

SWPPP. Bernard states that is ridiculous and absurd. We received a letter from a neighbor about the condition of the Site. Bernard states that it was promised five years ago that something would be done with the pile of dirt. Bruce states that this clean up work was proposed to be done in the current 2011 Application, but not in the 2004 or 2005 Applications. Cynthia states the work has been done in accordance with the Planning Board's signoff of the SWPPP. Bruce states it was done in accordance with their DEC Permit. We required that they bring closure to the DEC Permit at that time. Cynthia states they never finished the Planning Board's permit. Bernard states that the Applicant should have done the work.

3. **Auburn/Edens:** David Sessions (owner – The Auburn Group, LLC)
Wetland Permit (location – 301 Hardscrabble Road)

- Open the Public Hearing Regarding Wetland Permit Approval

Cynthia states that David Sessions is here tonight. Cynthia obtains confirmation from the Planning Board Secretary that this Public Hearing was properly noticed in the newspaper in accordance to our Wetlands Ordinance. Cynthia confirms the green cards have been handed in by Mr. Sessions, and that the Notices were sent out to the neighbors in accordance with our Code. Cynthia asks the Planning Board Secretary if the Planning Board Office received any comments, telephone calls, or written correspondence on this matter. Dawn Onufrik states no. Cynthia states that as Chair she did not receive any of these items either. Cynthia asks whether anyone is here from the public for this Application. There is no one here tonight to speak on this Application. Cynthia asks the Board whether they need a presentation or have comments on this Public Hearing. They do not. Cynthia states the Board will not close the Public Hearing tonight. It was recommended not to close the Public Hearing in accordance with the MDRA Memo which we will discuss next.

REGULAR MEETING:

4. **Auburn/Edens:** David Sessions (owner – The Auburn Group, LLC)
Wetland Permit (location – 301 Hardscrabble Road)

- Report from MDRA
- Report from Hahn

Mr. Sessions states that since the last time he met with the Board, he made modifications to the Plans to address the Hahn Memo, and the outstanding MDRA Memo. We made a submission to get on the Agenda tonight. We have received new comment memos from both MDRA and Hahn which seem fairly benign. We have addressed most of the comments. We have a little more homework to do, but are just about there. The focus of the MDRA Memo was essentially about working out the details regarding the bridge. As it turns out, we did receive our Geotechnical Report late this afternoon, as well as the Soil Logs. We will submit this information to the Board. The next step is to forward the Geotechnical Report and Soil Logs to the bridge manufacturer. They will be designing the footings and bridge abutments. Mr. Sessions confirms the next Meeting will be on July 6th, and states they will have bridge Plans and details by that Meeting, or before to submit to the Board and Consultants. Cynthia states the Board has to weight in on the Hahn recommendation to allow a reduction in the design requirement. Cynthia asks the Board whether they feel comfortable addressing this tonight so they may provide direction to Mr. Sessions. Cynthia asks if any of the Board Members are not interested in following the direction of the Town Engineer. Robert does not have a problem, and states there should be relief when someone can't accommodate 100%. Robert states that given the Site, which he knows fairly well, he does not see it as an issue. Cynthia states she was hoping to see information in the submittal regarding a reduction in phosphorous. Cynthia asks Mr. Sessions if they would be able to provide a phosphorous reduction figure. Mr. Sessions states yes. About a year ago when DEP had their own

