

Minutes of the Planning Board Meeting held by the Town of LaFayette Planning Board on June 21, 2005 in the Meeting Room of the LaFayette Commons Office Building at 2577 Route 11 in the Town of LaFayette at 7:00 PM.

**Present: James Nakas, Chairman
Andrew Peebles, Member
Richard Markoff, Member
Brad Bush, Member
Shawn Adam, Alt. Member**

Absent: Barbara Lasky, Member

Recording Secretary, Peggy Sutton

**Others present: John Langey, Planning Board Attorney
John Dunkle, Town Engineer
Joseph Jerry, 120 E. Washington St.
Jeffrey Cohen, Applicant
Ed Keplinger, Developer
Ann Chase, JRPA
Steve Chase, JRPA
Lynn Hutton, Applicant
Herb Brodt, Applicant
Steve Forward, Applicant
Dennis Maher, Applicant
Kyle LaTay, JRPA
Ann & Steve Chase, JRPA
David Broda, JRPA
Paula Naselli, JRPA
Rick Haskins, JRPA
Sheila Harrington, JRPA
Karen & Jim Brower, JRPA
Craig Fox, Applicant
Frank Mt. Pleasant, Jamesville
Tim Brayman, JRPA,
Kristin Kern, JRPA
Bonnie Seeman, JRPA
Jim McKeever, Post Standard
Liah Race**

Chairman Nakas called the meeting to order at 7: 10 PM and welcomed everyone.

Chairman Nakas asked if there were any changes to the April 19, 2005 minutes as submitted by the secretary. Member Bush said the Minutes should be corrected to read Lynn Hutton's subdivision Case # 348 was approved along with the cul-de-sac variance. The minutes were accepted as amended.

CASE # 353 - Application from Herbert Brodt for a 2 lot subdivision of his property located on the west side of Webb Rd. approximately ¼ mile from the Route 20 and Webb Rd. intersection in an Agricultural/Residential District. (Tax Map No. 's 020.-08-06.0 & 020.-08-07.0).

Herb Brodt submitted his survey.

John Dunkle said the applicant should be sure the whole septic system is on the parcel.

John Laney said the applicant must get the driveway cut approval from the D.O.T.

Mary Jo Kelly advised County Planning said they will not accept the submitted survey as it is incomplete.

Chairman Nakas said the applicant should be sure to follow the survey regulations or County Planning will refuse it.

Herb Brodt asked the soonest he can get this subdivision approved.

Chairman Nakas said August.

CASE # 354 - Application of Stephen Forward and Dennis Maher for a 4-lot subdivision of their property located on the west side of Naughton Rd. approximately ¼ mile north of the Route 20 and Naughton Rd. intersection in an Agricultural/Residential District. (Tax Map No. 's 20.-07-02 and 20.-07-05.5).

Steve Forward and Dennis Maher were present. They submitted their survey map dated April 29, 2005, and prepared by Land Lines Surveying, P.C.

Member Peebles asked if all the lots will be accessed off of Naughton Rd.

Steve Forward said yes.

Chairman Nakas said the applicant will need driveway approvals from the D.O.T.

Steve Forward said perk tests have been done.

Chairman Nakas said the surveyor should also provide the applicant with a septic design for each lot.

John Langey said this subdivision needs a name.

Steve Forward said the name is Naughton Road Subdivision.

Chairman Nakas said approval boxes will be needed on the map.

John Langey said there needs to be a signature line for the owner, the town and the Health Dept.

Chairman Nakas asked for the wetlands to be marked on the map. He said to be sure the survey does everything in the subdivision regulations for the map.

The applicant advised there are no plans for Lot. No. 5.

This will be scheduled for a public hearing in July.

CASE # 341 - Continuation of referral review for Town Board for application of CRAM Communications, LLC for construction of towers on their property located approximately 1600' north of the Webb Rd. and Groth Rd. intersection in an Industrial District. (Tax Map No.'s 025-05-12.2 & 025-05-14)

Craig Fox was present.

