



PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES

August 22, 2011

A regular meeting of the City of Cortland Planning Commission was held on Monday, August 22, 2011 at 5:15 PM in the Council Chambers at City Hall, 25 Court Street, Cortland, NY.

PRESENT: Vice Chair Schaffer, Comm. Beckwith, Couch, McMahon and Spitzer

Staff Present: Mayor Feiszli, Alderman Ferrer, Corporation Counsel Perfetti, Asst. Corporation Counsel Hertzberg, Capt. William Knickerbocker, Zoning Officer Bruce Weber, and Deputy City Clerk Cheryl A. Massmann

Item No. 1 – Site Plan Review & Recommendation to ZBA on Special Use Permit, Use Variance and Area Variance – 5 Lauder St. – (Bible Baptist)(R1) – School Expansion and Playground

Craig Miller stated that the church school needs more space. They have increased enrollment and all current instructional space is in use. They have acquired adjacent properties and had gotten 5 Lauder Street in 2007. They acquired it with the intent of using it as supplemental instructional space and it has been used from time to time as guest and emergency housing. In 2007, the church added a pre-school division to their existing K through 12 school and they are proposing to move that level of their instructional program into the main level of 5 Lauder. They are also requesting that the back yard which is presently used as a play area be upgraded to a playground. They would like to add more equipment and safer ground cover which would exceed lot coverage.

Vice Chair Schaffer asked if they intended to combine the four (4) church properties into one (1) property deed. Mr. Miller indicated that they had no plans to do that.

Vice Chair Schaffer asked what the planned lot coverage was. Mr. Miller stated that the maximum space available and taking out the buffer would be forty (40) feet deep by fifty (50) feet wide. He also noted that the design of the play set had changed since the application had been submitted and it has been re-configured because of the ten (10) foot buffer zone and condensed to twenty-nine (29) by twenty-nine (29) feet. Vice Chair Schaffer noted that anything approved by the Planning Commission would be pending approval by the Zoning Board. Mr. Miller understood that. Vice Chair Schaffer noted that this was a planned playground area for pre-school children. Mr. Miller indicated that it would be used by ages three (3) through eight (8). Vice Chair Schaffer stated that she would like to have the playground area fenced with multiple building entrances/egresses provided to meet State Education requirements. Zoning Officer Weber noted that would be a building code issue.

Vice Chair Schaffer asked if they planned to provide additional parking spaces in the rear of the property. Mr. Miller stated no, but they had designated six (6) spots as ancillary parking.

Vice Chair Schaffer asked if a SEQR needed to be done on this. Zoning Officer Weber stated that the Planning Commission could ask the Zoning Board to do that. Planning Commission indicated that the ZBA will do the SEQR.

On the motion of Comm. McMahon, seconded by Comm. Spitzer, voted and approved the site plan as presented with the stipulation of adding fencing to the playground area, that adequate exits are provided and recommend Zoning Board approval.

Site Plan Review – 110 Main St. – (Cortland Standard)(CB) – Rear Door

Evan Geibel explained the project. He noted that they will carefully be removing the existing door and replacing it with a door that will be twice as wide and it will be painted the same color. He noted that the roof line and the current roof will not change. He noted that they will be replacing the gutter and that they will paint the gutter the same color as the one being replaced.

Vice Chair Schaffer noted that this is in the Historic District and they will have to come before the Historic Board in September. She asked about the clutter in the rear of the building. Mr. Geibel indicated that once a wider door is installed, perhaps some of that material can be moved inside, but he did note that it was an industrial area. Vice Chair Schaffer asked if the roof hang will be removed. Mr. Geibel stated that only the gutter will be replaced noting the downspout drains into a storm sewer.

On the motion of Comm. Spitzer, seconded by Comm. McMahon, voted and approved the project as presented pending Historic Board approval.

Site Plan Review – 42 Church St. – (Cortland Housing Auth.)(CB) – Bus Shelter

Nick Giamei, Maintenance Director, stated that the Housing Authority had been approached by County Planning Board indicating that they had an extra bus shelter and wanted to know if it could be used. He would like to install it on the west side of 51 Pt. Watson Street in the northbound lane of South Church Street.