Regulations, before adopting the State Regulations, if someone were in their watershed, pollutant loading calculations had to be submitted for phosphorous, nitrogen, and biological oxygen demand. The DEP adopted the State Regulations. Now the DEP does not require those calculations. If we design the best management practices in accordance with the State Manual, the State feels phosphorous has been reduced to acceptable levels as long as these basins have been designed in accordance with their Manual. Mr. Sessions states they will provide pollutant calculations if the Board would like to see them. Cynthia was not suggesting this be done as part of the current regulations. This number will help us in justifying the crossing of the stream when another access to the back exists because there will be a benefit of a phosphorous reduction. Cynthia states that our Town Board is very interested in hearing about all phosphorous reductions because it helps them with their over all calculation goal. Mr. Sessions states they have not done a quantitative analysis. Mr. Sessions states the Hahn memo referred to the two biofiltration areas, and in the event that they fill up, how the excess runoff will be handled. Mr. Sessions shows on the Plan where they may eliminate the proposed under drain from one bio retention area. We only have an under drain under one bio retention drain because the other drain is on the right side of the driveway where a swale does not exist. The ultimate basin is on the opposite side of the driveway. We were trying to ensure the water would not overflow because we were putting in an under drain with piping. Mr. Sessions states that there is not as much credit given in these designs if there is an under drain. The water is not filtering down and going into the groundwater, it is going into the under drain and collected in the pipe. Mr. Sessions states that by eliminating the under drain they will receive more credit. The overflow will go into a very small drain, and then the overflow will be piped. We will provide the Board with the calculations. Mr. Sessions states they have been able to move the basin about 10% out after the redesign which will provide for about a 1,000 square foot buffer area reduction. We had 11,360 square feet of disturbance and are down to 10,334 square feet of disturbance. Mr. Sessions states the MDRA Memo suggested we leave a 10 foot buffer. We made modifications and added some additional invasive species removal to keep the net number the same.

Cynthia states she had previously raised a question regarding the bridge being able to handle the weight of fire trucks. Mr. Sessions believes Cynthia gave a figure of about 30 tons. Cynthia states she had been reading a Code for another Town regarding private roads and driveways, and states that if there will be a bridge on a private driveway, we better make sure it will be able to handle a tanker truck. Robert states the person delivering the hay will also want to make sure the bridge will handle the weight. Mr. Sessions will contact the fire department, as well as speak with Lynn Edens, as they do not want the bridge to fall into the wetlands. Cynthia states there is a huge barn in the back. If there is a fire, the last thing you want is for a fire truck to show up and have an issue with crossing. Cynthia asks whether the alternate driveway by the house is being maintained. Cynthia states it is not being shown to be removed on this Plan. Cynthia asks Mr. Sessions to confirm that the driveway will stay in place. If it is taken away, that will be a disturbance we will need to look at. If that becomes an emergency access route an easement would be needed from one lot to another. Mr. Sessions does not believe Lynn Edens mentioned removing the driveway. Cynthia states the Resolution will state that the driveway is staying. If it is decided to remove the driveway, that would require another Application. Mr. Sessions believes the intent is to leave it the way it is. Mr. Sessions states the intent is to have the bridge function for everything.

Cynthia restates that the Public Hearing will be left open.

Mr. Sessions asks the date of the July Meeting. Cynthia states it is July 6th. Cynthia states that the Board is not having another Meeting in June.

Dawn mentions the deadline date is June 11th for the July 6th Meeting. Mr. Sessions states he hoped he had more time. Cynthia states it is our policy to give our Consultants three weeks for their review. Cynthia states that they have made exceptions, but are not sure what the Consultants workload will be. Cynthia states that Mr. Sessions received the Hahn Report on a short turnaround even though his last submittal was a week late.

**5. North Salem Market: Peter McBride
Sign Permit**

(owner – Roger Nitkin)
(location – 60 June Road)