Chairman Nakas said this is a referral from the Town Board. The Planning Board has been asked to review the application and make a recommendation to the Town Board. He said the Planning Board received a report from Mullaney Engineering, Inc., out of Maryland dated June 9, 2005. They state "The proposed operation of WVOA will have no impact on the communication tower users as long as good engineering practices are followed concerning the installation of the equipment..." In 2004 the Planning Board made recommendations to the Town Board. About 1 year later, Mr. Fox responded to the Planning Board's concerns. In the report by Mullaney Engineering, Inc., they discuss the radio frequencies and radio frequency interference to the town tower. They conclude there's very little chance that Mr. Fox's towers will interfere with the town's tower and its tenants. They advise the radio tower will not bother the cell tower. They did advise there is a better chance that the cell tower will interfere with Mr. Fox's radio towers and they recommend detuning the town cell tower. He asked if all detuning expenses would be paid by the applicant.

John Langey said the recommendation could be that the Planning Board recommends the applicant be allowed to erect the towers but would be responsible for the cost of detuning the town cell tower and if the town should put up future towers, the applicant would be responsible for the cost of detuning those towers as well.

Member Markoff asked about interference with AM radio stations.

Craig Fox said you would have to be right next to his towers for interference.

John Langey asked if when the applicant gets the F.C.C. permit, do they look at other radio operators?

Craig Fox said they look at everything. They look at any wireless services in a certain area and they are responsible to provide filters if needed. They have agreed to do this beyond the required distance if anyone has any problems.

Member Markoff asked if the towers would have an effect on car radios traveling on Route 81.

Craig Fox said if you are listening to something out of Rochester or Cortland, the towers might interfere as you drive by them.

Member Peebles said the report discusses a detuning skirt on the tower. This is the only area it makes reference to our tower being impacted.

John Langey said the detuning would be inside the tower, not on the outside.

Member Peebles asked if the detuning skirt will work for the applicant.

Craig Fox said absolutely.

The Board reviewed the long E.A.F.

John Langey said the applicant did complete a long E.A.F. He noted the

board determined this was an unlisted action at a previous meeting. He reminded the board that it is the lead agency at the request of the Town Board. He asked if the Board was ready to make a determination on the environmental impact of this project.

Chairman Nakas believes one topic of concern is the aesthetics. The view of these towers by all the people traveling on Route 81 and the people living in LaFayette.

John Langey said the applicant has mentioned that the towers would be in an area zoned Industrial which allows towers and there is nothing to be done about the appearance of the towers.

John Dunkle asked what if the Board determines this to be significant?

John Langey said if the board deems it to be significant and the applicant can't mitigate it and the applicant had done everything within his power to mitigate it and if the Board tells him they feel it will have a really bad effect on aesthetics and tells him how to try to find a way to mitigate it, the applicant has given an explanation of why this is the way it is.

John Dunkle said the applicant said the aesthetics can't be mitigated and the applicant has explained why in his documents presented to the Board to try to help it make a determination. John reviewed his letter to the Board dated June 21, 2005. The letter offered comments upon his review of Mullaney Engineering's report.

John Langey reviewed his memo to the Board dated June 21, 2005, in which he condensed the highlights of this application for the past two years.

Craig Fox said the temporary tower has been removed.

Chairman Nakas noted this was a recommendation from County Planning.

Member Bush asked if there are any provisions by the F.A.A. regarding towers having to be taken down when they are no longer being used.

Craig Fox said no.

Member Markoff suggested putting in a stipulation that if the towers aren't used for a certain period of time, they should be taken down at a cost to the applicant.

Chairman Nakas said he looks at the bonding as an insurance policy for the town. He recommends that the applicant continue to look for some type of bonding.

Craig Fox said he has researched this and can't find any.

Chairman Nakas recommended the condition that the towers shall not be left unused for a period not to exceed 2 years of if they don't maintain their F.C.C. license, the towers must be removed.

Craig Fox said he understands this. From their standpoint, to maintain the bond is kind of a waste of money.

Member Markoff understands this but from the towns standpoint, we don't want to be left having to remove the towers.

John Langey said at this point it's only a recommendation to the Town Board.

Member Bush doesn't see the need to have bonding. He asked the annual cost to maintain the towers including insurance and everything.

Craig Fox said about \$40,000.

Member Peebles is in favor of the bonding. This is a business venture and the

only reason he is in favor of the bonding here is because we have noted the towers have an environmental impact on the community. He would like the town to have a way to relieve the impact.

Chairman Nakas asked John Dunkle for his input regarding the bond.

John Dunkle said bonds are usually required for things used by the public.

John Langey noted this originally was recommended by County Planning. He leaves it up to the Board on whether or not they want to recommend this to the Town Board. It doesn't mean the Town Board will approve it.

Chairman Nakas and Members Markoff, Peebles and Adam were in favor of bonding. Member Bush was not.

