

May 4, 2009

1

TOWN OF CORNWALL

PLANNING BOARD

MAY 4, 2009

MEMBERS PRESENT: NEIL NOVESKY, CHAIRMAN
KENNETH BRODMERKEL
WYNN GOLD
LED KLOSKY
WILLIAM GRABE

ALSO PRESENT: DOMINIC CORDISCO, ESQ.
PLANNING BOARD ATTORNEY

MARK EDSALL
PLANNING BOARD ENGINEER

BRYANT COCKS
PLANNING BOARD CONSULTANT

GARY VINSON
BUILDING INSPECTOR

ABSENT: HELEN BUNT
MICHAEL LOBLANCO

REGULAR_MEETING:

MR. NOVESKY: I'd like to call the meeting to order.
Helen Bunt is dutifully excused, she advised Mr.
Brodmerkel that she was going to be unable to come due
to a strained shoulder. And Mr. Loblanco is not
coming.

We have one brief discussion on the record a
formal congratulations goes to our attorney, Dominic

May 4, 2009

2

Cordisco, for his first child, Rocco Cordisco is his name. And again Dominic my heartfelt congratulations.

APPROVAL_OF_MINUTES

MR. CORDISCO: Approval of the minutes, everybody receive their minutes? Any questions? Any issues? Anybody wants to make a motion?

MR. KLOSKY: I move we adopt the minutes.

MR. GOLD: Second it.

ROLL CALL

MR. BRODMERKEL	AYE
MR. GOLD	AYE
MR. KLOSKY	AYE
MR. GRABE	AYE
MR. NOVESKY	AYE

RESOLUTIONS

MR. NOVESKY: Dominic, we spoke about the resolutions that I have signed but failed to deliver.

MR. CORDISCO: Already done.

MR. NOVESKY: No public hearings this evening, we'll move on to project number one.

NELSON_-_#2009-05

MR. NOVESKY: Project 2009-05, Nelson, are you present?

MR. YOUNGBLOOD: Good evening, my name is William Youngblood, land surveyor for the applicant, before you we have an existing lot which is in the town. Our proposal is to subdivide it into two lots which will accommodate two single family dwellings. The property is on the west side of Mailler on the south side of Academy where the main intersection of Academy and State Route 218, current lot has an existing one and half story frame dwelling as well as a one story garage, both of these structures are planned to be removed, they are in disrepair, they are too close to the road and so on. There's also an existing driveway entrance which accesses off Academy Avenue extension which we plan top remove that as well, we feel that it is a safety hazard, it's a not a proper place to have a driveway entrance with a curb cut, there's too many roads coming together at that point. Our proposal is to access both of the lots off of Mailler Avenue and proposed driveways will be far south or west from the intersection of Academy and Mailler to allow for proper ingress egress and sight distance for anybody who's making a right turn onto Mailler heading south, we don't want to have a conflict so we tried to pull as far south as possible. Again, this lot is serviced by all municipal utilities as far as sewer, water and gas so there will be no sanitary disposal system proposed, no well proposed, we'd be utilizing all the existing infrastructure currently on Mailler. We're not going out on Academy, we want to utilize all the existing stuff on Mailler. What we have done is that in the last work shop the consultants had asked us for a road dedication, currently the deed reads to the center line of Mailler Avenue. What we have done is we have gone ahead and we have taken the road dedication back to where the current designated street line or the

right-of-way line is. I had prepared a metes and bounds description for that particular dedication. I have one more to do because at the workshop it was asked that if we would give a dedication along Academy extension as well because the deed, the description and the property line extends into the traveled way of Academy extension, so we moved the proposed property line five feet south of the existing traveled way of Academy extension so there will be a second dedication that would be gratuitously dedicated to the Town of Cornwall. We meet all the current bulk requirements. There will be no variances required. This property is currently in the SR-2 zone, use group C and again the two lots both meet all the bulk requirements for all, for everything in this zone. Again, we're proposing single family homes and there's been no amount of trees that are going to be removed, they are indicated with an X shown on the legend. The property has no wetlands that are mapped, I physically did the work myself, there's no plants that are indigenous, no wetlands, it's a very nice lot. We believe that our project is going to enhance the corner and there's a lot of traffic, it's a partial gateway to the downtown area. The existing house there is in a bit of disrepair, somewhat run down and again it's only five feet off the curbed right-of-way line and I think it will enhance that whole traffic flow at that intersection.

MR. NOVESKY: Very good.