- Consider Draft Resolution of Approval

Cynthia states we finally received all of the outstanding information in within the last day or two. We were waiting for measurements to figure out whether or not the sizing they were asking for would conform to the Ordinance. Cynthia states it does not quite fit. Cynthia prepared a Draft Resolution for tonight which suggests a change in the size of the sign. Michael McBride is here tonight. Cynthia confirms he is with the sign company. Cynthia refers to the Town Ordinance and states that when looking at the façade the sign may only be 30% of that or 15 feet whichever is smaller. Cynthia states the sign may only be 10 feet. Mr. McBride states that is fine, he planned to recycle the sign that used to be there, and he will cut it down and reframe it prior to adding the letters. Cynthia suggested the size of the lettering come down. Mr. McBride does not see a problem with that either. Cynthia states that according to the Application there will be no illumination on the sign. Mr. McBride states that is correct. Cynthia states the sign will be white with green lettering. Cynthia asks Mr. McBride if he had a chance to look at the Draft Resolution. He states yes. Cynthia asks whether he has any questions. Mr. McBride states no. Mr. McBride states it is not a sign that is going to pull people in, it is more informational for people who are in the relative area. It is more of an expense to the tenant than a benefit. Cynthia states that when stopping at the intersection with June Road and Route 116, you will be able to see the sign. Mr. McBride states the angle from the Post Office side is lost. Cynthia states she will not read the whole Resolution. It does say at the end that the length of the sign and size of the individual letters shall not exceed 10.8 feet and 9.5 inches, the sign will not be illuminated, and the Applicant shall obtain a Sign Permit from the Building Inspector. Cynthia asks whether any of the Board Members have comments or questions. They do not.

Chairwoman motions that the Planning Board Adopt the Resolution of Sign Plan Approval for the North Salem Market at Salem Center. Charlotte seconds. All in favor. No opposed.

6. Various Code Discussions:

- Consider Referral of Chapter 89 Fill, and Chapter 189 Sand & Gravel/Tree Removal
- Consider Referral of Subdivision Code Changes to the Town Board
- Discussion Regarding Sign Regulation Changes

Cynthia states she would like to cover all three items regarding proposed changes to our Code tonight. The first would be Chapter 89, the second would be Subdivision Code changes, and the third would be the Sign Regulation changes. Cynthia does not think it is necessary to have Roland stay for all three discussions. Cynthia asks the Board whether they have any specific legal questions for Roland in regards to any of the three discussions. They do not. Cynthia refers to the Subdivision changes and states she did take it out of the Final and put it in under Preliminary. Cynthia asks Roland if he reviewed the Sign Regulation changes. Roland states he did not see it. Cynthia states she did ask Roland a question about political signs and whether there is any way we may suggest a change in content. Roland states that is a First Amendment issue. Cynthia states a resident had mentioned not wanting to see negative signs. Cynthia asks Bruce if he has any questions for Roland on Chapter 89. Bruce states no, not at this point. He may have questions later on in the process. Roland leaves.

Referring to the Chapter 89 discussion, Cynthia states she is working off the March 28th highlighted version. Referring to the colors, Sonja states the yellow highlights are items that were changed in accordance with prior discussions. The green highlights refer to items we still need to talk about. Most of the green highlights were comments from Bruce. The red highlights we already talked about. Cynthia states we will go through

all of them.

Sonja refers to Page 3 in regards to the definition for Fill, Clean. Cynthia states that we use the word Fill throughout this document. She did not see where we specifically mentioned the words Clean Fill. Bruce states that we didn't. Bruce states we were looking for wording to replace the references to NYCRR 360 throughout the document. Bruce talks about materials used in fill such as metal, plumbing items, plastic, and glass, which are part of NYCRR 360. Cynthia confirms that if we have a good definition for Clean Fill that we all agree to, we will take out all of the references to NYCRR 360 and replace them with the words Clean Fill. Bruce states yes, and it comes down to how we define Clean Fill. Bruce looked for ways to improve the definition and he came across the DEC reference to unrestricted items. Cynthia asks what is wrong with the definition we have now.