It was decided to leave it in the Planning Board's recommendation to the Town Board.

John Langey said debris removal should be a recommendation too. He would suggest attaching John Dunkle's letter of June 21, 2005 to the recommendation.

After review of the submittals and upon the motion of Chairman Nakas, seconded by Member Bush the Planning Board having discussed the application is now prepared to provide the following resolution with its comments and recommendations with respect to the said application. The recommendations are as follows:

- 1) That Cram be required to enter into an agreement with the Town stating that it will supply and install such filtering devices as necessary upon request.**
- 2) That the applicant submit in writing an acceptable and proper maintenance schedule for all portions of the facilities and the towers and keep a copy of same on file with the Town Clerk.**
- 3) That designs that comply with all requirements for structures of their type and stamped by a professional engineer licensed and recognized by the State of New York be submitted and reviewed by the towns consulting engineer prior to the issuance of a building permit.**
- 4) That the town engineer confirm statements made by the applicant through reference to the detailed site plans submitted with regard to the danger of a tower break and the impact on neighboring properties that the towers are proposed to be well within the boundaries of the property line such that if a fall did occur it would be within the boundaries of the property and sufficient distance from Route 81.**
- 5) That the Town Board require the applicant to post and maintain the Reclamation/Deconstruction Bond sufficient to remove all six permanent towers and further recommends that a condition be in place that the towers be removed if not used for two (2) years or if the applicants license expires or becomes invalid for any reason.**
- 6) That the final site plan provide specific detail for fencing for each tower and all the guy wire anchors supporting each tower.**
- 7) That a copy of the Mullaney Engineering Inc.'s report be provided**

to the town’s current tenants for their review and comment prior to any final approval by the Town Board.

- 8) That the consulting engineer, Mullaney Engineering Inc.’s June 9, 2005 recommendations be adopted and that a written agreement between the Town and the developer be executed as a condition to final approval of the proposed site plan. The proposed agreement would encompass both the Town’s current tower and any future towers, as well as any future tenants on the current or future towers and provide that Cram shall take at Cram’s sole cost and expense all mean as necessary to internally detune said towers and future towers and arrays with no disruption to the Town’s towers or tenants. Additionally, the agreement would cover maintenance for the detuning skirt apparatus during the life of all WVOA tower.**
- 9) That the Town Board adopt the recommendation of the Town’s consulting engineer (Mullaney Engineering Inc.) that the agreement include an ongoing commitment of WVOA to maintain the detuning apparatus at its’ sole expense and responsibility.**
- 10) It is further recommended that any approval of the proposed site plan reference the specific drawings and site plan documents.**
- 11) That the Town Board require the applicant to provide correspondence from each of the existing town telecommunication towers’ tenants affirmatively indicating that it is each tenant’s understanding that the town’s granting of site plan approval will not be a violation of their lease with the town. Additionally, such correspondence should affirmatively state that each tenant is satisfied with the Town’s obligations under the leases between the Town and the tenant with regard to the proposed WVOA towers.**
- 12) That a storm water prevention plan application has been submitted and the applicant should be required to demonstrate to the Town Board a full up-to0date permit from all appropriate agencies.**
- 13) That any approval be condition upon the applicant agreeing to remove all debris now present in and around the proposed site insofar as the applicant has acknowledged that there has been significant clear cutting on the premises and that such clear cut materials have been piled in various locations upon the premises.**

Voting on the above resolution was as follows:

Chairman Nakas	Yes
Member Peebles	Yes
Member Markoff	Yes
Member Bush	Yes
Alt. Member Adam	Yes

Motion passed unanimously.

CASE # 331 - Continuation of application for a subdivision by Jeffrey

Cohen consisting of 8 lots on his property located at 4065 Route 91 approximately 1 ¼ mile south of the Route 91 and Route 173 intersection on the west side of Route 91 in an Agricultural/Residential District. (Tax Map No.'s 001.-05-14.1 & 001.-05-14.2)

Chairman Nakas said the Board has two critiques. One is from John Langey and the other is from John Dunkle.