Vice Chair Schaffer asked if they had applied for a right of way permit from the City. Mr. Giamei indicated that they had received the permit. The shelter will be placed between the sidewalk and the street in the approximately fifteen (15) feet of greenspace. He noted that there would be a handicapped curb cut.

Vice Chair Schaffer asked about signage regarding “Bus Stop” or “No Parking”. Mr. Giamei was unsure of what he needed, but noted that the local bus company indicated that they would service this stop. Zoning Officer Weber noted that currently there was no parking allowed along that street.

On the motion of Comm. McMahon, seconded by Comm. Couch, voted and approved as presented.

Site Plan Review – 182 Pt. Watson St. – (CFCU)(GB) – Flag Pole

Tom Drake, Maintenance Manager, stated that CFCU wants to install a flag pole in the front of the building at this location. They have installed them at their other branches in Ithaca.

Comm. McMahon asked if they had a flag pole at their Rt. 281 location. Mr. Drake indicated that they did not, because they did not own that property.

Vice Chair Schaffer noted that the location met all setback requirements and she noted that there will be no other use of this other than as a flag pole for the United States flag and no other flag will fly from it. Mr. Drake agreed.

On the motion of Comm. Couch, seconded by Comm. Beckwith, voted and approved as presented with the stipulation that no other advertising or flags be flown from the pole.

Site Plan Review – 19 W. Court St. – (DeVecchio)(R4) – Additional Units and Parking

Vice Chair Schaffer noted that the Planning Commission was currently waiting for the arrival of Corporation Counsel Perfetti. Atty. Scott Chatfield was present to represent Mr. DeVecchio. He proceeded to introduce the legal team present for Mr. DeVecchio. There was Atty. John DeVecchio, Jr., Atty. Mike Cardinal, Atty. Christopher Simser and Atty. Jamison DeVecchio.

Corporation Counsel Perfetti arrived at 5:35 PM. Attorney Chatfield stated that Judge Rumsey had ruled on their Article 78 proceeding and determined that the site plan that was previously granted for the structures that are presently on the premises contained a notation on it that said it was a four (4) unit building and he had concluded that they had site plan approval altogether on the site for seven (7) units as opposed to nine (9), but they had proposed to have six (6) units in the rear building.

Atty. Chatfield stated that there had been four (4) different Article 78 proceedings and this is the fourth (4th) Site Plan Review application for precisely the same property. He stated that the City, in their opinion, had demonstrated a history of reluctance to consider his client's cases in a fair and even-handed manner. Atty. Chatfield stated that he had been made privy to a series of e-mails between Vice Chair Schaffer and members of the Board and Comm. Spitzer and members of the Board. These had been sent last week. He stated that based upon their content and demeanor, it indicates that it would be impossible for us to obtain a fair and impartial determination by this Board. He also noted that by way of full disclosure, another member of the Board, Comm. Beckwith, has the potential for an appearance of impropriety in as much as he has had a contractual relationship with his client in the past. Atty. Chatfield insisted that the Chairwoman, Comm. Spitzer and Comm. Beckwith recuse themselves from consideration. He noted that this request was not made lightly, but he is looking out for the City's best interest as well as that of his client. He noted that he is certain based upon past history of this case, that despite what they are after is entitled by right, they will not be able to get approval from this Board, which will then necessitate additional litigation. He proposed that with the consent of City Corporation Counsel, that they stipulate to move this matter away from the jurisdiction of the City Planning Commission and to a jurisdiction in the environ, somewhere around here; of the City's choice of any

other municipality's Planning Board. He asked that that Planning Board apply the City's site plan approval standards to the merits of this case with an agreement that all parties be bound by their ultimate determination.

Comm. Spitzer stated that there is no basis in law or in fact for any member of this Board to recuse themselves and he felt that they should proceed as they always do. Atty. Chatfield asked if Comm. Spitzer had read the e-mail that he wrote. Comm. Spitzer stated that he knew what he had written. Atty. Chatfield felt that this was a matter for Corporation Counsel and he suggested that any questions be presented to him for a ruling in the matters of bias, prejudice or conflict of interest as these were not matters to be taken lightly. Comm. Spitzer agreed.

Vice Chair Schaffer noted that was Atty. Chatfield's interpretation and she would like to take the matter back to the application that was before this Board.