Gary asks what is meant by the raising of dairy products referred to in the definition of Farming Operation. Gary does not know of a dairy product that is raised. Charlotte states cows or goats. Gary states those are not dairy products. Cynthia talks about the definition Peter Kamenstein had provided for a Farming Operation and thought that the Board had agreed to that one. Gary is not arguing with the definition. As he stated before, he does not know of a dairy product that would be raised. Robert states that milk is a dairy product. Gary states that milk is not raised. Cows are considered to be livestock. Gary states he does not know what the term livery means either. Charlotte states that would be the renting of a horse. We do not have any of those operations in Town. Cynthia reads the Farming Operation definition in the Wetlands Ordinance that was just adopted where it states "Any operation on a parcel of land, not less than four acres, that is used primarily for soil-dependent cultivation of agricultural crop production and/or the raising of livestock, poultry or dairy products as permitted under Chapter 250, Zoning". It excludes operations involving the raising of fur-bearing animals, riding academies and commercial horse boarding facilities, breeding and raising of livestock, and dog kennels. Cynthia confirms that definition in the new Wetlands Ordinance is also in another Town Ordinance. Charlotte states the dairy piece is the only part that does not make sense. Robert reads the definition for Farming Operation from Peter Kamenstein which states "Section 301(11). "Farm operation" means the land, no less than 4 acres, and on-farm buildings, equipment, manure processing, and handling facilities, and practices which contribute to the production, preparation and marketing of crops, livestock, and livestock products in commercial horse boarding operations, timber processing and harvesting of farm woodland. Such farm operation may consist of one or more parcels of owned or rented land, which parcels may be contiguous or noncontiguous to each other". Cynthia states that this definition does not reference fur-bearing animals. Charlotte states it does not reference dairy products. Cynthia asks if we should have language referencing the raising of livestock and poultry, or the production of dairy products. Robert states that slurry might be considered a dairy product. Gary does not think we want the production of dairy products in the definition. That could be considered a bottling plant. Cynthia states she would like one definition for Farming Operation, and she thought the Board had one. Gary states that maybe they had one that changed, as he does not recall reading this language before. Charlotte talks about changing the language to "livestock and livestock products". Gary asks if we want tanneries. Gary states a tannery is a live stock product. Robert states so is slurry. Robert states that slurry would be considered manure. Cynthia asks if we have a definition for agricultural and markets. Robert state that agricultural and markets has a definition, but not of Farming Operations. Bruce states that Robert just read from that Section of 301, which is from Agricultural and markets. Robert states this is the definition of Farming Operations from the Agricultural Districts Law as opposed to the agricultural exceptions. Cynthia states that what is permitted is the raising of field and garden crops, vineyards, and orchard farming. The keeping, breeding, and raising of cattle, including dairy, sheep and goats. The keeping, breeding, and raising of pigs. The keeping, breeding, and raising of fowl. The keeping, breeding and raising of not more than 25 rabbits, foxes, mink and other fur-bearing animals for commercial and/or laboratory purposes. Gary asks Sonja whether she drafted this. Sonja states that this is language that is already used in the Zoning Ordinance. Bruce states this definition came from 2003 when the Farming Operation was defined to be consistent with the Agricultural and Markets Law because it had to do

with the establishment of the Agricultural District. Bruce refers to the definition in 250-5 and states it is identical. Bruce states a suggestion to make this definition work and confirms the only wording that does not work is the raising of dairy products. Cynthia states that according to the zoning, someone may only do what the zoning allows. Robert states that not the case in a District. Robert talks about limiting dairy cattle to 25. No one will make a living on 25. Robert refers to a resident having 100 acres in an agricultural district, not being limited. Cynthia states that resident may have multiple lots. Robert states there maybe someone with 100 acres not having multiple lots and states the local zoning will not preclude someone from milking as many cows as they want. Cynthia states that is a number limitation. Cynthia refers to the zoning and asks Robert what he would do beyond what is allowed. Robert states there is no language about agriculture in there. Cynthia asks Robert if he is talking about the raising of field and garden crops, vineyards and orchard farming. Robert states that is one piece. Later down there is language which quantifies the number allowed. Cynthia asks Robert if there is anything going on that the zoning doesn't allow. Robert believes the State will determine that, not the local zoning. Cynthia brings up tanneries and does not know whether they are allowed. Gary states he mentioned tanneries in conjunction with livestock products. Cynthia states that if our zoning doesn't allow tanneries, if someone is in an agricultural district, would that override our zoning? Gary states he would find it fascinating if our zoning would not allow tanneries. Bruce states it would be looked at from a standpoint of whether the zoning definition is reasonably broad for the circumstances the Town has. Bruce states that one of the items to be reconciled over time is having agricultural districts right along side residential properties. Bruce states that anytime zoning is looked at, it may be said that the zoning is reasonably restrictive for agriculture. Robert states there is sufficient case law for at least 8 or 10 years in regards to Site Plan Review and setback requirements for pastures. People do not want to come in and smell the manure. If someone buys a property next to a farm in an Agricultural District, that information is disclosed in the title search. Cynthia gives an example of someone deciding to have a pig farm, bringing in 300 pigs. Our ordinance does not allow more than 25. Cynthia asks if agricultural and markets would have a different opinion. Robert states they might not think that it would be unreasonable to restrict 300 pigs in a suburban neighborhood. Cynthia states that agricultural and markets do look at our Ordinance. Bruce refers to the use group tables and states that someone may apply for a variance. Robert gives an example of someone having 100 or 500 acres, wanting to locate their barn far away from the house. Cynthia states that if we change the definition of Farming Operation, she recommends we change the definition in every Code it is in. Cynthia asks if one of the Board Members would like to take on the job of coming up with a definition of Farming Operation for discussion. Robert states he will take it on. Gary refers to the livery stables and would like to know why we are allowing them. Cynthia states that we were trying to be broad and reasonable in the definition. It doesn't mean that it is a permitted use in the Code. If we want to bring the definition inline with the use permitted, it may trigger comments from agriculture and markets.