MR. YOUNGBLOOD: That's basically it in a nutshell.

MR. NOVESKY: Thank you. Consultant number 1? We'll go with our comments from our consultants.

MR. COCKS: We had no further comments. We have referred this to the Orange County Planning Department on April 24, we haven't had a response yet to date so we're waiting for that but other than that they have

addressed all our previous comments.

MR. NOVESKY: Thank you. Consultant number 2?

MR. EDSALL: Comment 1 I agree with Bill, some of the benefits from the subdivision include driveway location, it definitely is an improvement both safety and functionally for the individual residents. Comment 2 there's some minor corrections that need to be accomplished. There's no need for a SWPPP because it's well less than the five acres. Four, a reminder that we need to send this to the village water department so they can review the water connections, also town highway. And last but not less coordinating the new 911 address numbers with our building inspector, all minor comments. My suggestion is you authorize the public hearing for next month.

MR. NOVESKY: Thank you. Dominic, any additional comments?

MR. CORDISCO: That was going to be my recommendation as well.

MR. NOVESKY: Members of the board any comments?

MR. KLOSKY: No.

MR. GRABE: No.

MR. GOLD: No.

MR. BRODMERKEL: No.

MR. NOVESKY: With that then I'll take a motion to schedule a public hearing next month.

MR. KLOSKY: So moved.

MR. GOLD: Second it.

May 4, 2009

7

ROLL CALL

MR. BRODMERKEL	AYE
MR. GOLD	AYE
MR. KLOSKY	AYE
MR. GRABE	AYE
MR. NOVESKY	AYE

MR. YOUNGBLOOD: Thank you very much.

NEW_YORK_MILITARY_ACADEMY_#2009-04

MR. NOVESKY: Project 2009-04 New York State Military Academy lot line change and two lot subdivision.

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

MR. DEKAY: I'm Dick DeKay representing New York Military Academy and the contract purchaser, Raymond Yannone. What I have done here is submit the same plan we had before but we've incorporated the changes and recommendations that the engineer asked for from our last meeting. We have also added a site plan for sheet number 4 which shows the building that's known as the Donaldson plot if you recall and it says on the plan that it is been in continuous just since 1931. We have also added on there pertinent notes as far as environmental things like the fabricated silt fence and the construction specifications. We also added profiles of the driveways and we reconfigured the parking around the Donaldson House and we also show a computation on sheet 2 I believe it is, yeah, sheet 2 has the computation on it for the amount of land, excuse me, sheet number 3 has the computation on it for the area disturbance which was asked for by the town engineer and the area to be reclaimed by pavement removal, there's the difference there is only about 5,000 square feet. The only thing that's not shown on this plan on section, on page 2 or page 3 it shows the lot lines is the negotiation with Mr. Wood, the adjacent owner whose property line is only 3 1/2 feet off his house, that has not been finalized with Mr. Wood yet but that would be part of the final submission to give him, not to give him, to provide for him a small piece of land, lot number 1 is the largest lot and it has several thousand square feet extra in it so we can spare a little bit along his property line to widen out his postage stamp lot that he has. What else do you want me to add here? I think maybe the thing we

should talk about if anything is the site plan. We show a total of 16 parking places, including a handicapped parking spot for the Donaldson lot that's on the site plan map and I believe we show all the details that are required for that plan.

MR. NOVESKY: Okay, Mr. DeKay, since I think this is going to be a referral, I think maybe I'll open it up for discussion for comments from the consultants.

MR. COCKS: Yes, this is going to need a front yard variance for lots 1 and 3, that's for the Donaldson lot, then there's also just a question of what the use group for the Donaldson lot is, the applicant currently is listed under group C which is residential, it could also be group K which is accessory so I'm not sure if the board wants to discuss which use group this would be. I think it would affect the ZBA determination of the actual dimensions for the variances.

MR. NOVESKY: Okay.

MR. DEKAY: Can I speak to what he just said?

MR. NOVESKY: Please.

MR. DEKAY: I'm 76 years old now, that property has been in use years before I was born and what you see here on these plans is existing homes that have been in present use along with the driveway, the present driveway that comes in. I would ask since these were built many years ago that the planning board waive the requirement for a variance because this is an unusual situation because of the existing homes and the property lines keeping in mind that the zoning was passed long after these buildings were built there was not zoning restrictions.

MR. NOVESKY: Dominic, can you set us on the right track so we can nip that one right in the bud?