Corporation Counsel Perfetti recommended that the Planning Commission go into executive session to appropriately seek counsel. He noted that if Atty. Chatfield was correct in the nature of the issue he has raised, that everything this Board did hereafter would be suspect and he could prevail upon it. He noted it was to their benefit to seek counsel now, because when it comes to a conflict of interest there are several matters that should be counseled upon. He noted that even if there was not an actual conflict of interest, the Planning Commission had an obligation to avoid even the appearance of impropriety and in that regard; he advised that they should have a frank discussion in executive session. Atty. Chatfield agreed with that.

On the motion of Comm. Spitzer, seconded by Comm. McMahon, voted and approved to go in to executive session.

On the motion of Comm. McMahon, seconded by Comm. Spitzer, voted and approved to come out of executive session.

Vice Chair Schaffer stated that on the request of the applicant's counsel for recusal on the basis of various issues, she polled the Board. Vice Chair Schaffer asked Comm. Beckwith if he recused himself on this application. Comm. Beckwith recused himself. Vice Chair Schaffer asked Comm. Spitzer if he recused himself on this application. Comm. Spitzer recused himself. Vice Chair Schaffer recused herself. Vice Chair Schaffer noted that it left the Planning Commission with only two (2) members present and that this application was now off the table for lack of a quorum.

Site Plan Review – 93-95 Tompkins St. – (Grodinsky)(R2) – Fence

Atty. Chatfield stated that he was representing this application for Mr. Grodinsky regarding the installation of a fence to separate the two (2) parcels. He noted that they shared a common paved area in terms of their driveway. He noted that there had been a question about a deed and he presented a copy to provide proof that Mr. Grodinsky is the owner of record and he submitted a copy of that deed, which was dated September 22, 2008.

Atty. Chatfield noted that the application speaks to the fence along a common property line. He stated that the proposal is to install the fence along the common property line

and that would leave a seven point five three (7.53) foot separation between the adjacent premises and the proposed location of the fence. He noted that the other property owner would still have means of egress/ingress to the rear of his property. He noted that the City regulations call for a minimum eight (8) foot driveway on residential properties. He noted that the seven point five three (7.53) is just a bit less than that and what is there is a result of a pre-existing non-conforming lot lines. He noted that he has not had the opportunity to discuss with his client a proposal, by way of accommodation and to help, to give him eight (8) foot of width they would move the fence eight (8) feet away from the adjacent property so he would have the benefit of the width for ingress and egress. They would not sell him the property, though. He felt that was a reasonable accommodation, but they would not give up their rights to that property. He noted that having less than eight (8) feet was a concern, so he would recommend to his client to voluntarily agree not to move the fence to the limits of the property line, but rather stay back that plus or minus six (6) inches.

Vice Chair Schaffer stated that if he would like to speak to his client, the Board would grant him some time to do so and thereby amend the application. Gerry Ruggiero stated that he managed the property.

Zoning Officer Weber stated that he felt they were talking about a legal solution that might set precedent that the existing driveway is a pre-existing, non-conforming use and it doesn't have to be any wider than what it currently is. He also noted that there were a variety of things being expressed now and when something definitive is proposed, he would be happy to review it.

Atty. Chatfield understood the spirit in which Zoning Officer Weber's comments were being offered. He stated that the definitive proposal is to erect a fence as described along the property line to the extent that is his client's right and the Board has no concerns with respect to it and that is what he is asking the Board to consider. Atty. Chatfield noted that trying to anticipate the Planning Commissioners' concerns without conceding that you have a legitimate right to compel us to back the fence up six (6) inches so as to be nice to the next door neighbor, he would recommend that to his client if that was a condition of the approval of this Board. He noted that was as far as he would say. He stated that there was an application before the Board, that shows the fence on the property line which leaves the neighbor, seven point five (7.5) feet between the fence and the building on the neighbor's property and that is what is being submitted for your decision. He stated that the Board can approve this, approve with modifications or disapprove the application.

Vice Chair Schaffer asked how wide the actual fence was. Mr. Ruggiero stated that it was chain link fencing on one and five eighths (1 5/8) inch pipe and would be on the applicant's side of the property. Comm. Spitzer asked if he had had any discussions with the neighboring property owner about the fence. Atty. Chatfield stated that he had not spoken with him.