Bruce refers to the definition of Clean Fill and states what is written in the Draft is for a perfect world, where there are no contaminates in the soil, and states we are not going to find such soil. Gary agrees. Bruce states that is why he keeps coming back to the DEC definition of Clean Fill for unrestricted soils which permits up to a certain level of everything. Cynthia asks if Bruce provided the Board with that definition. Bruce has it with him tonight. It is defined by a table with levels of contaminants. Bruce states that this definition works against itself, where it states that "no construction demolition materials, including soil containing sand, gravel, rocks and dredged sediment are allowed". Everything is ruled out. Gary states that it seems as we are just cutting and pasting without much thought given. Cynthia refers to the information within the parentheses and states we are missing the point. Cynthia reads the definition of Clean Fill as Uncontaminated inert solid materials including soil (loam, sand and gravel), rock, stone, dredged sediments. The information in the parentheses tells us what uncontaminated means. The Board and Bruce understand. There is a discussion about dredged sediment being clean fill, or not being clean fill. Bruce states there is a standard within the DEC for unrestricted fill. It is fill which is compatible with all residential uses. Cynthia states we should put that language in. Bruce talks about individuals being able to demonstrate that the soil they are bringing in meets the unrestricted fill requirements. In those cases, that would be the end of the discussion. Cynthia

confirms the definition will state "Fill, unrestricted". Bruce states yes, as currently defined by DEC as unrestricted fill. Cynthia asks Bruce if the table may be dropped into the document. Bruce states it goes on forever. Bruce states maybe we could add it in as an addendum. Cynthia suggests we add in language that states this information will be on file in the Building Inspector's office. Cynthia states every place where there is a reference to NYCRR 360; we will put in the words unrestricted fill instead.

