

January 5, 2009

1

TOWN OF CORNWALL

PLANNING BOARD

JANUARY 5, 2009

MEMBERS PRESENT: NEIL NOVESKY, CHAIRMAN
WYNN GOLD
LED KLOSKY
WILLIAM GRABE
HELEN BUNT

ALSO PRESENT: DOMINIC CORDISCO, ESQ.
PLANNING BOARD ATTORNEY

MARK EDSALL, P.E.
PLANNING BOARD ENGINEER

LESLIE DOTSON
PLANNING BOARD CONSULTANT

GARY VINSON
BUILDING INSPECTOR

ABSENT: JANE DEANS
KENNETH BRODMERKEL

MR. NOVESKY: I'm calling the meeting to order at 7:39, technical glitch happened. All present with the exception of Mr. Brodmerkel and the now retired Jane Deans. We look forward to replacements being appointed within the month. With that, we'll move to correspondence.

CORRESPONDENCE _____

MR. NOVESKY: I'll forward to you correspondence from Mr. Loeb, Mr. Rodd at the ZBA, New York State DEC, we'll have that handled by the close of the meeting.

APPROVAL_OF_MINUTES _____

MR. NOVESKY: Approval of the minutes. Everybody receive the minutes?

MR. CORDISCO: Excuse me, the Loeb correspondence required action by the board. Those are from the Town Board seeking a change on the inspection sheet for site plans and subdivisions.

MR. NOVESKY: Right. Okay, did everyone receive the minutes for the December 1 meeting? Anybody have any questions on them?

MR. KLOSKY: Move we accept the minutes.

MR. GOLD: Second it.

ROLL CALL

MR. KLOSKY	AYE
MR. GRABE	AYE
MS. BUNT	AYE
MR. GOLD	AYE
MR. NOVESKY	AYE

RESOLUTIONS _____

MR. NOVESKY: Resolutions, Dominic, would you like to explain?

MR. CORDISCO: Yes, the Town Board has asked for your input and advice regarding two changes, one to the zoning law and one to the subdivision law that would change the way that fees are computed for site plan and

subdivision approvals for the improvement costs. It would clarify that it is going to be 4 percent, not 2 percent as currently is written in the law.

MR. EDSALL: In follow-up, the 2 percent in the subdivision regulations is for private improvements part of the subdivision such as private roads. Mr. Vinson advised that public improvements for subdivision is already 4 so it's private improvements within subdivisions.

MR. NOVESKY: Hearing that shall we put that in the form of a motion or consent?

MR. CORDISCO: Should be in the form of a motion, actually a report attached to that in which if the motion's passed on both of these then you could sign the report.

MR. NOVESKY: Okay, I'll ask for a motion on the two Town Board recommendations.

MR. GOLD: So moved.

MS. BUNT: Second it.

ROLL CALL

MR. KLOSKY	AYE
MR. GRABE	AYE
MS. BUNT	AYE
MR. GOLD	AYE
MR. NOVESKY	AYE

MR. CORDISCO: If you would indicate that on both resolutions and then sign both reports I would be much obliged.

MR. NOVESKY: Mr. Counsel, for the record, the two members absent tonight inasmuch as they are not

January 5, 2009

4

replaced, are they considered absent or no longer members?

MR. CORDISCO: They are considered absent because their terms continue until their positions are filled.

MR. NOVESKY: Just a point of clarification, thank you. And I guess you want these?

MR. CORDISCO: Yes, sir.

STONE_HOLLOW_AT_CORNWALL_#2008-10_-_PUBLIC_HEARING

MR. NOVESKY: With that we'll move to the public hearing that we had left open last month, that's the Stone Hollow at Cornwall. We'll reopen I guess we're not reopening technically we're continuing the previously opened public hearing at 7:43. Are you here?

MR. LUCASIK: We are, good evening, happy new year, Mark Lucasik for the applicant, Tectonic. As you stated simply a continuation of open public hearing on the project. What we have done recently we submitted plans and reports to address comments that were outstanding, we're waiting for a response from the County Planning Department which we have.

MS. DOTSON: Just got it today.

MR. LUCASIK: So with the comments in hand basically they remain items for the board to consider. I don't know if you have actually had a chance to read these comments, perhaps Leslie will want to go over them and we can just probably go that route at this point, see how you want to proceed.

MR. NOVESKY: Leslie, you want to go over them?