Mr. Ruggiero stated that he had had a discussion with Mr. Calabro last year about putting the fence up and that Mr. Calabro had offered to plow the snow in the shared driveway in order to keep Mr. Grodinsky from putting up the fence. He stated that now Mr. Grodinsky wants to go forward with putting up the fence.

Vice Chair Schaffer asked with the fence being up, how Mr. Ruggiero planned to do snow removal. Mr. Ruggiero stated that there was no problem with that on his side of the fence. Atty. Chatfield noted that their driveway was fourteen (14) to fifteen (15) feet wide and they had snow storage in the rear of the property. Vice Chair Schaffer asked if the neighbor had room to store snow. Atty. Chatfield stated that they had room because they had open space behind the adjacent premises.

Vice Chair Schaffer asked if the erection of the fence would necessitate a change in the curb cut. Mr. Ruggiero stated that it would not affect the curb cut.

Vice Chair Schaffer asked for a change in the site plan drawing as it shows that the fence is going across the sidewalk into the curb cut and out to the center line of the street. Atty. Chatfield stated that he would initial the change in the drawing as it would not be going across the sidewalk.

Comm. Spitzer asked if Mr. Calabro's attorney was present to express his opposition to this proposal.

Atty. Brody Smith was present and he indicated that he had reviewed the site plan and he noted several issues. He asked permission to speak and was granted permission.

Atty. Smith noted that putting the fence all the way up to the curb, could create line of sight issues and could pose a safety concern. He also noted that by putting up the fence down the middle of the driveway would not allow his client's driveway to be wide enough to allow access by a fire truck. He distributed photos. He noted that this was a three (3) story building and the current driveway width would allow a fire truck with a ladder to access the property, if needed. He further explained that snow plowing was another issue as his client's driveway wouldn't be wide enough to get a snow plow in there. He also noted that seven and a half (7 ½) feet wasn't wide enough for many of the larger cars. He also stated that the proposed fence is out of character with the community as there is no other chain link fencing on Tompkins Street. He stated that there had been in its present state for over twenty (20) years with the shared agreement.

Atty. Chatfield noted that it was not his client's problem that his neighbor suffers from difficulty of use of his property, further stating that the neighbor doesn't have the right to use his client's property for his convenience. He noted that his client does not wish to continue the contractual relationship and that this is about the rights of individuals to use their property that they own. When their relationship ended they could've made a legal arrangement to swap some land, but it was not done and Mr. Calabro did not protect his rights at that time. Vice Chair Schaffer stated that the Planning Commission had the right to make projects appropriate to the look of the neighborhood. She noted that the wooden fence on the edge of the greenspace clearly defines his property and was much more in keeping with the neighborhood and it defines, visually, a property. She felt that a wooden fence was far more appropriate for Tompkins Street, which is an extension of the Historic District, than a chain link fence would be in an R2 District. She asked that he take this site plan back and discuss it with his client and come to a better agreement that would be more appropriate to the neighborhood and to the use of the driveway.

Atty. Chatfield wanted more specificity and a resolution from the Board in dictating approval with that modification of wood fencing instead of chain link. He had a problem with this interminable refer and consider, refer and consider noting that it took two (2) years to go through one (1) case. He stated that if the Board had no problem with the erection of the fence, but would like them to consider a wooden fence, stockade or split rail as opposed to chain link, then he would have no problem if they did a resolution indicating approval with that modification and imposing that as a condition of that approval. That would bring this matter to a conclusion and his client would either agree or disagree.

Vice Chair Schaffer stated that the Board had proposed that Atty. Chatfield client should speak with the neighbor and come to some sort of agreement.

Atty. Chatfield stated that there would be no agreement between these two (2) parties. He stated that he had proposed that he would recommend to his client, if the Board imposed a condition, that the fence be eight (8) feet off of the neighbor's building, that he would recommend that to his client, but he would not recommend an agreement and that's all he said.

Comm. Spitzer felt that an agreement between the parties would be sensible.

Atty. Chatfield stated there would be no agreement between the parties. Mr. Ruggiero stated that he doesn't want to talk with the other property owner. Atty. Chatfield stated that he did not state to the Board that they were willing or able to enter into negotiations with Mr. Calabro, that will not occur. The reason being that Mr. Calabro has filed a complaint against his client. He stated that this Board is obligated to approve, approve with modifications or deny this application.