Robert states that presently there is a fill certification letter that truckers are to provide to a building inspector or homeowner, which lists where the fill came from. Robert asks Bruce if he is familiar with this letter. Bruce states yes, and refers to their Fill Permit, which asks for information as to where the fill came from, as well as a breakdown of the materials. Robert asks Bruce how often he has had to ask for an analysis of the fill, and has it been problematic. Bruce states he most recently requested an analysis for a property that was in foreclosure because he could not obtain information from the property owner. Bruce requested the new owners provide the information. Robert confirms with Bruce that this was a very unusual circumstance. Robert refers to the samples and asks how many are required. Bruce states it would be whatever was appropriate. It would depend if the materials were coming from different sources. It is impossible to pinpoint. Robert states he has spoken with people who are in the business and they have told him if this were to be passed, there would be no fill coming to the Town. Robert states the samples are approximately \$135.00 each. For someone to have to provide 15 or 20 samples, depending on the size of the job, would be a big issue for an area that does not seem to be problematic. Cynthia states that sometimes we don't know. The suggestion was that if a homeowner is ordering fill, they should be told where the fill came from. Robert states they do that now. Cynthia it might make the homeowner stop and wonder whether they want the fill or not. No one is saying the fill has to be tested. At least notify the homeowner and the building inspector of where the fill came from. Robert asks Bruce if he is familiar with a New York State requirement called the Stars Memo, which quantifies how many samples need to be taken per maximum amount of materials being brought to a site. This is for commercial, not residential. Bruce states the onus is placed on the homeowner. The Town is not in the business of certifying fill. We are trying to come up with standard language. There needs to be factors for any particular circumstance, as opposed to a broad definition that may not be quantified. Bruce states that the homeowner is responsible for the fill that is being delivered to their site. We are giving them our best guidance. Bruce states that one of the provisions in the unrestricted fill definition is that if it is coming from an excavation on another property, and being taken to another site, used as unrestricted fill. Bruce states that in order to qualify for unrestricted fill, the materials don't necessarily need to be tested.

Cynthia confirms that No. 2 on Page 4 under excluded activities is fine. Cynthia refers to No. 5 on Page 4, and confirms language has been added to a later version stating "where all of the following thresholds are met". So if someone meets all four requirements, they would receive a pass. Charlotte confirms the draft she has was e-mailed on April 12th. Robert refers to the issue regarding the amount of fill and talks about there being a sliding scale. Someone may have one acre, or someone may have 100 acres and only be allowed 200 feet of cubic yards which might be fine for a swimming pool. If someone has 1,000 yards of fill, they should be able to use it. Cynthia asks what Robert would suggest as a sliding scale. Robert does not have a problem, as long as it is on a yearly basis. Robert does not see a benefit of putting the regulation in place and refers to the purpose of this Chapter to prevent the importation of unsuitable fill, ect., and states what if the fill is suitable. Cynthia states if the fill is suitable, and someone is going to create a steep slope, then it will not be suitable anymore. Robert gives an example of someone having a dip to repair. Cynthia states that might be an instance where the Planning Board would quickly advise an Applicant that they receive a pass. Robert states an example of a resident getting a call from someone working down the street, asking whether the resident would be able to use the fill. Cynthia asks for suggestions for a sliding scale that the Board may talk about. Robert suggests 500 for two acres, and 750 for three acres. Gary suggests 250 per acre up to a maximum of 1,000. Robert states that is a lot of dirt to move around. Robert states that is more reasonable. Cynthia asks Bruce his thoughts. Cynthia suggests language to be added "the cumulative amount of excavation and/or fill is no more than 250 cubic yards per acre of land not to exceed 1,000 cubic yards". Bruce states that the area

of disturbance may not exceed 5,000 square feet.

Robert confirms that the sentence in Page 5, Item 6 ends with the word “disturbance”.

Cynthia refers to Page 5, Item 8 and confirms with Bruce that NYCRR Part 360 will be changed to unrestricted fill. Bruce states he is still hung up on the language where it refers to “certification of the material’s compliance”. He will confirm how the certification will take place.

Sonja refers to Page 8, Item f(3) under Permit Determination, and states she added in the sentence that is shaded. Bruce is fine with it.

Robert refers to Page 5, Item 89-6 regarding project plans being required, and asks whether there are instances where people having fill delivered would be allowed to have a visual inspection, or is everyone supposed to go through the one inch equaling 50 feet requirement in order to get a load of fill. Cynthia states this is only required if someone is going through the Permit process. If someone having 10 acres goes to Bruce and states they are going to have 500 yards of fill delivered, Bruce will make sure all of the criteria have been met for the allowed exclusions.