MS. DOTSON: The County's comments specifically they reiterate their point about preferring low impact drainage design and they'd like to see filter strips along the town road. This is something that's been discussed before, it's not something that the town would be supporting just because it raises maintenance issues along the town road. They also do support the idea of some changes to the landscaping around the basin though and I'm going to defer any discussion on that comment until Mark does his comments because he also has some comments on that and solicits my input, I had not spoken about that before.

MR. NOVESKY: This is still an open public hearing, let's continue with the public then close the public hearing and hear those comments. So saying that, are there any members of the general public wishing to make comment on this project? Okay, seeing nor hearing any I will call for a motion to close the public hearing at 7:45.

MS. BUNT: So moved.

MR. KLOSKY: Second it.

ROLL CALL

MR. KLOSKY	AYE
MR. GRABE	AYE
MS. BUNT	AYE
MR. GOLD	AYE
MR. NOVESKY	AYE

MR. NOVESKY: Now we'll go to the comments.

MR. EDSALL: Comments are brief, they're back to the 29 count and did receive the revised SWPPP for the project, we have no issues with the SWPPP as it's been revised and corrected, other than procedural issues the board can discuss further. One, is it your preference to send it to DOT for informal comment only or rely on the, on their previous review? It has changed somewhat and is acceptable to our office but it's at your discretion if you want them to look at it again. And the second bullet is that which Leslie referred to which is the fact that you've got the visible storm water improvements and it may be such that you want to ask for enhanced plan for those locations and I know Leslie had reviewed the plans previously so I lateraled that to her to continue her review and that was it from an engineering standpoint.

MS. DOTSON: I had not commented on that because I was waiting on the engineering review to see whether or not the bases were sufficient and whether any major changes were going to be implemented to that. I think some of the plantings that are around the basin are primarily more for screening purposes, there are several 10 to 12 foot Norway spruces that are proposed in a very narrow strip of what looks like erosion control gravel stone mixture at the base of that slope. You've got 10 to 12 foot trees which are fairly large which are going to be placed in a fairly narrow area. I'm not so sure that they're really going to be doing that much screening because you've got 10 to 12 foot trees that are going to be placed at a toe of a 24 foot slope, 24 foot until you get to the, I think it's going to be fairly open, I'm not sure what you're proposing to put other than just fabric and seeding mixtures on the side of that. I'm thinking that if you planted something smaller at the base and did some more shrubbery on the side of that that it would probably soften the whole thing and present less of a visual impact and probably help to stabilize the slope.

MR. LUCASIK: One of the considerations that you may want to discuss and this would be as good a time as any is that to answer your first question we propose simply to grass the embankment slope and it's primarily done to keep things visible and maintainable. So since this this will be ultimately a facility that's only maintained by the Town of Cornwall, the owner/maintainer is going to want to know if there's any potential issues somewhere down the road 10, 20, however many years from now if there were to be seepage you'd want to be able to detect that on the face of the embankment. Any sort of dense vegetation on the embankment is going to make it difficult to see any of that occurring, particularly if it's allow to essentially just I don't want to say run wild but without repeated maintenance you run that risk of obscuring those. So I think the only option we have in

that area given the proposal is to put something down at the toe, if the intent is to try to screen the embankment from 9W in any fashion.

MR. KLOSKY: I'm not sure that I concur with that, I mean if there were to be seepage or cracking the seepage or cracking would mostly likely occur at the downstream toe of the dike rather than on the face of it. Those sorts of issues are difficult to address, sometimes that sort of shrubbery can help to shade the surface of the embankment thereby preventing cracking so there can be beneficial things from shrubbery and tree coverage on the embankment. So I think visually it's a six of one half dozen of the other situation. Is it going to be visible from 9W?

MS. DOTSON: Oh, yes, it will be quite sometime also before those larger trees do stabilize, if you plant a smaller tree it tends to recover more quickly from the transplant shock, if you plant a larger tree it starts off larger but it takes a while for it to adjust and start growing again. So it takes several years before you're really going to start getting substantial growth out of that.

MR. LUCASIK: Not that this is the DEC in all their guidelines for owner and maintainer and development of these facilities will advise against any substantial vegetation on an embankment slope. We agree any seepage that comes through will be at the lower quadrant, it certainly won't be above any of the water storage elevation but again their approval is generally better safe than sorry.

MR. NOVESKY: Any final thoughts?

MS. DOTSON: I was just talking off line with Mark and asking about the ability to mow the grass on that steep a slope and Mark informed me that in fact the town is not intending to mow that grass.