Joseph Jerry said John Dunkle provided them with a copy of his written remarks today. They have responded in writing and the responses have been submitted tonight. They would like the Board, as a result of the comments the Board will hear from their attorney and engineer, consider the FEIS received and complete. They have two requests. They have been able to totally discredit the County Planning Board's recommendation to this Planning Board and they have discredited them by virtue of the fact that their never was nor is there now any question about the land ownership. They would like the County Planning Board to have the opportunity to retract their recommendation for denial. They request a formal resolution referring this back to County Planning. He will personally make himself available at that County Planning Board Meeting. The other request they have is if the Planning Board could call a Special Meeting after the July 5th County Planning Board Meeting and before the next Town Planning Board Meeting to receive and declare the FEIS as final. They don't want to loose another building season.

Chairman Nakas doesn't see a problem with submitting this to County Planning again

John Langey said regarding the issue of the Blue Line lands, he would recommend the amended copy of the subdivision map be submitted back to OGS who would reference the date and note none of the lands are in dispute by OGS.

Ed Keplinger showed John Langey a section of the FEIS that refers to the land ownership.

John Langey said the letter he is looking for from OGS is within the FEIS.

Chairman Nakas noted the Board is in receipt of the responses to John Dunkle's concerns. He asked John Langey if he had any comments.

John Langey said the one comment regarding ownership of the Blue Line has been resolved. The other concern he has is that in one part of the FEIS they say the town will be taking responsibility for the drainage regarding future maintenance and repair. There was discussion at the last meeting regarding a district being formed of the people living in that area to cover the maintenance costs, etc. for this.

Joseph Jerry thinks this is out of order. The applicant will object. There is no precedent in this county regarding a drainage district. They will go before the Town Board and object to this. He believes it's out of order to discuss this with the Planning Board at this time.

John Langey said one of the things in the FEIS is a statement that says (page 14) "The Detention Basins and/or Water Quality Basins would be maintained by the Town of LaFayette Highway Department after acceptance." That would be a general town expense. Later on in the FEIS (page 23) it states "Will the Developer agree to the formation of a drainage district for the creation of same and charge back on

operation and maintenance?” This was a question to the Developer in a letter from John Langey dated May 5, 2005. On page 23 of the FEIS the response to this question is “The applicant will agree to a drainage district if the town requires the formation of a drainage district as part of the approval of this action.” Until this moment, he felt they were in favor of this. The Town Board should make a determination of what they would like.

Chairman Nakas said lets leave it up to the applicant to make the pitch to the Town Board. The Planning Board’s recommendation will be that they do form a drainage district.

John Langey said in terms of whether there is precedence for this, what they are proposing is a fairly large drainage area. If they turn this over to the town we don’t know what the maintenance costs will be. The town certainly would be in the position at the beginning of the development to create a drainage district to cover these costs. The town has created districts in the past.

Member Peebles asked how forming a drainage district helps with the costs.

John Langey said the people in that subdivision are responsible for the expenses to maintain the drainage. If the Town Board is in favor of creating a drainage district, we would want to get going now. He would like to do a letter to the Town Board right away recommending the drainage district. This Board will also advise the Town Board that the applicant is not in favor of this.

Joseph Jerry said for an 8-lot subdivision, there really is no precedent for it in this town. They were a little shocked when they started looking into it. Drainage issues should be discussed by the Town Board. He doesn’t know if it’s proper for the Planning Board to make a recommendation when it’s not requested by the Town Board. He would recommend this issue be left before the Town Board. This recommendation is not within the Planning Board’s prevue.

Chairman Nakas asked what if the Planning Board were to make a recommendation to the Town Board that they consider the potential for creating a drainage district and discuss it among themselves and the final decision will be up to them?

John Langey said there’s an issue with that. You have a drainage district being a part of this. You have to do an environmental review. The area of undisturbed lands, includes portions of this drainage area. If the maintenance of the drainage areas is turned over to the town, the town could be responsible for having town vehicles cross the easements on the undisturbed areas without having done an archeological review of the undisturbed land. If a drainage district is approved, a SEQR will be done which requires an archeological review of the easement areas on the undisturbed land. If we are going to do a drainage district, we should do it all together with this.

Joseph Jerry said it’s their belief that they can find a way to contain the easement in such a way they don’t have the archeological involvement. This is something they would be taking up with the town Board. He reiterates that it is improper for this Board to take up an issue that is a Town Board issue. They feel they would be held to an undue precedent. For an 8-lot subdivision, he hasn’t seen this requirement in any town. They don’t feel the Planning Board should make a recommendation to the Town Board.

John Langey said this is an 8-lot subdivision. Two large parcels may be undeveloped. There is concern of segmentation. This Board is going to do everything the right way. This would include the applicant granting us easements over land that has not undergone an archeological review. These are easements over land the applicant has agreed not to develop.