Corporation Counsel Perfetti stated that what the Vice Chair was suggesting was beyond the scope of what the Board has been requested to do. He stated that whether private parties chose to have agreements between them is a matter among them. The Vice Chair cannot recommend that they do that and is without meaning and not an appropriate exercise of what your authority is. He advised that the Board either approve, approve with modification or deny. He noted that what Mr. Chatfield is asking for is some definitive answer, so that he can advise his client that he's either going to get what he requested, or whether he's being compelled to a modification, which he can accept or reject and litigate or you'll reject this and then he can decide if he'll litigate or not.

Vice Chair Schaffer noted they were talking about a six (6) inch difference and he could talk to his client and that would make the Board's job considerably easier and we could go forward with any recommendation.

Comm. McMahon stated that he thought they should approve the project with the six (6) inch difference and if we want a wood fence, make that stipulation.

Corporation Counsel Perfetti counseled that dictating materials such as a wood fence would be treading into difficult ground to dictate fencing materials. He noted that unless the applicant was aware prior to his application as to what would not be approved, then he has no notice of what this Board may or may not approve. He gave background on
Planning Commission – August 22, 2011
City of Cortland

his opinion, noting that dictating materials was your own opinion or speculative and leaves the Board wide open to accusations of capricious arbitration. He further explained that as far as directives to where the fence is located, the applicant has asked that it be located on his property line. He explained that the applicant did not ask to have it located another six (6) inches within his property line. He noted that it's his fence and if he wants it on his property line he can put it on his property line. He further explained that the job of the Planning Commission isn't to work out accommodations for neighboring property owners and noted that they were not here to regulate neighborhood relations among neighboring property owners.

Comm. Spitzer read from the guidelines for the Planning Commission to reinforce the Commission's opinion on what they could do.

Corporation Counsel Perfetti stated that aesthetics are a matter of great personal preference and those municipalities that have had success in regulating aesthetics are ones that give the property owners advanced written notice, prior to their putting in applications, of what is acceptable and we don't have anything like that here in Cortland. He explained that what the Commissioners felt was aesthetically pleasing was a matter of their personal preference and might not be in the applicant's personal sense of aesthetic sensibilities and therefore, he has no advance notice. He stated that if the Commission was going to regulate in that area, he believed they were on very precarious ground on what will be upheld on a legal challenge of this Board's decision.

There was further discussion between Vice Chair Schaffer, Comm. Spitzer and Corporation Counsel Perfetti regarding physical attributes of a neighborhood and safety.

Corporation Counsel Perfetti noted that he had posed the question of the driveway width on the neighboring property being a problem for fire engines and Capt. Knickerbocker didn't seem to think there would be any problems getting in there. There was discussion regarding what was necessary to get equipment access to a piece of property. Capt. Knickerbocker stated the only concern would be getting a ladder to the upper floors from between the fence and the neighboring house.

Corporation Counsel Perfetti stated that from the nature of the Board's questions it would appear that the Board was looking for reasons not to approve this request and this is not your mandate.

Vice Chair Schaffer stated that Mr. Chatfield had raised the issue of suggesting to his client that he move the fence back another six (6) inches.

Corporation Counsel Perfetti stated that if that argument was made by the Board they would need to prepare to address that.

Atty. Chatfield stated that he would recommend to his client that it was probably not worth going to court over six (6) inches, but he would not speak for his client on that.

Vice Chair Schaffer stated that she understood that. She noted that a chain link fence was not appropriate for a residential area, especially in an Historic District. She reminded Atty. Chatfield that he had told her once, that he lived in an Historic District.

Comm. Couch stated some concerns with students who live in these buildings and they were used to driving into these driveways and with a chain link fence going down the middle of the blacktop it's going to look ridiculous. He felt that the fence will be hit frequently and will look unkempt. He noted that this was not a grassy strip, but a blacktopped area with a twenty (20) year history of shared use.

Atty. Smith asked the Planning Commission to read his letter on the second page noting the bullet points, especially the third bullet regarding impact on the neighborhood. He noted that these were things that the Planning Board was allowed to consider. He noted that they didn't want to approve a site plan that denies access to a property explaining that creating a narrow driveway would disrupt traffic patterns.