MR. EDSALL: Given the slope it's probably one they would rather vegetate and leave wild and I tend to think the visual issue is probably the greater one for the board's consideration, if you want it vegetated I'm sure the applicant and our office and Leslie can come up with an acceptable modified plan. I just think it's a lot of slope to be exposed and visually you probably would not be happy with the way it is now once it's completed unless it's landscaped.

MR. KLOSKY: I concur with Mark.

MR. NOVESKY: Let's hear your comments.

MR. KLOSKY: That's my principal comment, I would agree with Mark on that, I think the face of this thing should be vegetated or it's going to be quite a blight as seen from 9W, it's big, I mean, what's the total offset in terms of height from 9W?

MS. DOTSON: Twenty-four feet.

MR. LUCASIK: Off 9W probably looking at 15, about 15 feet from roadway elevation to the crest.

MS. DOTSON: I thought I counted 24 feet from where the gravel is up to the--

MR. LUCASIK: We'd be a regulated dam by the DEC if we were that high. I think we tried to stay away from that, we're talking anywhere from probably 8 to 12 feet depending on where you are on 9W for the height.

MR. KLOSKY: But although basically it will go trees trees, trees, big open embankment, looks like a window into the project and trees, trees, trees, trees, trees is what it will look like, correct?

MS. DOTSON: Yeah.

MR. LUCASIK: Right now there's a limited number of evergreens proposed in that gap.

MS. DOTSON: Plus also there's a, I mean, I don't know how closely you can plant, there's a catch basin that's in the middle there, not really sure how the trees are going to be planted relative to the catch basin cause the landscaping plan doesn't show the catch basin so it's, I'm not quite sure how that's all going to work.

MR. LUCASIK: We can protect the structure so it doesn't get planted on.

MR. KLOSKY: This is a retention not a detention facility, it's only going to hold the stuff for 24 to 36 hours, right?

MR. LUCASIK: No, there's a permanent water service similar to the originally approved, there's a permanent water service.

MR. KLOSKY: Permanent water surface is how far from the peak?

MR. LUCASIK: Probably talking about 7 feet.

MR. NOVESKY: Okay, so do we want to make any approvals contingent on the provision of the landscaping plan?

MR. CORDISCO: I think at this point because you just closed the public hearing and you just got your comments from County Planning what you can do is authorize preparation of resolutions for next month's meeting and we can certainly include a condition in there that the storm water plan, the landscaping plan be revised to address the board and the board's consultants' comments.

MR. NOVESKY: Okay, is that okay?

MR. KLOSKY: Yeah, that seems like a path to pursue.

MR. GRABE: Leslie and Mark and the applicant can come up with a plan for this then yes?

MR. CORDISCO: Hopefully then that will be done prior to next month's meeting so that if there's any lingering questions that can be addressed at the meeting.

MR. GRABE: Then you'll prepare the resolution.

MR. CORDISCO: Yes.

MS. BUNT: Nothing.

MR. NOVESKY: With that, ask for a motion to direct Dominic.

MR. CORDISCO: I just have one question for the applicant. Given the fact that this is a previously approved plan I assume that you're going to want both preliminary and final approval?

MR. LUCASIK: Correct.

MR. CORDISCO: Okay, and that's the resolution that we would prepare.

MR. EDSALL: I'm presuming that you're not looking to refer us back to DOT again.

MR. NOVESKY: Unless you're recommending that we do that.

MR. EDSALL: No, I mean, what's in the DOT right-of-way has not changed, I mean, any changes are within the subdivision proper and obviously, you've looked at it, our office has come to look at what we're proposing as

far as the technical design so we'll look at the landscaping with Leslie.

MR. NOVESKY: Okay, with that Dominic then you'll prepare the appropriate resolutions?

MR. CORDISCO: Yes. If you would take, I'm not sure if you actually acted on the motion.

MR. NOVESKY: We are just now.

MS. BUNT: So moved.

MR. GRABE: Second it.

ROLL CALL

MR. KLOSKY	AYE
MR. GRABE	AYE
MS. BUNT	AYE
MR. GOLD	AYE
MR. NOVESKY	AYE

MR. NOVESKY: Thank you.

MR. LUCASIK: Thank you. Have a good evening.

JOHN_LATIMER_#2006-16 _____

MR. NOVESKY: Next is John Latimer.

Mr. John Queenan appeared before the board for this proposal.