John Dunkle reviewed the easements on the map. As long as we have archeological clearance on the property the easements are on, we should be O.K.

John Langey discussed a drainage district with John Dunkle and asked what the boundaries would be.

John Dunkle would suggest all the property be placed in the district at this time.

John Langey asked if we would have to require an archeological review given the potentiality.

Ed Keplinger said they spoke with Nancy Herter of SHPO today who said if they are not disturbing the land, they don't need an archeological review at this time.

John Langey said whatever the drainage district will be, it should include the lands that will benefit by it.

John Dunkle would like to see some language showing natural drainage ways will be preserved and maintained in their current condition.

John Langey noted 2 of the easements should be removed from the map. He believes the Planning Board should still ask the Town Board if they would like to form a drainage district. He is satisfied with OGS. The applicant must resubmit a new map with the two unnecessary easements removed. We will need a revised subdivision map.

Ed Keplinger said he didn't change any lot lines.

John Langey reviewed the FEIS. He asked about the SHPO letter referencing the footprints.

Ed Keplinger said he spoke to Nancy Herter today and she will be sending a revised letter.

John Langey said with regard to Lot No. 1, is she stating construction is limited to the house location?

Ed Keplinger believes they are limited. He will get some clarification from her on this.

John Langey said the way it reads now is very confusing. There should be a note on the map regarding this.

John Dunkle said if there are restrictions on any of the lots, it should be covered on the map.

Ed Keplinger believes she listed what the significant restriction is. He believes it's on the south end of Lots No. 1 and No. 2.

John Langey said on Page 19, B-1, he was concerned where it reads "When subsequent phases occur at this project site, the archeological resources will be reviewed at that time." There is correspondence from Joseph Jerry that there may not be anything further done in the future. Joseph Jerry has stated there may be future development. He would recommend clarification in this and he would like to know if the applicant intends to develop the undeveloped area. The way it reads, it refers to future development.

Joseph Jerry said there is no intent at this time.

John Langey would have this paragraph modified then. He noted C-9 recommends that there be restrictive covenants and that the owners are on notice they are not to change the grade.

Ed Keplinger said the basins are not on any of the parcels.

John Langey said whoever is the owner, they must be instructed not to change the grade. This should be noted on the map too. Regarding C-11, we need to be clear on whether this is an 8-lot subdivision at this time or a 20-lot buildout being planned. The Highway Superintendent was concerned about flooding in the area.

John Dunkle said he had asked the applicant to respond to this.

Ed Keplinger said their proposed project will mitigate this problem by removing the pipe.

Ann Chase asked if she could say something.

Chairman Nakas said the public hearing has been closed on this.

John Langey noted on page 17 of the FEIS in C-26 they have noted a 20-lot subdivision again. He believes the applicant, again, must continue to state whether this is an 8-lot subdivision or a 20-lot subdivision. There has been a lot of comment and concern that the applicant is looking for something much bigger than the 8-lot subdivision.

Member Peebles asked if it was better to have a build-out plan of a 20-lot subdivision.

John Langey said the problem with discussing the 20 lots is that the critique has been there should be an archeological review of the entire area. The applicant has said they are only looking for an 8-lot subdivision. When we start mixing up the 20 and 8, confusion arises. There has been comments about segmentation. It's up to the Planning Board whether they feel the applicant has addressed this enough. He wants the Board to review if this is an 8-lot subdivision with 2 undeveloped lots that they are not developing at this time. The applicant reserves the right to build the other large parcels out at a future time. The applicant needs to be consistent with their requests.

Member Peebles said at some point the Board needs to address what this could look like down the road.

John Laney said unless they never develop the other 2 lots.

Member Peebles asked what the basis of the Planning Board granting them a waiver on the road is then.

Joseph Jerry said it's a very practical situation. They are essentially saying they have a very valuable property. They ran into archeological concerns. They addressed the concerns for the 8 lots they wish to build on. They must show the 8 lots stand on their own independently right now. They have asked both their archeologist and Nancy Herter of SHPO if one necessitates the archeological study of one based on the other. They feel comfortable right now to say the 2 large parcels can be considered undeveloped, fully recognizing if they do come back to the Planning Board they have to go through the EIS and the whole business. They understand this. They are comfortable with the segmentation issue because they have fully demonstrated that these parcels stand on their own. There is no question

that some time in the future they could come back before the Planning Board. There is no question that the applicant regards the undeveloped land as valuable. A lot depends on how well these lots sell. They want to leave the door open.