MR. CORDISCO: Well, I agree that they are pre-existing but the fact what triggers the need for the variance is the fact that you're before the board asking for subdivision approval at this point so that's a variance as I understand it for front yard setbacks for lot 1, lots 3 and 4 as they exist right now, they don't need any variances but to carve additional lots out of this property is going to trigger the need to go to the zoning board.

MR. NOVESKY: Okay.

MR. DEKAY: There's no appeal of that, I mean, I'm thinking of the time element involved, we're trying to accommodate NYMA and go through with the process, you know.

MR. NOVESKY: We recognize I think the desire to accommodate but I think that we would, if I as chairman I would defer to the legal advice of our counsel and I will ask for a--

MR. KLOSKY: Certainly, the property is salable in its current state and you're asking to change the state prior to sale so there's relief there.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Which variance are we talking about so I'm sure?

MR. COCKS: Front yard variance for lots 1, 3 and 4.

MR. NOVESKY: One is on Main, 3 and 4 are on Academy or 218.

MR. BRODMERKEL: There's nothing existing on 1?

MR. DEKAY: The existing houses are on 3, 4 and 5.

MR. BRODMERKEL: I agree.

MR. DEKAY: Can't possibly be lot 1, there's no house on lot 1 and that conforms with all the zoning.

MR. NOVESKY: So the issue is lot 5, 4 and 3 is it?

MR. BRODMERKEL: No, 3 and 4 is that correct?

MR. DEKAY JR.: Lot 3 has gotten larger, lot 3 is larger.

MR. YANNONE: If we don't disturb lot 3 and leave it as it is then a variance would not be required for lot 3?

MR. NOVESKY: I will defer to our legal counsel first.

MR. DEKAY: Yeah, that's on sheet one if you look on sheet one it shows the property before subdivision. But it's a postage stamp lot that we're making larger.

MR. BRODMERKEL: I'm trying to come to an understanding here.

MR. CORDISCO: It may very well be getting larger but the question is whether or not it complies with the existing zoning for that zone.

MR. YANNONE: But the question I have for you would be if Donaldson Hall was sold as a house, it's on an existing lot right now, it's considered a home and it's not being used for its current use.

MR. CORDISCO: Those are several assumptions that I'm not willing to make.

MR. YANNONE: But it's on its own lot.

MR. CORDISCO: I agree that it's on its own lot but not being used as a residence.

MR. YANNONE: If it, if the New York Military Academy decided to sell that as a single-family home they could do that today, is that correct? It's on its own lot, if it was used but could it be sold as one is what I'm asking?

MR. VINSON: Not in its present condition, you must apply for a permit, make changes to that building that makes it a single-family home, once you have a C.O. for a single-family home then we can entertain that.

MR. YANNONE: But it's on its own lot is my point I'm trying to make.

MR. VINSON: What's the lot size of the lot?

MR. YANNONE: But it's existing.

MR. VINSON: Don't have a map, what's the lot size?

MR. BRODMERKEL: Does it matter, Gary?

MR. VINSON: Yes, if it's not 20,000 square foot then it doesn't meet the requirements of a single family lot.

MR. YANNONE: Either it's a single family lot or commercial use, it's preexisting, we have to take one position or the other, I'm trying to hone in on the most direct route.

MR. CORDISCO: To be honest right now Donaldson House is being used solely accessory to any use, it doesn't have its own separate distinct use at all is part of the problem, we talked about that last month as well.

MR. YANNONE: So my question again would be we have a single-family house on a non-conforming lot, it's already there, it's pre-existing, it's by itself.

MR. CORDISCO: Which house is this?

MR. YANNONE: This would be 153-2, we have Donaldson Hall which let's set its use aside for a moment, it's on a separate lot so if we leave these two parcels assuming we can come up with a permitted use for Donaldson Hall as they are and only have the address 153-1 then we're only talking about a front yard for 153-1 at this point.

MR. EDSALL: That's assuming you're not putting a private road in.

MR. YANNONE: 153-2 is already on its own.

MR. EDSALL: But the front yard condition is being created since the private road creates a corner lot.

MR. YANNONE: So it doesn't even need one, if we came up with a different access point for these two lots if we can come up with another way to access these lots Mr. Wood wants some portion of our property.

MR. VINSON: The board will entertain it, we'll entertain it at a workshop, this is a forum to discuss the plans that were submitted. If you're talking about revisions and modification we would ask that you come to the workshop and we'll be glad to without being pressured on the spot trying to give an answer cause you're in a rush.