MR. QUEENAN: My name is John Queenan from Lanc & Tully Engineering representing the applicant. Also here with me tonight is Mr. John Latimer. I don't know if the board may recall this subdivision has been around for quite some time, it's a 2 lot subdivision of an existing 5.74 acre parcel located along New York State 32 situated between two private roads, Sugar Maples which runs here and Roaring Brook Road here, it's about 500 to 800 feet to the east of Angola Road which is right here. The last time we were before the board you referred us to the Zoning Board of Appeals for variances for net lot area for each lot. Since that time, the applicant's obtained the variances and has addressed all outstanding engineering comments at this time. We're before you tonight for hopefully the scheduling of a public hearing and I don't know how the board handles it or a negative dec.

MR. NOVESKY: Looking to authorize a public hearing and authorize the negative dec preparation but first we'll hear from Leslie.

MS. DOTSON: I'm just noting that they did receive their ZBA decision, the ZBA restricted clearing on the new lot to within a specific specified building area and it also established some size and bulk limits for the proposed house. These plans have incorporated reference to the Zoning Board decision and all of the conditions but there was an important typographical error that needs to be fixed in the variance notes because it really changes the whole meaning of it. It's kind of odd, I did some looking into the Zoning Board decision to make sure that it was correct because

the ZBA decision actually talks about restricting clearing of the new lot within the building envelope. Actually, what they mean is within the designated clearing area. It's very clear that the Zoning Board of Appeals decision refers to the exact same disturbance area that's shown on sheet 4 of this plan otherwise you wouldn't be able to use the lot at all. So it was little bit strange but I did check it out. I had wanted to ask Dominic to address the map note incorporated on sheet 1 was sufficient to address the ZBA conditions, just my only concern just because it limits both the building size and dimension of the lot disturbance. I'm sure that because Gary attends the ZBA meetings that he, that he is aware of the restriction and they have it in their files but I just wanted to make sure any future lot owner would be notified properly.

MR. CORDISCO: And I reviewed the notes and they are acceptable.

MS. DOTSON: My comment 2 just notes that they have pretty much responded to my previous concerns, although they didn't show the electric easement near Roaring Brook Road, there doesn't seem to be any disturbance proposed within that easement that would interfere with the ability to use the site. Comment 3 just wondered if there was any contact with DOT regarding private road improvements and Mark will address that. I'm just reminding you that you're subjecting this to coordinated SEQRA review so any declaration that we say would also be affecting DOT. And comment 4 just noting that we understand the applicant's installed the curtain drain and completed its testing and this is going to be reviewed by the town engineer. I noted there was a non-standard map not included on sheet 2 regarding the septic system but I didn't think that if there are any other outstanding legal or engineering concerns it seemed as if they might be ready for a hearing.

MR. NOVESKY: Mark?

MR. EDSALL: My first comment just a recap of the status of the information. Comment 2 deals with the sanitary system they have in fact completed their field testing information on the plan, 5 percent to be accurate relative to what we witnessed, design is complete on the plan. There's an inconsistency between sheets 2 and 3 for the size of the system. I just ask that the plan when it comes in for the public hearing coordinates that in consistency both meet the state regulations, one has an extra 4 feet in each lateral to make it a little more conservative. Relative to the sanitary the board received a letter from the neighbor the Ellicks asking that you use the witnessed perc tests in the design, actually some of the other tests in other areas of the site actually had slower results which these I think is a very appropriate thing in using the design rate as being more conservative than the actual tests we witnessed, we have varying tests on the site, it's always good to not design around the best case but base the design on either the average or closer to the worst case and they have done that and used a higher percolation rate than what they had to, therefore, it's more conservative. And I would agree with that approach. So the Ellicks' request in fact has been addressed by them being even more conservative than they have been. Leslie referred to a note that's on sheet 1 general note 7 which says you will design the systems you're actually designing them now what you use should just say that you're going to apply for a permit for construction. All of them are very minor corrections, one that we talked about that's not listed here is the issue of the pavement down near Route 32, I don't know that there's much there for the DOT to get into a design with you on but it may be appropriate to ask that they add a note indicating that prior to any construction work within the DOT right-of-way that they will request a permit from the DOT. And I use the word

request rather than get because I personally think the DOT is going to say no, this is only four foot of pavement by two foot, we're not going to issue a permit for that small amount of pavement but I think they require that they request one prior to doing any work. That's my suggestions on how to handle that one from my prior discussions with DOT for very minor what could be called maintenance improvements.

