Te lephone
(914) 277-5366

FAX
(914) 277-4093

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

TOWN HOUSE
335 ROUTE 202
SOMERS, NY 10589

Town of Somers

WESTCHESTER COUNTY, N.Y.

Fedora DeLucia, Chairman
John Currie
Christopher Foley
Vicky Gannon
Nancy Gerbino
Eugene Goldenberg
John Keane

SOMERS PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
MARCH 9, 2011

ROLL:

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman DeLucia, Mr. Keane, Ms. Gerbino, Mr. Goldenberg, Ms. Gannon and Mr. Currie

ABSENT: Mr. Foley

ALSO PRESENT: Town Planner Sabrina Charney Hull
Consulting Town Engineer Barbagallo
Town Attorney Joseph Eriole
Planning Board Secretary Murphy

The meeting commenced at 7:35 p.m. Planning Board Secretary Marilyn Murphy called the roll. Chairman DeLucia noted that a required quorum of four members was present in order to conduct the business of the Board.

APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY 9, 2011 MINUTES

Chairman DeLucia noted that Panning Board Secretary Marilyn Murphy prepared and submitted for the Board's consideration the approval of the draft minutes of the Planning Board meeting held on February 9, 2011 consisting of seventeen (17) pages.

The Chair asked if there were any comments or questions from members of the Board on the draft minutes and no one responded.

The Chair asked if there was a motion to approve the February 9, 2011 draft minutes.

On motion by Ms. Gannon, seconded by Mr. Currie, and unanimously carried, the minutes of February 9, 2011 were approved.

The Chair noted that the DVD of the February 9, 2011 Planning Board meeting is made a part of the approved minutes and is available for public viewing at the Somers Public Library. The text of the approved minutes are also on the Town's website www.somersny.com and is available for public review at the Planning & Engineering office at the Town House.

PUBLIC HEARING

NEW CINGULAR WIRELESS, PCS, LLC (AT&T)
AMENDED SITE PLAN APPROVAL AND WETLAND PERMIT
[TM: 4.20-1-11] 80 ROUTE 6

Chairman DeLucia noted that this is the Public Hearing of the application of New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC (AT&T) for Amended Site Plan Approval, Special Exception Use Permit, Area Variances and Wetland Permit to co-locate a wireless telecommunications facility for three panel antennas inside an existing monopole and related equipment cabinet inside new shelter at grade, located at the Somers Commons Shopping Center, 80 Route 6 in the Community Shopping (CS) Zoning District. The Chair explained that AT&T has entered into Lease Agreements with UB Somers, Inc. as the owner of the property and with T-Mobile as the owner of the existing concealment monopole and seeks to provide wireless service along Routes 118 and 6 as well as the surrounding local roads, homes, and businesses in the vicinity of the premises. She indicated that this application is being processed under the revised Wireless Telecommunications Facilities Code, Section 170-129 of the Code of the Town of Somers. The Chair noted that this application was last discussed at the February 9, 2011 Planning Board meeting whereby the Board preferred design Option 2 which requires a zoning variance for the setbacks and a wetland permit and then scheduled a Public Hearing for this evening. She said that Option 1 flips the building and moves it over one foot but Option 2 is more visually pleasing. The Chair said that the Board also requested the applicant to revise the plans and submit a wetland

application. She mentioned that this application falls under a Type II Action as not having a significant impact on the environment under SEQRA and therefore no further environmental review is necessary.

The Chair acknowledged for the record receipt of the following: an application for a wetland permit and supporting documentation and plans last revised February 23, 2011 received on March 3, 2011 from Tectonic Engineering and Surveying Consultants, Inc. who are retained by Bechtel Communications to perform wetlands services; a memo received on March 7, 2011 from the Conservation Board (CB) with 3 comments and recommendations; a memo received March 9, 2011, from the Architectural Review Board stating that they have no objection; and a memo dated March 7, 2011 from Town Planner Sabrina Charney Hull, AICP with project review and recommendations and updated comments.

The Chair asked the applicant's representative to give a brief presentation regarding this submission.

Neil Alexander, the applicant's attorney, explained that AT&T is seeking to co-locate on the T-Mobile existing tower at UB Somers, Route 6 at Baldwin Place. He noted that the flagless flagpole is 120' with equipment at grade. Attorney Alexander said that AT&T is trying to provide coverage to Route 6 and Route 118 and local roads in the vicinity. He mentioned that a Special Use Permit, wetland permit and variances for lot coverage and setbacks are needed.