MR. YANNONE: I'm just trying to understand what triggers the variance here.

MR. EDSALL: The creation of the private road creates corner lot issues, that's number one, the point being can you eliminate all the variances. If you can't, then you maybe want to consider going to the zoning board with maybe more than one variance but saying this is the best layout for the future, they may be

interested in dealing with more than one variance if it's a better plan, that's a consideration you should think about. Reducing the number of variances doesn't always give you the best plan.

MR. YANNONE: Okay.

MR. VINSON: At least take the referral when you leave tonight.

MR. YANNONE: Yeah, sure.

MR. EDSALL: You could go to the zoning board, they could say we'd rather give you three variances and have a good plan and if they don't agree then you say well, what would you entertain and come back with an alternate plan, I don't know if you can avoid the ZBA, if you can, we'll go over it at the workshop.

MR. YANNONE: I just wanted to understand what triggered the variances, that's all.

MR. NOVESKY: Okay.

MR. DEKAY: The town created the variances per your zoning, NYMA didn't, the houses were built 78 years ago.

MR. NOVESKY: I'm not going to debate the legalities of it, Mr. Cordisco's our able legal advisor, we'll defer.

MR. CORDISCO: If you want to further review it and minimize what variances they need because of changes to the plan we can talk about that at the workshop.

MR. NOVESKY: Right.

MR. BRODMERKEL: If they don't modify the current lots that are there then they don't have to go for variances, is that a correct statement?

MR. CORDISCO: It sounds correct but I'd be hesitant to make that conclusion here until we see the revised plans.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Understood.

MR. YANNONE: One last question.

MR. CORDISCO: Depends on whether the new lots or the existing lots are going to front on the private road.

MR. YANNONE: Just one last question, the current access is through that same drive as what we're considering the private road, wouldn't that be considered a pre-existing access point, you know, we have three, basically three residences that were currently using that and have been for many, many years.

MR. CORDISCO: I think we should talk about that at the workshop, that way we can look at the plans.

MR. NOVESKY: I'll ask for a motion to refer to the ZBA.

MR. GOLD: So moved.

MR. GRABE: Second it.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Discussion? I don't know if they want to go to the Zoning Board of Appeals, I don't know if they're ready.

MR. EDSALL: Gives them the opportunity if they want to.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Just a discussion.

MR. NOVESKY: Dom, is it safer to do this now so that

if they want to go they can?

MR. CORDISCO: Well, I think the risk is you certainly can refer them to the ZBA now and the zoning board application is going to be whatever variances that they need, they don't have to go basically if they change something I think however I would add that the record is not entirely clear, the zoning board I do know does read your minutes, certainly their attorney reads your minutes and then advises the board about that. So at this point, it's not entirely clear what variances that they need because there may be changes to the plan but they also might not want to wait another month in order to come back to this board, say these are the variances we absolutely now know we need.

MR. BRODMERKEL: If they take the plans as they exist today they need front yard variances.

MR. CORDISCO: Yes.

MR. NOVESKY: That's what we're here to consider. I have a second. All in favor?

ROLL CALL

MR. BRODMERKEL	AYE
MR. GOLD	AYE
MR. KLOSKY	AYE
MR. GRABE	AYE
MR. NOVESKY	AYE

MR. KLOSKY: Yeah, I would only point out a couple of things first is that I believe the plan generally cleans up what is a somewhat difficult lot if it's accomplished as is so I don't mean to come out as being opposed to the overall concept of the plan. However, I am very curious and will likely be insistent that we match up the occupancy of the stone building with the available parking through the use of same. So if the

occupancy of the stone building is 80 persons then you need to meet the parking requirements for an occupancy of 80 persons if you want to access it, if you want to meet that parking area access by having people park on the NYMA property across the street that's been going on for a long time anyway, if we can do that safely I'll need to have that demonstrated that we're going to be able to safely cross the street at night after functions going on in their structure. So that's my only main safety concern, I don't want to see somebody leaving the facility trying to cross the street to the parking and they get run over by a car. There needs to be a crosswalk or perhaps a streetlight or I don't know what the best way to go forward with that is.

MR. DEKAY: This has been going on for many years.

MR. KLOSKY: I would ask you to talk to our team through the workshops, I think that Mark's got probably the most expertise in this area so I'd ask him to talk to you about how best to accommodate that remote parking.