MR. QUEENAN: I would agree with that, we have had a couple instances where DOT says it's too small we're too busy, if you're going to improve it, make it better, go right ahead and we'll be doing that, we're going to be taking the loose stone and gravel that's there now actually bringing it up to town specifications so the entrance will only improve.

MR. EDSALL: With those items in mind I think that they are ready for a public hearing and I would request that they make those revisions on maps for the public hearing.

MR. NOVESKY: Okay, Led?

MR. KLOSKY: My only comment was that the plan is currently drawn especially on sheet 1 it sort of just implies that the water from this regulated I think it's actually a federal wetlands that it actually just runs to the road and then sort of disappears into space over there. I think it's important for the record that the plan at least one of the sheets show what the termination of all this actually is so some detail on the northwest side of the road I think is called for to show that that's been--

MR. QUEENAN: Are you looking for topo?

MR. KLOSKY: Just a couple quick topo lines.

MR. EDSALL: Is that where the roadside swale is?

MR. QUEENAN: It's actually on the other side of the road.

MR. EDSALL: No, when it goes down to the bottom of the hill, is there a catch basin near the property or roadside swale?

MR. QUEENAN: There's a culvert right on the property, I think he's looking for topo on the other side which I can provide with the water authority.

MR. KLOSKY: Just some detail of the outfall.

MR. EDSALL: Is there developed land?

MR. QUEENAN: It's on Moodna about a 92 acre parcel owned by Storm King Art Center undeveloped.

MR. KLOSKY: Right, but I think that the plan should reflect that to show that we fully considered the impact of the runoff from the site, I don't think it's going to pose any difficulty.

MR. QUEENAN: No, as long as the board's comfortable I'll use the two foot contours from the water authority because we don't have the permission to actually go on someone else's property.

MR. KLOSKY: Mark, do you see any benefit to resurveying?

MR. EDSALL: No, again, if it's the undeveloped parcel that I'm thinking about I don't think there's any impact.

MR. KLOSKY: Then the record will be complete.

MR. GRABE: I'm fine.

MR. GOLD: Nothing.

MS. BUNT: Nothing.

MR. NOVESKY: So we'll take a motion to authorize a public hearing next month.

MR. GOLD: So moved.

MS. BUNT: Second it.

ROLL CALL

MR. KLOSKY AYE

MR. GRABE AYE

MS. BUNT AYE

MR. GOLD AYE

MR. NOVESKY AYE

MR. NOVESKY: Dominic, I can take a resolution to authorize preparation of a negative dec as well?

MR. CORDISCO: Yes, sir, as well as not only the negative dec but perhaps preliminary and final approval if that's what the applicant is requesting.

MR. QUEENAN: Yes.

MR. NOVESKY: I don't think that's a problem, take a motion for both.

MR. KLOSKY: So moved.

MS. BUNT: Second it.

ROLL CALL

MR. KLOSKY AYE

MR. GRABE AYE

MS. BUNT AYE

January 5, 2009

19

MR. GOLD AYE
MR. NOVESKY AYE

MR. QUEENAN: Do you know what date the hearing will be on?

MR. NOVESKY: February 2, I believe, yes.

COMITO _____

MR. NOVESKY: We had a request for a 6 month extension that I neglected to bring up request for 6 month extension on Comito.

MS. BUNT: I move to extend it.

MR. GOLD: Second it.

ROLL CALL

MR. KLOSKY	AYE
MR. GRABE	AYE
MS. BUNT	AYE
MR. GOLD	AYE
MR. NOVESKY	AYE

CORRESPONDENCE

MR. KLOSKY: At the same time just for the purposes of getting into the record we had a letter from Adam Rodd that was actually listed in the minutes in the agenda and I believe that that, that the questions posed in that letter were resolved in the minutes from the December meeting just if anybody is trying to track it down through the record.

MR. NOVESKY: Duly noted in the record, thank you, Led.

STURGES_&_DUELL_#2008-11 _____

MR. NOVESKY: I apologize for the delay, Duell & Sturges.

Mr. Richard Miller appeared before the board for this proposal.

MR. MILLER: I'm Richard Miller, the architect on the Duell residence and this was a request for a 55 foot rear yard setback variance which was approved by the ZBA or recommended, I'm sorry, and but there was a request for a map drawn up by the surveyor stamped which I think you have copies of showing the actual proposed setback and so you have that here. I believe that's all that was requested for tonight.