Attorney Alexander advised that because of recent changes in the law this application has been on-going for a while. He said that by appearing before the Planning and Zoning Boards the original design at grade was questioned. He explained that T-Mobile is using the top two slots on the tower with AT&T taking the bottom slot. Attorney Alexander explained that the issue centered around the equipment compound. He showed the Board a copy of the existing monopole with T-Mobile installing brick walls with their equipment cabinets inside the monopole. Attorney Alexander mentioned that Verizon will take the third slot on the monopole and the Board asked that be explored. He noted that the equipment cabinet will be rotated 90º which will minimize the needed variance but will require a wetland permit. Attorney Alexander asked what is the wetland buffer, and said that there will only be approximately 6.28 square feet of disturbance and there are no hydric soils left. He indicated that there is no mitigation

that can be done and the wetland permit will accomplish an aesthetic upgrade.

The Chair asked Town Planner Hull to share her memo comments for the benefit of the public.

Town Planner Hull stated that the applicant was responsive to her comments and addressed all the issues identified in her memo. She mentioned that the wetland application fees have been provided, the buffer line has been addressed but there is no mitigation proposed. She said that the Board has to agree in relation to mitigation. Town Planner Hull noted that pursuant to the outcome of the Public Hearing a draft Resolution can be requested. She also mentioned that the Planning Board will need to make a positive or negative referral to the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) regarding the issuance of the requested variances.

The Chair asked Consulting Town Engineer Joseph C. Barbagallo, P.E. if he had any comments.

Consulting Town Engineer Barbagallo said that he does not have any written comments at this time but will make verbal comments.

The Chair asked if there were any comments or questions from members of the Board and if there were any comments in reference to mitigation.

The Chair said that it was the consensus of the Board that mitigation is not necessary.

Mr. Keane asked the applicant if he reviewed the CB memo dated March 4, 2011, specifically number 3, *On page, Z-1A/Plot plan there is a map that clearly exhibits lot 5.17-1-2 and lot 5.17-1-3 (several residences) at approximately 450 ft. from the proposed facility. The applicant should check the measurements for inaccuracies and resubmit the plans.*

Attorney Alexander said that the CB is mistaken.

Town Planner Hull said that when the tower was first approved the CB raised this issue and further investigation proved that the CB is inaccurate with their interpretation.

The Chair mentioned that the CB had only three members approving the memo and not a quorum. She said that the Board acknowledges receipt of the memo and will take the memo as advisory.

The Chair asked Planning Board Secretary Murphy if prior to the Public Hearing was the required legal notice published, the adjoining property owners notified and the property posted.

Planning Board Secretary Murphy stated that the legal notice was published in the North County News for their March 1, 2011 issue, the adjoining property owners were notified via mail on February 28, 2011 and the sign stating the date and place of the Public Hearing was posted on February 16, 2011.

The Chair asked if anyone was present who wished to be heard regarding this application and no one responded.

The Chair indicated that there was a consensus of the Board to close the Public Hearing.

On motion by Ms. Gannon, seconded by Mr. Currie, and unanimously carried, the Board moved to close the Public Hearing on the application of New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC (AT&T).

The Chair mentioned that the applicant has requested the Planning Board to make a positive recommendation to the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) for the required variances. She asked if the Board or staff had any objection.

Ms. Gerbino asked for clarification on the requested variance for the location of the proposed cabinets which would require a new variance of 0.01%.

Attorney Alexander confirmed that the new variance of 0.01% will be issued for a total site coverage of 87.72%.

The Chair said that there is a consensus that Town Planner Hull send a memo to the ZBA that the Planning Board at its March 9, 2011 meeting unanimously recommends, and with no objection by the Town Planner and

the Consulting Town Engineer, that the ZBA grant the required setback variances requested by the applicant.

The Chair directed Town Planner Hull to prepare a draft Resolution of Approval for the March 23, 2011 Planning Board meeting.