Bruce refers to Page 8, Item f(3) where a sentence has been added which states that “The Building Inspector shall administer and enforce the terms and conditions of the Planning Board’s permit approval”. He states that that the Planning Board approvals are often written so tightly, and with good intentions. Bruce is working with Applicants regarding the cell tower on the Sulcevski property, and he will be speaking with Cynthia regarding a Field Change that is needed. The topo didn’t represent the difference in the grade. Bruce states that on the ground is different than what was represented on paper or the solution that was applied. When the work began, there were items that didn’t come together to follow the Plan. Bruce states the generator was turned 90 degrees. The length dimension was down slope, and the pad was up in the air. Bruce met with the Engineer at the Site regarding the drainage. Large rocks were used which may not be walked across without twisting an ankle. We would like to go over these items to solve both of these problems. Bruce requests the Planning Board, when writing the Resolutions, make some provisions for circumstances that are encountered that may require modifications. Cynthia asks how the Field Change section is written. Bruce has to go back and read it again. He believes there is a provision for a Field Change. Cynthia states she believes all Field Changes are supposed to come to the Planning Board. Cynthia states that Field Changes are only for Site Plan Applications. Sonja will take a look at the language in order to build something into this Chapter. Cynthia refers to the Applicants for the Sulcevski cell tower, and states that they didn’t want to do a current survey. We allowed them to use an old document. Now we hear they encountered problems in the field.

Gary has to leave. Cynthia asks him if he minds the Board doing a referral to the Town Board of the Subdivision Regulation changes. Gary states not at all.

Bruce states there is no substitute for site inspections. Before Permits are issued, we have to go out and see the conditions. Cynthia talks about the Planning Board letting Bruce know when they go on Site Inspections, as there are instances when Applicants are referred to him.

Bruce states he has no other comments. The Board discusses going through one more round. Cynthia asks the Board whether they have to go through another round or whether they agree with referring this Chapter to the Town Board. Sonja will draft up language regarding a Field Change. Cynthia states we could do a Resolution forwarding this Chapter to the Town Board for their consideration at a Work Session subject to our sign off on the proposed Field Change language. When we circulate the language, if any of the Board Members would rather talk about it at a Work Session first, we will wait. Robert supports giving more subjective authority to the Building Inspector. The Board agrees. Cynthia states the Board will take this up at their July Work Session if they are uncomfortable with the Field Change language from Sonja.

Cynthia states the other referral was for the Subdivision changes. Cynthia confirms Gary was comfortable with the referral. The Board confirms they are comfortable. Cynthia states this is a requirement that Roland told us had to be done by State Law.

Chairwoman motions that the Planning Board Refer the New Chapter 89, Land Excavation and Fill Law Amendments to the Town Board Subject to the Board's Consensus of the Field Change Wording to be Provided by MDRA, as well as the Referral of two Revisions to the Subdivision Regulations to the Town Board for their Consideration. Robert seconds. All in favor. No opposed.

After the motion Cynthia talks with the Board about the Sign Regulation Changes she had drafted up in regards to political signs, and temporary signs as far as reducing the time they are allowed to be up, and adding size limits. The Board decides to hold off this discussion until the July 6th Meeting. Cynthia states the Town Board did want us to discuss the political signs. We don't want to get too far into the political season and then come up with changes to the regulation that no one hears about. Bernard talks about the comments from Roland. Cynthia states Roland advised that the content could not be changed. We would be able to regulate the size of the signs, and the length of time they are up. Cynthia states that the DOT has told people that they are not allowed to put a sign in a State right-of-way, unless it is an approved sign, such as a sign for a library. Robert refers to people putting up signs for tag sales who never come back to take them down. Cynthia states that Maureen Eckman the Assistant Building Inspector is very good about taking signs down when she sees them.

7. Financial Report:

- May, 2011

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

8. Minutes:

- March 2, 2011
- May 4, 2011
- May 18, 2011 – held over to July 6th Meeting

Chairwoman motions that the Planning Board Approve the Minutes for March 2, 2011. Robert Tompkins seconds. All in favor. No opposed.

Chairwoman motions that the Planning Board Approve the Minutes for May 4, 2011. Robert Tompkins seconds. All in favor. No opposed.

9. Next Meetings:

- Work Session – June 15, 2011 - cancelled
- Regular Meeting – July 6, 2011

10. Resolution:

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

