



PLANNING COMMISSION City of Cortland

MINUTES

June 28, 2010

A regular meeting of the City of Cortland Planning Commission was held on Monday, June 28, 2010 at 5:15 PM in the Council Chambers at City Hall, 25 Court Street, Cortland, New York.

PRESENT: Vice Chair Hansen, Comm. Felix, Ryan, Schaffer, Smith and Spitzer

Staff Present: Zoning Officer Bruce Weber and Cheryl Massmann, Deputy City Clerk

Vice Chair Hansen introduced Rafael Felix, the newest member of the Planning Commission.

Item No. 1 – Site Plan Review – 243 Pt. Watson St. – (Wilkinson)(GB) – Conversion of Commercial Building to Two Units

Vice Chair Hansen noted comments from the Zoning Officer Bruce Weber. Mr. Wilkinson noted that his was an older two family house that was converted to a commercial building. He had a couple of old certificates of occupancy showing that it had been a two family house. He would like to convert it back to a two unit as he is finding it hard to find a commercial renter. It is also an awkward building for a single family as it has two kitchens and two furnaces and is an awkward setup. He also would like to build a garage in the back yard. The garage would be for his use for storage of equipment and materials for his other properties. Vice Chair Hansen noted concerns were mentioned regarding the rear yard buffer. Mr. Wilkinson noted that there was an eight (8) foot high fence surrounding the neighbor's pool and he wasn't sure that the neighbors would be able to appreciate any greenery that he might place back there because of that fence. He noted that tenant parking would be in the front of the garage. He has four (4) parking spots and four (4) are all that are needed. He wants to do a hardpack driveway with no surfacing to go back to the rear of the property. Zoning Officer Weber noted that the proposed garage was for Mr. Wilkinson's use and the zoning for this property was General Business and the garage is okay. Comm. Felix asked if it was going to be a one (1) story building. Comm. Ryan asked how tall the garage might be.

Zoning Officer Weber noted that this application was for a recommendation on Use and Area Variances to the Zoning Board of Appeals and if approved, the applicant would have to then come back for a full Site Plan Review for conversion and the garage. Comm. Spitzer asked about the five (5) foot buffer in the rear. Mr. Wilkinson noted that it would be up against an eight (8) foot fence. Comm. Schaffer noted that this property was backing into an R1 District and she suggested that he look into that before coming back for site plan review. Comm. Smith asked if Mr. Wilkinson had tried to rent this property as commercial. Mr. Wilkinson stated that his realtor had told him that his chances would be

greater renting it as a residential property than as a commercial property and he would realize less income renting it as a single commercial building. Comm. Schaffer noted that this improves the nature of the neighborhood and will add to the neighborhood by converting it back to residential. Comm. Felix noted that the garage was sixty (60) feet by thirty-two (32) feet. Mr. Wilkinson agreed.

On a motion by Comm. Schaffer, seconded by Comm. Spitzer, voted and approved to recommend to the Zoning Board of Appeals approval of the variance to converting this property to a two (2) family house and to follow County Planning's recommendations.

Item No. 2 – Site Plan Review – 128 Tompkins St. – (Seales)(R1) – Exceeding Lot Coverage

Gary and Judd Seales were present. Comm. Schaffer noted that this was a confusing building. Gary Seales noted that he would like to shift three (3) parking spots to the west and create a turn around so that cars can exit out forward onto Tompkins Street. Comm. Schaffer noted that there were two (2) houses in the rear that used egress through this property through a shared driveway right of way and the parking spots would be angled toward Tompkins St. He noted that the ten (10) foot wide driveway was an easement. Comm. Smith asked Zoning Officer Weber how many units were in the front house. Gary Seales noted that it was a three (3) family house and nine (9) parking spaces were needed. Comm. Schaffer noted that he only required six (6) spaces. Gary Seales noted that he already had nine (9). Comm. Schaffer asked why tenants couldn't park in the garage. Gary Seales noted that the garage was used for business storage and not for parking. Judd Seales noted that the problem occurred when the dentist bought the adjoining property and put up a fence and then tenants had to back out of their parking spots on to Tompkins Street.