MR. NOVESKY: That's a state highway, there may be issues with DOT on that so Mark has some answers that he may need satisfied. Sir, you can make a comment?

CAPTAIN WATTS: In short time that I've been at NYMA I've sent two letters to the Department of Transportation asking them for a crosswalk and light and both times they refused.

MR. NOVESKY: If we can get a copy of this letter.

MR. BRODMERKEL: That may be all we need.

CAPTAIN WATTS: I have that.

MR. NOVESKY: Thank you. Mark?

MR. EDSALL: We can send a letter that it's a concern of the planning board if you have the Donaldson Hall building as an accessory building to the main site, the planning board can go on record saying they believe the appropriately designated crosswalk should be provided that may lead to another issue I just want to make clear on the record is the, for convenience when and we discussed this with the applicant at the workshop we're going to be splitting the applications to a subdivision application which is the 09-04 and a site plan application which will deal solely with the Donaldson Hall lot that's going to be designated as 09-07, that's purely for file separation, the applicant has agreed and I can be corrected if I misunderstood that all buildings will go through the original application number just to keep the records separate so that 10 years from now we don't have to mix subdivision and site plans so with the applicant here I'm assuming they are concurring.

MR. DEKAY: Yes.

MR. NOVESKY: Just trying to make it as smooth as possible.

MR. KLOSKY: My specific concern is that once we sort of approve the Donaldson building as being 16 spaces for however many square feet are there that becomes acceptable.

MR. CORDISCO: We talked about that last month as well, it's my understanding that the applicant NYMA is willing to work on a declaration of restrictions that would be recorded in the chain of title so that anyone who will be purchasing Donaldson Hall in the future would understand that they would need to obtain separate approval for any use of that particular building because right now it's solely accessory to any mass use it doesn't exist as its own separate entity or separate use or lot.

MR. KLOSKY: If somebody wanted to open that up as a restaurant or catering hall in the future and that was separate from the NYMA operation then they would have to obtain site plan approval from us before undertaking that change.

MR. CORDISCO: The answer to that is yes, so if someone was to buy that lot tomorrow they'd have to do that, the fact of putting a declaration in is so that there will be no question that whoever was going to buy that lot would understand that they would need to get separate approval.

MR. KOLSKY: I'm much more comfortable with the idea of remote parking across the street.

MR. EDSALL: We put a lot of thought so when you create site plan approval we don't want to have the lot sold with a parking deficiency that would get segmented from the main property, so having a map note and recorded instrument would lock it tight.

MR. NOVESKY: Thank you very much.

MR. DEKAY: Thank you.

MR. GOLD: Dominic, that would be, we could make that as a condition of our approval?

MR. CORDISCO: Correct, condition.

MR. GOLD: Thank you.

MR. YANNONE: The application now for the variances because we're splitting files do we need to make two separate applications?

MR. VINSON: Make an application for each parcel.

MR. YANNONE: So it would be three applications?

MR. VINSON: If you have three parcels then there's an application for whatever parcel you're going with.

MR. YANNONE: But they'll be viewed as a single when they vote because one variance without the others would be--

MR. VINSON: You'll have to talk to the planning board.

MR. CORDISCO: This will be treated as one.

MR. DEKAY: Thank you very much.

THE_ARC_OF_LEARNING_#2009-06

MR. NOVESKY: Arc of Learning.

Mr. Peter Manouvelos, RA from Lan Associates appeared before the board for this proposal.

MR. MANOUVELOS: Good evening, my Peter Manouvelos from Lan Associates representing Miss Jackie Hernandez this evening, Little Lamb Daycare Center, we have an existing lot at 1641 Route 32. The lot is zoned as a--

MR. KLOSKY: Can somebody help me out with where it is?

MR. VINSON: Just near the entrance to Star there's a green building, Masonic Temple.

MR. KLOSKY: Generally when you zoom out this far with the location map.

MR. MANOUVELOS: This is the actual copy of your zoning map and I tried to use that as a reference because it had the other zones to it.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Gary, I'd like to go along with what Led is saying, you have to be the cop in this case and if you can look at this and read where that is you're a better man than I am. I'm asking you to be fussier about this kind of thing because sitting here once I got here somebody told me this was the old Grange Hall then I knew where it was.

MR. MANOUVELOS: I will correct that at the next submission, that will be corrected, I apologize. We have a lot that requires 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 variances because it's an existing lot non-conforming to the existing code. So we're here before you tonight to get referred to the Zoning Board and to move this proposal forward.