Vice Chair Schaffer stated that the Planning Commission has made a determination on issues like this in the past.

Atty. Smith stated that the Planning Commission did have the ability to not extend a non-conforming use. He noted that if the Commission's action exacerbated a non-conforming use that is absolutely something they should consider even though the applicant makes it seem very cut and dried regarding what they want to do on their property, especially if they're creating a public safety concern, adversely affecting neighbors or if they are going to be exacerbating a non-conforming use. He noted that they had a lot of legal support for denying this application. He stated that his client continues to make offers to purchase a six (6) inch easement or a two (2) foot easement and will continue to do so, but that's not really your problem. He asked them to please consider denying this application.

Vice Chair Schaffer asked Zoning Officer Weber about the non-conforming use.

Zoning Officer Weber stated that if that area has been used as a driveway, it's a non-conforming use that then is an established use. He noted that on the map, which went back to 1986, it shows that both driveways are non-conforming.

Atty. Smith noted that they would be expanding the non-conforming use.

Corporation Counsel Perfetti rejected that argument stating that it was not an expansion because if it were, they would need a variance. He noted that erecting a fence as a boundary does not get into the issue of whether the non-conformity is expanded or diminished. He felt it was an argument that complicated the issue.

Atty. Chatfield agreed that conformance has no implication in this issue. He did note that they were not altering the curb cut and not altering egress and ingress from which exists.

Vice Chair Schaffer stated in a sense the applicant was because it's now going to be a sharp turn.

Atty. Chatfield noted that he is not saying that drivers won't have to change their habits, but his client will still have about fifteen (15) to twenty (20) foot wide drive on his side from where the fence will be erected. He noted that they are not altering egress or ingress to either property and drivers will have to modify their behavior, but that is not a

concern of the Planning Commission. He explained that the Planning Commission would have to site facts that substantiated each of their conclusions, but in the absence of specific guidelines and specific determinations adopted by the legislative body to curtail or constrain the exercise of discretion by the Planning Board almost any determination is arbitrary and capricious.

Comm. Spitzer noted that doesn't make any sense. Escalating discussion ensued regarding the definition and role of the Planning Board and their decision making process.

Atty. Smith tried to speak. Atty. Chatfield stated that this was a public hearing and he had the floor. Vice Chair Schaffer stated that this was not a public hearing. Atty. Chatfield asked why opposing counsel was allowed to speak if this wasn't a public hearing. Vice Chair Schaffer stated that he had been allowed to speak.

Vice Chair Schaffer felt that a motion should be considered if anyone had one to put forward.

Comm. Beckwith recused himself.

On a motion by Comm. Couch, seconded by Comm. Spitzer, to deny this application based on the fact that it would change precedent and use for tenants, was voted and failed.

Comm. Spitzer – Approve
Comm. Couch – Approve
Vice Chair Schaffer – Approve

Comm. McMahon - Deny

Comm. Beckwith – Recused himself

MOTION FAILED

Atty. Chatfield stated that the motion failed and Corporation Counsel Perfetti concurred. Corporation Counsel Perfetti noted that this was less than a full seated body of seven (7) noting that there was a quorum, but for any proposals to pass they would need a majority vote of four (4) persons of this duly constituted body.

A discussion regarding a quorum then took place between Commission members and attorneys. Corporation Counsel Perfetti stated that Atty. Chatfield was correct in his statement regarding this vote. Vice Chair Schaffer agreed, noting that was how the Planning Commission's governing document also read.

Vice Chair Schaffer noted that this could be tabled until such time as the Board might get a larger number of voting members in attendance. Atty. Chatfield stated that they could table it for up to sixty-two (62) days.

On the motion of Comm. Couch, seconded by Comm. McMahon, voted and approved to table the Site Plan Review of 93-95 Tompkins St. until the September 26, 2011 meeting.

Atty. Chatfield asked for a roll call vote.

Comm. Couch – Approve to table
Comm. McMahon – Approve to table
Comm. Spitzer – Approve to table
Vice Chair Schaffer – Approve to table

Comm. Beckwith – Recused himself

Minutes – July 25, 2011

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

Adjournment – 7:25 PM

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

I, JO SCHAFFER, 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 22TH OF AUGUST 2011.

JO SCHAFFER, VICE CHAIRPERSON