Zoning Officer Weber noted that the applicant also needed a use variance for the garage as well. Gary Seales noted that he hadn't planned on paving the proposed parking area because it would create greater lot coverage and he would also have to put in a buffer strip. Comm. Schaffer noted that this was a commercial use of a garage in an R1 district. Judd Seales noted that they didn't create this situation and that they were only trying to make it safe for tenants. He noted that they had tried to buy a four (4) foot strip of that property, but the dentist wouldn't sell. Gary Seales noted that it was only non-conforming because the front of the lot was sixty-five (65) feet wide and not seventy (70) feet wide, but the lot actually has plenty of room. Comm. Smith asked if the access was wide enough to accommodate fire trucks. Zoning Officer Weber noted that the standard was twelve (12) feet, but noted that a truck should be able to get through. Comm. Spitzer asked Judd Seales to explain the parking. Judd Seales noted that three (3) of the spots would be pushed forward onto an area that was grass and allowing that would allow for a turn around area, so that tenants could drive out onto Tompkins Street instead of having to back out. He noted that they always had nine (9) parking spots; they were just asking to reconfigure the nine (9) spots. Gary Seales noted that the three (3) spots being pushed forward would be a paved area. Comm. Spitzer asked why it had to be paved. Zoning Officer Weber noted that it had to be paved. Comm. Felix asked if the Seales had thought about changing their driveway to the other side of the house or perhaps making it a wrap

around. Gary Seales noted that would be expensive, but if they were to be denied access to the current drive, they would have to consider that as an alternative if faced with that.

On the motion by Comm. Schaffer, seconded by Comm. Ryan, voted and **DENIED** to recommend to the Zoning Board of Appeals not to allow for a reduction in twenty (20) percent lot coverage and not to allow the accessory use of the garage for commercial purposes instead of tenant parking. (For Motion: Schaffer, Spitzer, Hansen --- Against Motion: Felix, Smith, Ryan) Motion Denied.

Comm. Spitzer asked if the ZBA debated the merits of this proposal. Zoning Officer Weber stated that they did not, they were only asked to receive and refer the applications to the City Planning Commission. Once this is placed on their agenda again, they will have a public hearing and at that time you will have the opportunity to discuss with them the application. This is simply a recommendation by the Planning Commission to the Zoning Board of Appeals as to whether the variance should be granted.

Gary Seales noted that they didn't create this situation and by denying this, would create an unsafe situation of students backing out onto Tompkins Street. He asked what the Planning Commission wanted them to do by denying this, given the conditions and to make this safe for the students.

Comm. Schaffer noted that the ZBA will make their evaluation and will make their decision. She noted that the Planning Commission had a different set of obligations to work by and they have another set of obligations to work by and that's how the process works. She noted that she lives in that neighborhood and sees people backing out on Tompkins Street all of the time and the fact that there are nine (3) students in that building in three (3) apartments, your going to have more than nine (9) cars back there and she noted that he was going to have a more difficult time with parking in the future than what he has now with the bushes. Mr. Seales noted that he has not had the problems that Comm. Schaffer described. Comm. Spitzer noted that a solution to the problem would be to utilize the two (2) car garage. Judd Seales noted that didn't solve the problem of where to turn around, stating that they had plenty of parking space and that is the only reason they have come here otherwise they'll keep the parking the way it is. Comm. Smith asked if there were any other options to paving over the section of parking area that they proposed or a variance to make that a semi-permeable area. Zoning Officer Weber noted that the present ordinance requires concrete or asphalt which is based on occupancy and not the zoning district, but they could potentially request a variance for that or they could send it back to the ZBA with no recommendation.

On the motion by Comm. Spitzer, seconded by Comm. Felix, voted and approved the motion that while the Cortland Planning Commission is sympathetic to the need for maintaining nine (9) accessible parking places, it is concerned about the space on the property occupied by a garage used for commercial purposes and not for parking and it is also mindful of safety concerns for tenants entering and leaving the property as well as the concern of lot coverage and the commercial use of the property and yields final judgment to the wisdom of the Zoning Board of Appeals. (Opposed: Schaffer)

Item No. 3 - Site Plan Review – 9 Owego St. – (Seales)(R2) – Exceeding Lot Coverage