PROJECT REVIEW

METROPCS NEW YORK, LLC
AMENDED SITE PLAN, WETLAND PERMIT, STORMWATER MANAGEMENT AND EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL, SPECIAL EXCEPTION USE PERMIT FOR THE GROUNDWATER PROTECTION OVERLAY DISTRICT
[TM: 17.15-1-13]

Chairman DeLucia mentioned that this is the project review of the application of MetroPCS New York for amended Site Plan Approval, Wetland and Stormwater Management and Erosion and Sediment Control Permits and Special Exception Use Permit for activity in the Groundwater Protection Overlay District to co-locate a wireless telecommunications facility on the existing 103' tall stealth flagpole tower at the Somers Towne Centre property, 325 Route 100. The Chair mentioned that this application was last discussed at the February 23, 2011 Planning Board meeting whereby the Board requested the applicant to provide larger scale drawings and address outstanding issues and then voted to retain outside consultant Michael Musso of HDR to confirm the necessity under Town Code Section 170-129.7(A) for this co-location. The Chair noted that Town Planner Hull advised that Mr. Musso will have to submit a scope and estimate for his work and the Planning Board and the applicant must agree. She said that Anthony Gioffre, attorney for the applicant, had no objection to the scope and work estimate.

The Chair acknowledged for the record receipt of the following: correspondence and e-mail messages between Town Planner Hull and Michael Musso of HDR regarding his reviewing the material prior to the Board's March 9, 2011 meeting; an e-mail dated March 2, 2011 from Michael Musso attaching his revised scope and budget letter for a focused review; a memo received on March 7, 2011 from the Conservation Board with 6 concerns and recommendations; a memo received March 9, 2011 from the Architectural Review Board stating that they have no objection;

and a memo dated March 4, 2011 from Consulting Town Engineer Joseph C. Barbagallo, P.E., BCEE, providing a summary of his review and noting that his February 18, 2011 memo to the Board remains unaddressed and should be incorporated into the revised site plan; and a letter received today from Attorney Anthony B. Gioffre III commenting that he has no objection to the proposed scope and budget submitted by HDR and that he will not be present this evening.

The Chair explained that Senior Project Manager Michael Musso of HDR will not be present to present his proposed review scope for the MetroPCS co-location application and provide comments with specific focus on Somers Town Code Wireless Ordinance Section 170-129.7(A) together with a Cost Summary. She asked that Consulting Town Engineer Barbagallo give his comments and then Town Planner Hull give her comments for the benefit of the Board and the public.

Consulting Town Engineer Barbagallo said that the expansion of the compound area requires a wetland permit and requires mitigation and that the plans be updated to reflect certain site features and mitigation.

The Chair asked Town Planner Hull to summarize her memo to the Board for the benefit of the public.

Town Planner Hull explained that as the revised Site Plan has not been submitted she does not have any comments. She explained that the scope was received from Michael Musso of HDR stating his cost will be $2,750. Town Planner Hull indicated that the applicant has agreed to the scope as written. She noted that the Planning Board will have to determine if the scope is acceptable pursuant to the direction that was provided.

The Chair asked if there were any comments or questions from members of the Board relating to Mr. Musso's proposed scope and budget letter for a focused review.

Mr. Keane asked if Town Planner Hull was satisfied that the calculations that were provided meet the necessity standard.

Town Planner Hull said that in her conversations with Mr. Musso she was specific on what the Board is looking for.

Mr. Keane questioned the wording in Mr. Musso's proposal, *As part of HDR's proposed review scope…*

Town Attorney Eriole advised that Town Planner Hull should clarify what the Board wants and to say that it is not part of the review but is the review.

The Chair said that there is a consensus of the Board for a motion that Mr. Musso's proposed review scope is acceptable and agreed to retain Mr. Musso to begin work and examine the application materials in relation to Section 170-129.7(A).

Ms. Gerbino said that the report must verify that the calculation that the applicant provided meets the necessity standards.

On motion by Chair DeLucia, seconded by Ms. Gannon, and unanimously carried, the Board directed that a modifying statement from the Town Planner to the consultant to clarify that the directive is to modify and examine the application materials in relation to the Town Code and to verify that the calculation made by the applicant's consultant meet with the necessity standard per Town Code.

The Chair advised that Michael Musso said that this work typically takes about one or two weeks to complete. She noted that this application will be placed on the March 23, 2011 agenda, which should be sufficient time in which to receive Mr. Musso's report.

