia states the Town Code does not allow parking to intrude into yards because that is where the buffers and plantings would be located. Mr. Allen states that Bruce has told him that the intrusion is towards the DOT right-of-way. Cynthia talks with Mr. Allen about adding screening and buffering to make the variance request reasonable. Cynthia states that from the lower road vehicles may be seen parked in the lot towards the edge. Mr. Allen states vehicles may barely be seen. Mr. Allen states that they are cutting an area back, so there will be space for a buffer. Cynthia states that it will help with the variance request to demonstrate that some screening and plant buffering will take place. Cynthia states she does not know whether the Planning Board will recommend the variances. Mr. Allen states the area sits approximately 30 or 40 feet above the road. Cynthia asks Mr. Allen if there is any other way to configure the amount of parking spaces. Mr. Allen states they could, but it would require more disturbance. Cynthia states that the ZBA may put the Applicant through tests in order to confirm if there is a way to alleviate the amount of spaces and redesign the parking. Mr. Allen states that would require parking be shifted which would cause more of an impact. We would like to leave what is there alone. Sonja states the Building Inspector would also consider the set back to be a front yard setback. Sonja states she is talking about south of the residential property and shows Mr. Allen the area she is referring to on the Plan. Mr. Allen states he will go through all of this with Bruce. Cynthia states she did. Mr. Allen states that Bruce told him that he considers anything that fronts a road, a front yard setback. The rear yard setback is discussed. Cynthia states it fronts the rear of the neighbor and is parallel to the road therefore Bruce calls it a front yard setback. Cynthia states the rear and front yard setbacks are the same size so it doesn't make any difference. Cynthia states that the Applicant does have a good argument about why the parking should stay where it is, such as it is better for the neighbors. There is a discussion about the parking to the left where the two offices are. Cynthia states that at one point there were 12 spaces. Mr. Allen states the new Plan has 9, so 3 spaces have been lost. Cynthia talks about the possibility of shifting parking spaces from one area to another to alleviate

the intrusion on the yard. Robert and Charlotte are fine with the parking.

Referring to the MDRA memo, Cynthia refers to the location map on the Plan and states the R1/2 should be R1. Cynthia asks Mr. Allen if he has any further questions. Mr. Allen states that they have questions regarding the signage and may need to talk with the ZBA about it. Mr. Allen talks about a proposal to install a placard in the stone wall which lists the address. Cynthia confirms with Mr. Allen that in addition, a larger sign is being proposed which will be tucked in back from the road. Mr. Allen states the placard will meet the setbacks and zoning requirements. Cynthia asks Mr. Allen if it is being considered as an E911 address sign. Cynthia asks Mr. Allen to show the Board what he is proposing. Cynthia states that the Applicant may be entitled to a placard that has 2 Hardscrabble Road on it. If the name of the company will be on it, that would be considered a second sign which would require a variance. Cynthia confirms the placard will be embedded into the stone wall. Cynthia refers to the free-standing sign and states it is nice looking and looks like the neighbors sign. The neighbors sign is five feet tall. Mr. Allen is proposing a ten foot tall sign. Cynthia asks why the sign has to be so tall. Mr. Allen states a concern with individuals missing the property as they are driving by. The Board requests Mr. Allen erect a post in the center of the proposed sign at ten feet high for them to see prior to the Public Hearing. Cynthia states Mr. Allen should talk with the Building Inspector about his interpretation of the second sign on the stone wall.

Mr. Allen talks about the addition of landscaping. Cynthia refers to the flood lights and states that they have not been on a previous Plan, so they will be treated as new. Cynthia asks Mr. Allen to show the Board the details so they know the lighting is downward. There is a discussion about sensors. Mr. Allen states they are not proposing any new lights. He is not sure if the lights are on timers. Mr. Allen states that to obtain numbers for lights that are existing is very difficult. He will make all assurances that the lights are downward. The Board would like to know if the lights are on sensors. Cynthia will take a look at the lights at night. The Board would like to know the amount of illumination.

Mr. Allen states he will clean up the EAF.

There is discussion about the Board drafting a letter to the ZBA for their consideration. Mr. Allen refers to a side yard setback of ten feet that they are encroaching upon. Mr. Allen states they will pull spaces back so the area will be out of the setback.

Cynthia asks Mr. Allen how quickly he will be able to turn this all around. Cynthia asks Mr. Allen what his target date is for getting on a ZBA Agenda. Mr. Allen states the ZBA meets in March. He is hoping to get on that Agenda. Mr. Allen states that the Plan does not require a lot of revisions except the zoning lines need to be changed and plantings added. Cynthia asks if there are trees around the parking lot. Mr. Allen states the whole hillside is trees. Cynthia asks if there is a grass or lawn area. The DOT property is discussed. Mr. Allen states the parking now goes onto the DOT property. Cynthia asks Mr. Allen if towards the Daros property and the other neighbor if there is only lawn and not trees. Mr. Allen states there are a few trees, but for the most part it is all lawn. Cynthia states we are treating this as if it is a new parking lot and perhaps we will need buffering and protection from the neighbors especially if this is going to be a very viable office building. There is a discussion about headlights being directed towards the two homes. Cynthia states the yard is supposed to be treated as a buffer. There is a discussion about landscaping. Mr. Allen will take a look at that.