Gary and Judd Seales provided information. Gary Seales noted that they are applying for the reduction of parking space width and to create a parking area as there is currently no parking to speak of. He explained that Mr. Brown's neighboring tenants actually park at the side of the shared driveway because he has no parking at all. Judd Seales noted that they didn't have a problem with that. Comm. Schaffer asked if there was an agreement with the neighbor. Gary Seales noted that this driveway is shared by deed. He stated that the area is currently gravel and doesn't have to be paved because it is a two (2) family. He just wants to create legal parking. Comm. Felix asked what the garage was used for. Judd Seales noted that the tenant, who is a sheriff, uses both sides of the garage for parking. Comm. Schaffer asked about the drawing and who did it. Gary Seales indicated that he had done it. Comm. Schaffer noted that no drainage had been indicated on the drawing and that it was indicated that it was pitched. Gary Seales stated that it was not required because the driveway was gravel. Comm. Schaffer was concerned that the plan indicated "once paved". Gary Seales stated maybe sometime in the future, but they didn't really want to pave it. Comm. Schaffer noted that the indicated parking spaces were eight and a half (8 ½) feet wide by eighteen (18) feet long. Judd Seales noted that was their parking variance request. It was noted that the City Ordinance was for ten (10) feet by twenty (20) feet. Comm. Schaffer noted that she is concerned regarding the drainage going on to the neighbor's property. Comm. Felix asked how many parking spots were needed. Gary Seales indicated that nine (9) spaces were needed and that the neighbor will continue to park in the driveway. Comm. Smith was concerned that the lot not be paved and she would like to have the parking spaces made wider. Comm. Spitzer noted that would reduce greenspace. Comm. Spitzer was concerned about having the parking spaces marked. Gary Seales indicated they could be spray painted, but that wouldn't last even a year. Judd Seales indicated that their secretary explained to tenants how they were to park before they moved in. Gary Seales noted that if he didn't allow the neighbors to park in the driveway, he wouldn't be making this request, but since the neighbor had no parking at all, he allowed them to do that. Comm. Smith again indicated her concern regarding the paving of the parking area.

On a motion by Comm. Smith, seconded by Comm. Spitzer, voted and approved to recommend to the Zoning Board of Appeals that the variance be approved with the stipulation that the parking area is to remain gravel with a total of no more than nine (9) parking spaces on the property.

Item No. 4 – 112-126 Homer Ave. – (PO & SD) & 7 Van Hoesen St. – (R1) – (CRMC) – Sidewalk Replacement and Landscaping

Atty. Michael Shafer and Architect Weiss were present to answer questions. Atty. Shaffer noted that the Cortland Regional Medical Center had received a letter from City DPW Head Chris Bistocchi dated May 6, 2010 concerning the property at 112 Homer Avenue on the Van Hoesen Street side. He noted that if the Planning Commissioners recalled, the last time the hospital was before this board they were instructed not to come back with anymore plans until a formalized long term plan was in place. He noted that the process was ongoing. He noted that because of the nature of this issue, they couldn't avoid coming back because this needed to be taken care of. He noted that the thought was they had inherited this problem when they bought the property. He also noted that he had

asked a hospital representative if they would also address the situation with Lisa and Michael Holl, 9 Van Hoesen, with regards to installation of some fencing. Atty. Shafer has given them tonight some computer generated diagrams of some privacy fence that could be put up along the east side of their property as well as the north side. He noted that it was not part of this current design, but he asked that they take a look at the proposal and come to some type of agreement.

Atty. Shafer noted that the proposed plan cleans up sidewalks and proposed curbs and curb cuts. Zoning Officer Weber noted that Chris Bistocchi of the DPW has seen these plans. Comm. Schaffer asked what Mr. Bistocchi's letter said. Atty. Shafer noted that the letter received indicated that as Superintendent of the Public Works Department he was authorized to inform the hospital that they had thirty (30) days after receipt of this notice to comply with Section 15-3 of the Code of Ordinances which requires maintenance of the sidewalks. If the situation is not corrected within that time, it is my (Bistocchi) responsibility to have the problem corrected and the billing for the cost of the improvements billed to the hospital. This triggered this application. Atty. Shafer noted that a complaint was placed and that 245-6 of the City Code of Ordinances states that the individual property owners have to construct and maintain the sidewalks. The complaint was specific to 112 Homer Avenue on the Van Hoesen Street side. He noted that the medical center has obviously made a proposal that will include more than just that one property.

