MR. COCKS: Bryant Cocks, Garling

Hauser & Edsall, Consulting Engineers.

24

notice that the Planning Board of the Town of

Newburgh, Orange County, New York will hold a

public hearing pursuant to Section 276 of the

23

24

Town Law on the application of lands of Gallagher for a two-lot subdivision on premises Ashley
Drive in the Town of Newburgh, designated on Town tax map as Section 43; Block 5; lot 2.21. Said hearing will be held on the 6th day of May 2010 at the Town Hall Meeting Room, 1496 Route 300,
Newburgh, New York at 7 p.m. at which time all interested persons will be given an opportunity to be heard. By order of the Town of Newburgh
Planning Board. John P. Ewasutyn, Chairman,
Planning Board Town of Newburgh. Dated April 6,

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Tom, would you report on the mailing?

MR. FOGARTY: We sent out thirteen certified letters and we received ten receipts returned.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Thank you.

Mr. James, if you would give your presentation.

Before we start the meeting; Mike
Donnelly, would you explain to the audience the
purpose of a public hearing.

MR. DONNELLY: Sure. Subdivision

1

7

5

9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25

We're showing the proposed house.

public hearings are mandatory. The purpose is for the public to bring matters to the attention of the Board that the Planning Board or its consultants may not have discovered. After the applicant gives his presentation, if anyone wishes to speak, we'd ask you to raise your hand and the Chairman will recognize you. Please direct your comments to the Board. If you have questions, the Chairman will direct those questions to either the applicant's representative or one of the consultants.

> CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Thank you.

Mr. James.

MR. JAMES: What we have is a two-lot subdivision of the lands of Edward and Cornelia Gallagher located at the northerly terminus of Ashley Drive. It consists of 4.9 acres. There's an existing house on the property.

The division line will create two lots. Lot 1 will have the existing house and improvements on it, and it is 3.6 acres. second lot, the vacant lot, will be 1.3 acres.

There will be on-site sewage disposal.

addressed.

MR. PROFACI: Aye.

MR. HINES: I'm not aware of that.

25

final approval for the two-lot subdivision of

| 1 | LANDS OF GALLAGHER 11 |
|----|---|
| 2 | lands of Gallagher subject to the conditions that |
| 3 | were presented to us by our Attorney, Mike |
| 4 | Donnelly. |
| 5 | MR. MENNERICH: So moved. |
| 6 | MR. FOGARTY: Second. |
| 7 | CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: I have a motion by |
| 8 | Ken Mennerich. The second was by Tom Fogarty? |
| 9 | MR. FOGARTY: Yes. |
| 10 | CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Any discussion of |
| 11 | the motion? |
| 12 | (No response.) |
| 13 | CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: I'll ask for a roll |
| 14 | call vote starting with Ken Mennerich. |
| 15 | MR. MENNERICH: Aye. |
| 16 | MR. PROFACI: Aye. |
| 17 | MR. FOGARTY: Aye. |
| 18 | MR. WARD: Aye. |
| 19 | CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Myself yes. So |
| 20 | carried. |
| 21 | Thank you. |
| 22 | |
| 23 | (Time noted: 7:07 p.m.) |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |

CERTIFICATION

I, Michelle Conero, a Shorthand Reporter and Notary Public within and for the State of New York, do hereby certify that I recorded stenographically the proceedings herein at the time and place noted in the heading hereof, and that the foregoing is an accurate and complete transcript of same to the best of my knowledge and belief.

DATED: June 1, 2010

U

MR. PROFACI: The next item on this evening's agenda is Metro PCS - Meadow Hill Road, Meadow Hill Road cell tower, Section 60; Block 3; Lot 35.1 located in the IB Zone. It's a site plan for a special use permit represented by Daniel Laub.

MR. FURST: Good evening. I'm John

Furst. I work at Cuddy & Feder with Dan Laub.

I'll be making -- would the Board like a brief

presentation?

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Please.

MR. FURST: Metro PCS is seeking a special use site plan approval to co-locate a wireless telecommunications facility on an existing 145- foot tower that's located off Meadow Hill Road which is right by the Newburgh Mall. As you know, Metro PCS is an FCC licensed provider of next generation digital wireless PCS services. They've been before the Board on a couple of prior occasions. They're trying to complete the build out of their network in the Town of Newburgh. They're starting from scratch here. They've already got some prior approvals before the Board . This is another piece of the

puzzle. They're looking to provide service along the New York State Thruway, I-84, Route 52, Meadow Hill Road and Route 300.