Cynthia states that for the Applicant to go to the ZBA, the Planning Board may need to start the SEQOR, and declare themselves as lead agency, but not close the Public Hearings until the ZBA votes. Mr. Allen does not believe this will be a coordinated action, it will be Type II. The Board talks about setting a Public Hearing. Mr. Allen states that as a Type II, each agency would make their own determination. Mr. Allen is comfortable with going to the ZBA for their approval and then coming back before the Planning Board to have the Public Hearing set. Mr. Allen would like to meet with Bruce regarding the setbacks. Mr. Allen will need a

recommendation from the Planning Board to the ZBA. Cynthia states we are talking about variances for the parking, pre-existing addition, and potential second sign. Cynthia asks the Board how they feel about recommending a variance for a second sign. They agree. The Board agrees regarding the pre-existing addition. The Board agrees regarding the parking, contingent upon the requested buffering. Cynthia will prepare a letter referring the Applicant to the ZBA.

Sonja asks Mr. Allen to make sure that what ever part is covered by the proposed action is shown on the Site Plan and only the items that are not part of the proposed action should be part of the existing Plan. Mr. Allen states that he and Cynthia have gone back and forth about this going back to the 1980 Plan. Mr. Allen states he has tried to show what is proposed as best as he could. He does not know if the lights were there in 1980. Cynthia states it is not whether the lights were there, it is whether or not they showed up on an Approved Site Plan.

Mr. Allen states the shed is being moved to the front and will meet the setbacks.

Cynthia states the Applicant has done a beautiful job with the property on the left. Cynthia states Mr. Allen should take a good look at how to buffer the neighbors from the headlights.

**6. Monomoy Farm: (owner – Steven Rattner)**  
**Wetland Permit (location 806 Peach Lake Road – Route 121)**

- Consider Request for a two ninety-day Extension of Wetland Permit Approval from October 4, 2010 to December 31, 2010, a well as January 1, 2011 to March 30, 2011 per Written Request.

Cynthia states she has been working with Monomoy Farm in regards to their DEC and other Permits. It came to light that the mylars that have been sitting on her desk cannot be signed without an extension. Cynthia hopes the Board does not have a problem with the extensions after the fact. Cynthia states this has not been sitting on a shelf.

**Chairwoman motions that the Planning Board Grant two Ninety-day Extensions of the Wetland Permit Approval from October 4, 2010 to December 31, 2010, as well as January 1, 2011 to March 30, 2011 for Monomoy Farm, LLC. Robert Tompkins seconds. All in favor. No opposed.**

After the motion, Cynthia states that she does not know if the Applicant is going to make the March 30, 2011 extension date in which case they will need to start over. Cynthia states that for the Dubin Wetlands Project the Army Corp. of Engineers Permit came in conjunction with the DEC Permit. All of the paperwork flowed from the DEC to the Army Corp. of Engineers. The DEC has changed their regulations. The DEC no longer includes the Army Corp. in with their Permits. Cynthia states that it may not be necessary for Monomoy Farm to obtain a Permit from the Army Corp. Charlotte states that the Applicant is buying the property that has the easement issue.

**7. Financial Report:**

- January, 2011

**Chairwoman motions that the Planning Board Approve the Financial Report for January, 2011. Bernard Sweeney seconds. All in favor. No opposed.**

**8. Minutes:**

- January 5, 2011
- January 19, 2011

**Chariwoman motions that the Planning Board Approve the Minutes for January 5, 2011 and January 19, 2011. Charlotte Harris seconds. All in favor. No opposed.**

**9. Next Meetings:**

- Work Session – February 16, 2011 - canceled
- Regular Meeting – March 2, 2011

**10. Comments from the Chair:**

- February 16, 2001 Work Session
- Discussion Regarding Electronic Copies.

Cynthia refers to the February 16<sup>th</sup> Work Session and states we are at a point with our Chapters 89 and 189 revisions where we need involvement from Bruce. Cynthia states that Bruce is not able to attend the Work Session on February 16<sup>th</sup>. The Board discusses moving the Work Session to February 23<sup>rd</sup>. Cynthia states that the only submission received for the March 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting was for Speyer. The Board discusses adding in a discussion of Chapters 89 and 189 onto the March 2<sup>nd</sup> Agenda. Several of the Board Members will be away the last week in February. The Board decides to cancel the February 16<sup>th</sup> Work Session and hold the discussion on March 2<sup>nd</sup>.

Cynthia states that on the table is a submittal today for the Speyer Project. Cynthia states that the Board did not respond in time to let us know whether they would prefer electronic or hard copies. The hard copies of the submittal are handed out. The Board confirms that in the future for large submittals such as this, they would prefer to receive an electronic copy or cd.

**11. Resolution:**

**Chairwoman motions to adjourn the Planning Board Meeting. Bernard Sweeney seconds. All in favor. No opposed.**