Comm. Spitzer noted that these things seem fine. Vice Chair Hansen noted that the area would probably still be a parking area. Mr. Weiss noted that he really didn't know yet. Comm. Schaffer noted that the plans showed trees and greenery inside the property line and she was concerned regarding the mowing in and around the trees. She also asked about their plans to put up fencing once they came to an agreement with the Holls and to come back before this Commission with that proposal. Mr. Shafer noted that this is outside of the scope and that they wanted to reach an agreement with the Holls. Comm. Schaffer asked about lighting. Mr. Weiss noted that there was sufficient existing lighting in the area. Comm. Felix asked how long they planned on taking to complete this project. Mr. Weiss noted that if approval was received this evening, they would be putting it out to bid in the next week or so and they could start as soon as the contract is awarded, which could be maybe a month. Comm. Felix expressed concern regarding flagging operations on Homer Avenue which is a heavily traveled street and asked how long the project would take. Mr. Weiss noted that he wasn't the contractor, so he couldn't say, but this project consisted of mostly little repairs and a repair section could take a day and then cones could be taken down every night.

Comm. Schaffer asked if they planned to close a lane of Homer Avenue. Mr. Weiss noted that would be up to the contractor.

On a motion by Comm. Spitzer, seconded by Comm. Ryan, voted and approved the project as presented.

Item No. 5 – Site Plan Review - 49 – 51 Elm St. – (Northeast Transformer)(GI) – Cement Driveway

Mr. Gilbert Kozer, owner, was present. He would like to build a cement roadway between the two buildings. Comm. Felix asked if this was for the use of tractor trailers and was it a shared driveway with Northeast and Marietta. Mr. Kozer noted that he owns both properties and buildings. Comm. Felix asked how long did these trucks park there and did they park there overnight. Mr. Kozer noted that they were just in and out.

Comm. Schaffer noted that she was aware of issues raised by neighbors regarding truck noise, travel, usage, etc. She asked how often Mr. Kozer expect trucks to be pulling in. Mr. Kozer noted that he didn't know, but that he had only two (2) trucks and that his hours of operation were from 8:00 am to 4:00 pm and that there was no night traffic. Comm. Felix asked Mr. Kozer to consider planting trees or shrubbery to buffer the truck noise. Mr. Kozer noted that he would like to stay away from shrubs and he also noted that the trains make most of the noise. Comm. Felix noted that neighbors have complained for a long time about truck noise. Comm. Spitzer asked him to put shrubbery in the grassy area.

On a motion by Comm. Spitzer, seconded by Comm. Felix, voted and approved the project as presented with landscaping and shrubbery on the Elm Street fence side.

Item No. 6 – Site Plan Review – 1 Huntington St. – (CAPCO-Headstart)(GB) – Playground & Parking

Mr. & Mrs. James Cosimo were present. Mr. Cosimo noted that the property belonged to him, but that Headstart had asked to use it. Vice Chair Hansen asked how long Headstart had been there. Mr. Cosimo stated that they had just come in. Comm. Felix and Schaffer noted that the playground on Huntington was already there. Comm. Smith noted that they were approving a project after the fact. Mr. Cosimo noted that the installation had taken place rather quickly. Comm. Schaffer noted that she was concerned regarding the safety of children on the playground with cars pulling in and the vinyl fencing being insufficient to stop a car. She asked if good solid cement stop blocks could be installed between the parked cars and the vinyl fence. Mr. Cosimo would consider putting in steel poles rather than concrete stop blocks, as they were an eyesore. Comm. Schaffer noted that small concrete blocks were not sufficient to stop a car.

Com. Felix asked how many parking spots were in the proposal. Mr. Cosimo noted that he had ten (10) parking spots including one (1) handicapped. Comm. Schaffer noted that parking appeared to be taking place on the sidewalk and suggested that he take a look at other childcare parking areas as she was very concerned about child safety and the use of sufficient barriers. She asked what the standard was for barriers. Zoning Officer Weber noted that there was no standard in the City Code indicating what was sufficient to prevent a car from going over the sidewalk. Comm. Schaffer noted that the vinyl fencing didn't look sufficient to protect children from a car. Mr. Cosimo stated that it was vinyl coated wire. Comm. Schaffer asked that they come back with sufficient barrier plans indicated because it was their duty to protect children in a playground that was right out in front of the building. Comm. Smith noted that it looked like the parking was on City property. Comm. Schaffer thought it looked like they were on the sidewalk. Mr. Cosimo noted that it was part of the apron to the restaurant and was City property, but it was all a part of the drive and it was not on the road and there was no sidewalk. Mrs. Cosimo noted that there was about thirty (30) feet between the road and the front of the building. Comm. Smith

asked for more detail. Comm. Schaffer suggested parallel parking to the playground especially if it was designated just for drop off. This would be for two (2) or three (3) cars and would prevent a car from going in to the playground. Everyone, including Mr. & Mrs. Cosimo liked that idea. Comm. Felix noted there could be three (3) spots, one (1) of which could be handicapped and none of them facing the playground.