Member Peebles said without referencing the 20 lots, a condition could be put in that if anything changes, the cul-de-sac must be modified.

John Dunkle said the basis for the Board waiver must be based on the 8 lots.

John Langey said their argument for the waiver has been approval from the fire department and the school district. For this to go forward, the waiver would have to be granted.

John Langey noted on Page 22, F-2 states “The Town of LaFayette Highway Department will be responsible for maintenance or emergency service after acceptance. Most of the easement area is of sufficient width that maintenance vehicles can travel along side the existing drainageway, if ever required.” Is there a part that is not accessible? Is it because it gets too narrow?

Ed Keplinger said there’s vegetation. They reviewed this on the map.

John Dunkle feels it’s wide enough.

John Langey asked the applicant about their response to F-5 where they agree to a drainage district. Earlier they stated differently. He would like to know where they stand on this. He will send a letter to the Town Board on this. Regarding F-10, OGS as an involved agency. He believes they should be removed from this. He noted on page 27, J-1 states “The details regarding the private easement that will be part of Lot # 8 have not been decided upon yet...” he thought it would be better if it were defined as all 8 lot owners would have access to the water and it would be limited to the owners within the subdivision. The public was concerned that it could become open to people who live offsite.

Joseph Jerry said he discussed this with his client. The easement will be on one private lot. Whether or not the other lot owners are going to have access through that easement, they really don’t know at this time.

John Langey asked if the Board could get a statement that this wouldn’t be open to the public.

John Dunkle would like to take this one step further and ask them to define this as it could become a major impact.

Joseph Jerry said the general public will not be allowed to use this.

John Dunkle said the applicant will have to make this decision pretty quickly if the applicant will be setting this up as a marketing plan.

John Langey said the applicant will need to comment about the water being an access point to people outside.

John Dunkle said this has been raised by the public as a potential impact and at this point he doesn’t believe it’s been adequately addressed.

John Langey would like a minimum clarification of this.

Jim Nakas said the Planning Board can expect the applicants responses to John Langeys concerns at some point.

Ed Keplinger said yes.

Chairman Nakas said the applicant has requested a special meeting. He suggested the Planning Board let this float for awhile depending on when they can respond to Mr. Langey’s items.

Joseph Jerry said they will have a response to John Langey by the end of the week. They would like the information resent to County Planning so they can be on their July 5th agenda. They would like the Planning Board to meet with them as soon after July 5th as possible.

John Langey said the Planning Board has been asked to rerefer this to County Planning in light of the information supplied with a request to reconsider their recommendation for denial.

John Dunkle noted the applicants responses to his letter will be incorporated in the FEIS.

Sketch Plan Conference for Lynn Hutton.

Lynn Hutton submitted a map. He said he has new buyers now. All he is proposing is different lines. It's the same number of lots, just a different configuration. He is adding ½ acre to Lot 18. The owners of Lot # 16 are going to take the piece of land directly behind them.

Chairman Nakas said this is a new plan. Is a new public hearing required?

John Langey said it's a significant change.

Lynn Hutton thought he had always been here as a sketch plan. He hasn't submitted a preliminary plat.

John Langey said the final plat will have to be amended.

John Dunkle noted there is a parcel now that will be accessed from Naomi Rd. (Lot # 24) so there were people not notified of this at a previous public hearing.

John Langey said a new public hearing must be held. The map must be revised to show he is requesting a Phase III. Signature lines must be put on the map. If the application and map are received in time, this can be scheduled for a public hearing at the July meeting.

**Member's Markoff moved and Lasky seconded the motion to adjourn.
Motion passed unanimously.**

The Planning Board Meeting adjourned at 10:31 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Jo Kelly
Secretary

7.19.05 Member Lasky had the following corrections:

Page 2, paragraph 5: "Langey" in place of "Laney"

Page 3, paragraph 9: "detuning" in place of "detunig"

Page 5, paragraph 5: "or" in place of "of"

Page 7, paragraph 13: "conditional" in place of "condition"

Page 8, paragraph 1: "they're" in place of "their"

Last paragraph: "general" in place of "genera"

Page 10, paragraph 2: “Two” in place of “Tow”

Chairman Nakas asked for any other corrections or additions. There were none. He said the June 21, 2005, Planning Board Meeting Minutes will stand as corrected.