Town Planner Hull stated that deficiencies in the application may be identified but the Board is not requesting Mr. Musso to request anything from the applicant but to assess the information requested by the Board.

PROJECT REVIEW

102 MOSEMAN LLC (GAGGINI)
WETLAND AND STORMWATER MANAGEMENT AND
EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL PERMIT
[TM: 48.18-1-10]

Chairman DeLucia noted that this is the project review of the application of 102 Moseman LLC, owner, by applicant Elizabeth Gaggini, member of 102 Moseman LLC, for a Wetland Permit under Somers Town Code Chapter

167 and Stormwater Management and Erosion and Sediment Control Permit under Chapter 93 for property located at the intersection of Moseman Avenue and Stuart Lane in an R-80 Residential Zoning District. The Chair noted that a Short Environmental Assessment Form has also been included with the February 9, 2011 submission. She mentioned that the proposed project consists of a garage addition and landscaping improvements to an existing single family residence within the buffer zone of a 6,534 sq. ft. man-made retention pond which will include hydrodredging the acidifying sediment from the pond and creating a bog area to improve the environmental viability of the pond without increasing its size. The Chair stated that a Tee Preservation Permit under Section 156 was issued on October 12, 2010. The owner/applicant is represented by Trevor Spearman, AIA, of Spearman Architectural Design, PC, of Thornwood.

The Chair acknowledged for the record receipt of the following: a wetland application with plans dated January 5, 2011 and additional supporting material submitted on February 9, 2011; revised drawing by NYS Registered Architect Trevor G. Spearman dated February 17, 2011 received on March 2, 2011; a memo from the Conservation Board received on March 7, 2011 with 4 concerns and recommendations, of which no. 2 has been addressed; a memo dated March 2, 2011 from Steven Woelfle, Principal Engineering Technician, giving a general project description, proposal, mitigation, and recommendations; and a memo dated March 8, 2011 from Consulting Town Engineer Joseph C. Barbagallo, P.E., BCEE, with comments to be addressed by the applicant and for the Board's consideration, and that the proposed activity to be a Type II Action as not having a significant environmental impact under SEQRA and therefore no further environmental review is necessary.

The Chair asked the applicant's representative to give a brief presentation regarding this submission.

Trevor G. Spearman, the applicant's architect, said that he looks at this application as a two prong attack on the approvals. He noted that a three car garage and the addition of a family room will be added to a single family residence. Architect Spearman showed the Board a picture of the pond with the 100-foot setback to the edge of the pond. He commented that the pond is described in the application as a man-made, clay bottom, non-contiguous retention pond. Architect Spearman explained that the Zoning

Board of Appeals (ZBA) granted a variance to the setback at the rear of the property and a small overage on the overall lot coverage. He indicated that he was able to maintain 50-feet from the addition; however, the primary home sits 100% within 100-feet of the wetland buffer.

Architect Spearman said that the second component is the proposed site improvements. He mentioned that the proposal is for a septic holding tank to be used to preserve and maintain a large quantity of water. He indicated that the septic tank will effectively hold runoff water from the 1,000 SF proposed addition. Architect Spearman explained that the runoff from the tank will feed into the more traditional infiltration system. He noted that it is 98% better than Code as he is designing to a six-inch storm. Architect Spearman said that there is an overflow detail from the infiltrators that will go to a level spreader at the pond edge.

Architect Spearman referenced the Conservation Board (CB) memo dated March 4, 2011, No. 3, *On Site Plan Details/S-3 the silt fence is inadequate. The applicant should provide a new description of silt fence.* He said that he intended to do a silt fence and erosion control in one detail. He mentioned that Detail E shows a stepped retaining wall which runs the length of the property and along the driveway. Architect Spearman explained that at its highest point will feature three retaining walls with the lowest retaining wall being a structural wall built down 3 ½ feet for frost reasons and its highest point will be 24 inches high. Architect Spearman said that there will then be a more natural 2 tier setup above to slow and prevent runoff on the existing slope on the right side of the driveway. He noted that this will also allow for two planting bed gardens for annuals.

Architect Spearman mentioned that Detail F is a drainage swale featured on the left edge of the property. He explained that the drainage swale is designed to take water from a rear seed wall. Architect Spearman indicated that there will be continuous infiltration as it progresses towards the pond.