On a motion by Comm. Spitzer, seconded by Comm. Smith, voted and approved the playground project as presented with two (2) conditions: Consult with the Dept. of Public Works and that the parking spaces be made parallel to the building and marked as "Drop Off Only".

Item No. 7 – Site Plan Review – 33 Pleasant St. – (Armideo)(R1) – Repair of Fire Damage to Front

Mr. Armideo distributed a petition from the neighbors asking that he not rebuild the porches on the front of this building that burned in the fire. He noted complaints of noise and large gatherings on the porches. He stated that he planned to replace the old porch access doors with windows. Comm. Schaffer asked how many persons were living in the house. Mr. Armideo noted that the property was grandfathered. Comm. Smith noted he is planning to put in some greenery.

On a motion by Comm. Spitzer, seconded by Comm. Ryan, voted and approved as presented.

Item No. 8 – Site Plan Review – 13 Court St. – (Grace Church)(CB) – Storage Sheds

Atty. Mike Shafer was present to represent this project. He noted that the church wanted to install another shed moving it from a sanctuary of the parish hall that was recently sold. He noted that there is a shed that sits on the northeast corner of the parish hall and has been there since forever. Vice Chair Hansen asked him what the church was asking for. Atty. Shafer stated that they wanted to move a new shed on to the southeast corner of the parcel and to leave the existing shed in the northeast corner. Comm. Spitzer stated that when he walked by this evening, he had noted that there already were two (2) sheds on the property. Atty. Shafer noted that the two (2) sheds would be on church property and did not go onto neighboring property. After some discussion and checking, it was discovered that unbeknownst to Atty. Shaffer, the congregation had moved the second shed on to the property and he apologized for that.

On a motion by Comm. Spitzer, seconded by Comm. Ryan, voted and approved the project as proposed.

Item No. 9 – Site Plan Review – 73 N. Main St. – (Smith)(SD) – Tent Placement

The applicant has asked that this site plan review be postponed until the July meeting due to an emergency family obligation.

Item No. 10 – Site Plan Review – 152 Clinton Ave. – (Palmer)(GB) – Canopy Changes

Rich Palmer was present. He informed the Planning Commission that his redesign project is in the final stages of approval. But in the meantime, Exxon Mobil has required that all locations must do an image upgrade and put a blue valance around their canopy. He explained to them that he was in the final stages of financing and was close to getting final approval from the bank and the new plans call for the whole canopy to be torn down and rebuilt. Exxon Mobil doesn't care. They have given him three (3) options on what he can do and it must be done by August. They prefer the 3D lighted where the valance sticks out, the 3D non-lit and the 2-D non-lit. He noted that his concern, as a business owner, is that the 3D lighted is around \$20,000 and it must be done by August and then when his financing comes through, he'll have to tear the whole thing down. He asked them to consider the 2D option. He noted that he could paint or put a vinyl panel.

Comm. Schaffer asked him if he was all okay with the Department of Transportation regarding his previously approved site plan. Mr. Palmer noted that the DOT is all set, but there had been a change on the approved drive-thru. There was an overhang on the approved plan and the contractor, Rich Gardner Construction out of Syracuse, noted that when they looked at the plans, their concern was that if a gas truck or tractor trailer were to go through that two-lane area that they might clip the overhang. Due to safety concerns, that overhang has been done away with.

On a motion by Comm. Smith, seconded by Comm. Felix, voted and approved the 2D non-lit option for the canopy.

Item No. 11 – Site Plan Review – 53 Lincoln Ave. – (Doerler)(R2) – Area Variance – Single Family to Two Family – Recommendation to ZBA

Applicant has requested postponement to July due to inability to appear tonight.