May 4, 2009

22

MR. NOVESKY: Prior to any further discussion on the project, why don't we consider the request for referral then you can ask questions?

MR. GOLD: I will move that we refer to the ZBA,

MR. GRABE: Second it.

ROLL CALL

MR. BRODMERKEL	AYE
MR. GOLD	AYE
MR. KLOSKY	AYE
MR. GRABE	AYE
MR. NOVESKY	AYE

MR. COCKS: Should they declare lead agency?

MR. CORDISCO: Yes.

MR. COCKS: That's historic so SHPO has to be involved.

MR. MANOUVELOS: Yes and we're going to be filing with SHPO and also have a long EAF form if you want that tonight it's one or two questions are incomplete because we haven't completed the investigative but I will submit it tonight.

MR. COCKS: That's fine, so I think it would be a good idea for the board to declare their intent for lead agency then this will get sent to SHPO.

MR. BRODMERKEL: So moved.

MR. WYNN: Second it.

ROLL CALL

MR. BRODMERKEL	AYE
MR. GOLD	AYE

MR. KLOSKY AYE
MR. GRABE AYE
MR. NOVESKY AYE

MR. NOVESKY: Any other things?

MR. EDSALL: I have a couple comments I will share with the applicant relative to additional information should they be successful at the Zoning Board and return.

MR. MANOUVELOS: I don't understand the last one if you can elaborate on that.

MR. EDSALL: Last comment is relative to circulation, the plan depicts a one-way counterclockwise movement through the site with pavement arrows I assume.

MR. MANOUVELOS: Yes.

MR. EDSALL: I sincerely doubt very much that the pavement arrows will have any affect whatsoever on traffic movement without signage, without curb alignments, I think people--

MR. MANOUVELOS: We would include signage, the curb cuts are existing so--

MR. EDSALL: Exactly my point being is that generally in this area Route 32 people have one goal in mind, get off the highway so we should give some thought between now and when you come back to the simplest way and whether or not one-way traffic is preferred whether or not two-way traffic if there's room for it.

MR. MANOUVELOS: It's also a requirement for a daycare center to have one way traffic in the regulations so that's another reason why it's--

MR. EDSALL: That's a dropoff and being that you have an existing site I don't know if we want to try to

hammer a round peg into a square hole, so you may want to think about that. I don't think the one-way traffic is going to work if you don't change the configuration of the curb cuts and provide a lot of signage. That's just an opinion.

MR. MANOUVELOS: Okay.

MR. EDSALL: I think we should give that a little more thought but the ZBA is first round.

MR. NOVESKY: Thank you.

MILL_POND

MR. NOVESKY: I have one additional item on the agenda which I neglected in my pile of mail, we have a request from Mill Pond subdivision requesting extension of preliminary approval.

MR. CORDISCO: Just came in today's packet.

MR. NOVESKY: Okay, Dominic, should we consider this?

MR. CORDISCO: Yes, absolutely, the board had previously granted preliminary approval to Mill Pond subdivision and that's valid for six months and you can renew it, there's no limitations on your renewals, the misunderstanding is that they have petitioned now to the Town Board for the formation of the drainage districts and the extension of the sewer, both are required so they are actually doing what they need to do in order to come back for final approval so I think that the board should grant them their request.

MR. EDSALL: Yes, they are still working with us, we're discussing the off-site pump station, they are trying to cooperate with us. So I think there's real activity so I'd suggest you grant the six month extension.

MR. NOVESKY: That in mind.

MR. KLOSKY: So moved.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Second it.

MR. CORDISCO: If I may just so the record is clear the request was so that their extension would run from the June meeting.

MR. NOVESKY: June 2 until December 2, I'm sorry, I didn't say that, the extension granted would run from June 2 to December 2, we had a motion and a second and

May 4, 2009

26

can I just have an all in favor?

ROLL CALL

MR. BRODMERKEL	AYE
MR. GOLD	AYE
MR. KLOSKY	AYE
MR. GRABE	AYE
MR. NOVESKY	AYE

MR. NOVESKY: With that, motion to adjourn.

MR. BRODMERKEL: So moved.

MR. WYNN: Second it.

ROLL CALL

MR. BRODMERKEL	AYE
MR. GOLD	AYE
MR. KLOSKY	AYE
MR. GRABE	AYE
MR. NOVESKY	AYE

Respectfully Submitted By:

Frances Roth
Stenographer