MR. NOVESKY: There was one question that Led had, why don't you pose the question?

MR. KLOSKY: Yeah, as I understand it this site requires a ridge line protection district analysis, the board's asked to consider the impacts on the viewshed from a project in that it's the overlay district?

MS. DOTSON: Ridge overlay line protection district.

MR. KLOSKY: We're asked to consider the visual impacts of a project, much of the work has already taken place, I do not suspect that there's a difficulty with this, however, as a matter of establishing an adequate record for the project should ownership transfer in the future, for instance, it's important that the record reflect cross-sections and there's a, I think that Leslie can probably explain it better, but we usually have a paperwork sort of requirement for consideration of visual impacts in that ridge line district as is required by the zoning.

MS. DOTSON: Yes, I do recall when you initially came

in before the planning board you did have a whole visual survey that you had done, I think balloon test but you did do mockups that adequately showed to the planning board that this particular location in this site would meet the requirements of the law that it actually was more compliant than--

MR. CORDISCO: That was your basis if I may for making a positive referral.

MR. NOVESKY: This is just a request for a submission as a matter of record.

MS. DOTSON: But I do note in the Zoning Board of Appeals minutes not all the ZBA members got it. I know that you had that big board put together, I guess what we're trying to say is that there does need to be something in the record, there had been some material put together, there are a few copies put together for some of the consultants, mine got given to the County Planning Department, the town does need to have something in its records to show that the board considered all the correct information that was specific to this site plan.

MR. MILLER: Is that something we can just submit or do we have to come back to do that?

MR. NOVESKY: We can make that as part of the contingency.

MS. DOTSON: Because you have seen it but it definitely does need to be on file.

MR. KLOSKY: You showed us a model as I recall.

MR. MILLER: Yeah, there's a model but I have some photographs with me and just to refresh memory, the original approved subdivision from several years ago the footprint was actually closer to the viewshed and

so we were actually the thing that everyone is laughing about is we're proposing it further back and more hidden so that's what this reflects but these photos were taken from 2 1/2 miles away from this so I think I handed out, there are copies but it's hard to see, this is the formerly approved site, this is a large about 6 foot triangle or 4 x 8 triangle and the same one I can pass these around you can't see it with the new location.

MR. NOVESKY: There are no issues.

MR. KLOSKY: I don't need to see it.

MR. VINSON: You need it for the file.

MR. NOVESKY: We'll make that an attachment to the resolution.

MR. KLOSKY: With some sort of explanation.

MR. NOVESKY: With that, I will ask for a motion to waive the public hearing.

MR. KLOSKY: So moved.

MR. GOLD: Second it.

ROLL CALL

MR. KLOSKY	AYE
MR. GRABE	AYE
MS. BUNT	AYE
MR. GOLD	AYE
MR. NOVESKY	AYE

MR. NOVESKY: And then I think we can direct that Dominic prepare a final resolution contingent on the submission of the attached information, take a motion for that.

MR. GOLD: So moved.

MS. BUNT: Second it.

ROLL CALL

MR. KLOSKY	AYE
MR. GRABE	AYE
MS. BUNT	AYE
MR. GOLD	AYE
MR. NOVESKY	AYE

MR. NOVESKY: Dominic, you will heretofore prepare a resolution for next month if you would.

MR. CORDISCO: I'm not sure heretofore.

MR. NOVESKY: From now on.

MR. CORDISCO: Yes, I will.

MR. NOVESKY: You're all set.

MR. MILLER: Thank you. So we don't need to come back?

MR. NOVESKY: No.

MR. KLOSKY: Next month we'll vote to adopt the final resolution contingent on the viewshed analysis being completed.

MR. MILLER: We'll take care of it.

DISCUSSION

MR. NOVESKY: With that, are there any other questions or issues? For the record, I know that Mr. Brodmerkel, a member of the board has applied for reinstatement on the board, I'd like to--

MS. DOTSON: He had actually wanted to discuss County Planning referrals and referrals to other boards but and I think if he's not here he was the one who introduced the topic, I just feel as if the whole board ought to be here before we discuss something that matters related to procedures.

MR. NOVESKY: Yes. Motion to adjourn?

MR. GOLD: So moved.

MR. GRABE: Second it.

ROLL CALL

MR. KLOSKY	AYE
MR. GRABE	AYE
MS. BUNT	AYE
MR. GOLD	AYE
MR. NOVESKY	AYE

Respectfully Submitted By:

Frances Roth
Stenographer