Item No. 12 – Site Plan Review – 51-53 Greenbush St. – (Edwards)(R4) – Rebuild of Storage/Garage

Tabled – Revised plans not submitted

New Business

Comm. Schaffer stated that she had read into the Common Council record at their last Council session the letter that had been approved by the Planning Commission regarding the request for the Common Council to be involved with the critical environmental area of the Waterworks and the proposed structure on SUNY Cortland land on the Chugger Davis field. She gave copies to the Council members and the Mayor stated that she had started to be in contact with President Bidderbaum. President Bidderbaum had told her he appreciated her interest, but that the SEQR had already been done. Three (3) Council members were shocked and dismayed as was the Alderperson from that Ward upon hearing this. The neighbors are also dismayed. She explained that there were six (6) acceptable sites to the architect and the College has gone through a matrix plan and they have chosen the site that is on the football field. In terms of the neighbors and the City, it is the worst positioning of all six (6) proposed sites. It's closest to the Waterworks,

adjacent on the last piece of green between the upper campus and the bottom campus. This building will be in operation 24/7 with fast food, traffic, noise, the whole works.

Comm. Schaffer felt that if the short form SEQR was done, they must have lied because of the proximity to an environmentally crucial area. They would have had to sign off saying it wasn't going to affect anything that was potentially environmentally important to the City.

Comm. Schaffer asked the Planning Commission to ask the Mayor on behalf of the Planning Commission to ask Corporation Counsel to do a Freedom of Information Letter to the College asking for a copy of their SEQR review, asking for a copy of the architect's plans for all six (6) sites and their matrix planning as to how and why they made a decision to choose that particular site.

Comm. Smith asked if the SEQR needed to be done by this board (Planning Commission). Comm. Spitzer asked if it had to involve a government agency. Zoning Officer Weber noted that if it's State property involving a State agency, the State was the only involved agency. Comm. Schaffer noted that the Planning Commission had no idea what went on and what their responses were. She also stated that they mentioned a SEQR, they didn't say whether it was a long form SEQR or a short form SEQR and she thinks that they did a short form SEQR. Comm. Schaffer noted that the most direct and the most positive way of our getting this information is to do a FOIL request.

On a motion by Comm. Schaffer, seconded by Comm. Felix, voted and approved to have the Planning Commission request that the Mayor direct Corporation Counsel Walsh to file a Freedom of Information Request to request freedom of information responses from the State on the completed SEQR form and the architectural plans as well as the whole process that they went through to choose this one site for the location of a recreation building on the Chugger Davis Field.

Atty. Mike Shafer returned to state that the church shed had been moved into location by parishioners and he had no knowledge that they had done that already.

Comm. Schaffer noted that the Zoning Board of Appeals had denied Mr. DelVecchio's application. She noted that Mr. DelVecchio can only go ahead with what the Planning Commission had approved originally and he will not get a certificate of occupancy until he meets all of the conditions set forth by this Planning Commission.

Vice Chair Hansen noted a training session sign up sheet was included in their packets. Comm. Spitzer noted he would be unable to attend, but asked if there would be other opportunities. Vice Chair Hansen stated that she had contacted Brian Dailey, ZBA Chair, with regards to a locally done, joint training. Comm. Schaffer noted that Dan Dineen did a good job last year.

A review was done with regards to the proposed amendment to the adult entertainment law. Comm. Smith had comments and compared the old law with the proposed new law. She had issue with the 40% of gross income reduced to 25% and now instead of being one thousand (1,000) feet from restricted areas, it's been reduced to six hundred (600) feet. It was questioned as to why these reductions were made. Comm. Schaffer noted

that some areas were allowed, but that some of those areas are surrounded by R2 and R3 neighborhoods and she would like to keep it one thousand (1,000) feet. Comm. Spitzer wondered if it had been derived from State standards. He questioned another section about whether a business could be in the home. Comm. Schaffer also questioned a section regarding five (5) people watching a video arcade. She also noted that some of the wording was archaic. There was further discussion regarding massage and what constituted therapeutic and licensed versus unlicensed in the eyes of the State Education Department. Perhaps a less confusing definition of the word massage might be needed. Vice Chair Hansen will convey the various points brought up in this discussion to Corporation Counsel Walsh.

Item No. 13 – Minutes – May 24, 2010

On a motion by Comm. Spitzer, seconded by Comm. Felix, voted and approved.

Adjournment

On the motion by Comm. Spitzer and seconded by Comm. Schaffer, voted and approved.

I, NANCY HANSEN, VICE CHAIRPERSON OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF CORTLAND, NEW YORK, DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT SAID RESOLUTION(S) WERE ADOPTED AT A MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF CORTLAND, NEW YORK, HELD ON THE 28TH DAY OF JUNE 2010.

NANCY HANSEN, VICE CHAIRPERSON