Architect Spearman said that Detail H is a concrete wall at the back of the property creating a courtyard. He noted that there will be a footing drain fed to a footing dry well that will overflow into the drainage swale. Architect Spearman described Detail I as the seed wall and basically

brings the surface water runoff to a bio-retention rain garden. He said that there will be an in-pond bog filter which creates an environment that is not currently there. He noted that there will be tall grasses made of plantings. Architect Spearman opined that the site improvements are a great improvement on the property. He mentioned that there will be geo-thermal wells for heating and cooling and a solar roof which will power the geo-thermal equipment. Architect Spearman said that he feels that he has documented the mitigating of the run-off and the project is a vast improvement.

The Chair asked where the sediment will go after it is removed from the pond.

Architect Spearman explained that the sediment will be removed off site but the nutritious soil will be used for the plantings in the vegetable garden.

Ms. Gerbino asked what is the condition of the pond after the recent storms.

Architect Spearman said that there is some deterioration on the surface on the pond. He mentioned that there is surface run-off from the applicant's and the neighboring properties. Architect Spearman noted that he is proposing a drainage swale to help with this problem.

The Chair asked how deep and how large is the pond.

Bill Meyer, John Jay Landscaping, said that the pond is approximately 7 to 10 feet deep and is 6,534 square feet in length.

Mr. Keane asked if the calculations included the run-on which is coming from other properties.

Architect Spearman explained that the calculations were difficult although he observed neighboring properties during heavy rains. He said that the property to the west sends run-off to the applicant's property.

Mr. Keane suggested using the NRCS data and methodology for the calculations for water coming from another property.

Architect Spearman said that there are other components to be considered such as road surfaces and certain sections of curbs that are not intact.

The Chair asked Consulting Town Engineer Joseph C. Barbagallo to summarize his memo to the Board for the benefit of the public.

Consulting Town Engineer Barbagallo said that he requested additional information on the subsurface drainage system.

The Chair asked if there were any comments or questions from members of the Board.

Mr. Currie asked why Mr. Woelfle, in his memo of March 2, 2011, was against the stockpile area to be placed in front of the new garage.

Consulting Town Engineer Barbagallo said that Mr. Woelfle's comment was focused on the dredging. He said that there is also a proximity issue from the stockpile to the pond and what Mr. Woelfle meant is that the resulting material (the net) should be taken off site after the dewatering.

Architect Spearman said that he will show a stockpile area closer to the front entrance where rocks and boulders will be accumulated to use in the stone walls that will be created.

Consulting Town Engineer Barbagallo asked what the elevation distance is between the berm of the second rain garden in relation to the pond elevation.

Mr. Meyer said that there will be three drops of elevation and the initial drop will go over the tiered waterfall into a swale at the bottom and will be a three-foot drop. He noted that there will be a six inch detention basin in the center with the second tier having a 2 ½ foot drop and the third tier will have a 2 foot drop.

Mr. Keane said that he is concerned if there is 3 inches of rain, is the swale sufficient to handle the volume of water, concentrated flow, when it runs over the decorative waterfalls into the pond. He stated that the idea is not to keep dredging the pond. He reminded the applicant that the Board follows the New York State Stormwater Manual rainfall data.

Mr. Meyer explained that the water will infiltrate into the pond. He suggested a larger plunge pool at the end of the waterfall.

Consulting Town Engineer Barbagallo asked the applicant to consider adding a forebay which will lessen the need to dredge the pond. He asked how the drainage will infiltrate and drain out behind the wall.

Architect Spearman indicated that the stones will be in three to four foot sections which will slow the water velocity.

Mr. Keane noted that he likes all the techniques that the applicant is using.

Architect Spearman handed out a brochure on the Aquacleaner Environmental which will be part of the application.

The Chair said that this is a Type II Action and there are no environmental impacts. She asked if the Board would like a site walk for this project.

The Chair indicated that it was the consensus of the Board to waive the site walk.

The Chair directed the applicant to revise the plans and address the comments outlined in the memoranda of the Consulting Town Engineer, Principal Engineering Technician, and the Board.

DISCUSSION/APPROVAL

APPLICATION COMPONENTS NECESSARY FOR THE REVIEW OF WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES IN THE TOWN OF SOMERS

Chairman DeLucia said that this is a Board discussion regarding the Application Components Necessary for the Review of Wireless Telecommunications Facilities in the Town of Somers, prepared by Town Planner Sabrina Charney Hull, AICP for the Boards consideration and approval.

Town Planner Hull explained that the intent of this exercise is to clarify the submission requirements that were scoped out with an applicant regarding the wireless submission to make sure that they address all the Board's

concerns. She explained that the initial scope divided the information into two sections. Town Planner Hull noted that the first section is a list of what should be submitted and the second section is a dissertation on visual character and visual quality. Town Planner Hull said that the version the Board is reviewing tries to incorporate both sections into one document. She mentioned that the intent is that the Board endorses the document so the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) can adopt the scope in the application of Route 35.

Town Attorney Eriole said that this exercise is on a dual track. He noted that this document gives the framework to both parties, the municipality and the applicant, in order to avoid missteps and difficulties. Town Attorney Eriole stated that this document will provide a very good review for future applications. He suggested that the document be titled and referenced in the Town Code because the document being reviewed does not have the teeth of law.

Town Planner Hull stated that much of the document was derived from the Code and states how an applicant should go about meeting the criteria of the Code.

Town Attorney Eriole said that there was much discussion on the interpretation of the Code and the next applicant may not agree with the guidelines. He indicated that in some respect the document is an expanded and detailed application.

Mr. Currie opined that the Board should take the document to the next level and make it Code.

Mr. Keane said that the underlying aspects and facts in this document are saying to the applicant this is what you need to do to convince the Board that you have met the spirit and intent of the Town's regulations. He noted that if the applicant fails to meet the intent of the regulations it puts the applicant in jeopardy of the Board denying the application.

Town Attorney Eriole agreed with Mr. Keane but was worried that the document is not enough.

Town Planner Hull mentioned that the Town has asked for a consultant to review the Code and this document can assist the consultant when he or she reviews the Code.

Town Attorney Eriole suggested that the document be tabled until the consultant can review the Code.

Mr. Keane opined that when an applicant states they will submit an application for a cell tower that this guideline be submitted with the application even before the application is accepted.

Town Attorney Eriole suggested changing the title of the document to "Appendix to Application".

Town Consulting Engineer Barbagallo suggested putting a reference on the application form that this document is necessary if you are making an application for a cell tower.

Ms. Gannon commented on the document on line 44, page 1, *differences in the data should be qualified by the RF Engineer.* She suggested *qualified* be changed to **explained** and the Board agreed.

Ms. Gannon referenced c) on page 3, *Select four viewpoints including the worst case view, to show representative views of the proposed project.* She referred to e) on line 32, page 3, *From points identified by the Lead Agency with the recommendation of the other boards of the town, provide…*

Town Planner Hull indicated that c) and e) have to be linked. She questioned if the Board wants the applicant to submit four viewpoints even those that are not the worst case viewpoints.

Mr. Keane explained that under SEQRA the applicant is supposed to submit a complete application. He said that applicants have not submitted a complete application but after much discussion the plan is designed by the Boards. He mentioned that the purpose of asking for the four viewpoints is to have the applicant get to the important things right away based on the initial application not five iterations later. Mr. Keane opined that the applicants don't always address the worst case scenarios. He explained that if the Board does not believe the applicant chose the worst

case scenarios they will have to go back and provide the worst case scenarios. Mr. Keane stated that the Board is asking for the minimum when it refers to worst case scenarios.

Town Attorney Eriole said that what is being done is to give the applicant the direction at the beginning that they should choose 4 representative viewpoints because the Board wants the applicant to submit a better application. He referenced e) on line 32, page 3 and changed it to state *that selected viewpoints as well as identified by the Lead Agency upon recommendation of other boards of the town, if any.*

Ms. Gannon referred to line 35, page 4, *for each of the Selected Viewpoints* and asked if this should have another reference.

Town Planner Hull said that *or other points as identified* should be added to that sentence.

Town Planner Hull said that she will prepare a memo to the ZBA on the review components for Wireless Telecommunication Facilities applications.

There being no further business, on motion by Ms. Gerbino, seconded by Ms. Gannon, and unanimously carried, the meeting adjourned at 9:30 P.M. and the Chair noted that the next Planning Board meeting will be held on Wednesday, March 23, 2011 at 7:30 P. M. at the Somers Town House.

Respectfully submitted,

Marilyn Murphy
Planning Board Secretary