Sprint, Omnipoint, Verizon and AT&T currently operate at this site. We would be the fifth carrier on this pole.

Metro is planning to install fifteen antennas on the existing tower with a center line item of approximately 108 feet above ground level. So they'll be the lowest of all the carriers on this pole.

In addition, they will not be increasing the height of this tower.

In addition to the antennas there will be an unmanned equipment cabinet within an existing fenced-in compound located at the base of the tower.

Just to provide a little update, in the original application we had submitted plans for three equipment cabinets. We made a slight revision this week. What they're doing is they're proposing four cabinets in the same general area. It's going to be a little L-shaped.

In addition to that they had to relocate one of the power and telephone cabinets a little further I guess to the northeast within the existing compound.

So all the changes are just minor changes occurring within the compound. It has to do with their site layout. Again, this just came about the last couple of days. We will submit revised plans to the Board when they're ready.

This proposal constitutes the highest preference for siting wireless facilities within the Town pursuant to your wireless regulations.

It's consistent with the other carriers' facilities. It will have minimal impact, if any, on the surrounding neighborhood.

We had some individual simulations.

Again, we are the fifth carrier. There's already four carriers on there and we'll be the lowest height.

That's pretty much it in a nutshell.

We also had submitted a structural report which I guess is probably the real issue here. I believe your consultant is still looking at it. So that was submitted with the original

application and we're here for any questions. We have the engineer as well as the radiofrequency engineer here if you have any questions regarding coverage issues.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Thank you. At this time in the meeting we'll ask the Planning Board's communication representative, Mike Musso, to update us.

MR. MUSSO: Sure. Mr. Chairman,

Members of the Board and Members of the Public,

thanks for having me here tonight. Mike Musso

with HDR working on behalf of the Town of

Newburgh.

As noted, this is a proposed colocation site. The New York State Thruway is running north in that direction. This is in the back of the Newburgh Mall area. I know this Board is familiar with it because we did look at a co-location several months ago for Verizon.

A couple notes. There is an established equipment compound in the back.

Metro PCS's equipment by design and the nature of their system is relatively small. This L-shaped area is the proposed lease area within this

bubble.

This is the small change. It's about a four-foot by two-foot pad where an equipment compound is going to be set onto. So as noted, we have confirmed everything is within this

 $\verb|compound.|$

The existing tower is located back at this end. At this point we are working with the applicant's structural engineer to confirm and clarify some assumptions.

I know every application that's gone in front of this Board, we do want to be ensuring the existing infrastructure has enough structural integrity to maintain the new and existing.

We're reviewing that right now with regard to the latest codes, design assumptions and what not, and certainly by the time we issue our report within the next couple weeks we'll have our structural addendum on the back of that.

One thing I did want to note about the photo simulations is photo simulations were taken at a time when there were three carriers located, Sprint at the top, Omnipoint second and what is now AT&T number three. Since those photo

_

simulations were taken Verizon antennas have been installed.

I think a question that came up at the work session was the antennas seemed a little bit out of scale. The plans that are shown are accurate. They do display all four existing arrays and the proposed array.

At this point, I guess just to give you some highlights of our review, we have reviewed it for comprehensiveness against the code. We do feel that the application has all the elements in it that we usually look at except for the structural clarifications that will happen.

This site is a very key site to Metro PCS as it is to other carriers. 84 and the New York State Thruway are certainly highly traveled areas, and also the commercial areas off of 300 are a high desire for wireless coverage.

We looked at the radiofrequency report that preceded, confirming that the existing four carriers plus Metro proposed antennas have been incorporated. As expected, the ground-based or general public areas of radiofrequency are significantly lower, on the order of one to two

| 1 | METRO PCS - MEADOW HILL ROAD 20 |
|----|--|
| 2 | percent of what would be allowed for full-time |
| 3 | general public exposure. |
| 4 | So we'll tie up all these items for our |
| 5 | final letter report that's submitted including |
| 6 | the structural. Really at this point I don't |
| 7 | have much more to comment on, unless there's any |
| 8 | questions from the Board or public. |
| 9 | CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Are there any |
| 10 | questions from the Board at this time? |
| 11 | (No response.) |
| 12 | CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: The consultants? |
| 13 | MR. HINES: None. |
| 14 | CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: John, would anyone |
| 15 | on your team like to speak? |
| 16 | MR. FURST: No. We're basically here |
| 17 | for the Board's questions, if any. |
| 18 | CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Thank you. |
| 19 | Mike Musso, your advice to the Board as |
| 20 | far as SEQRA determination. Would you advise us |
| 21 | that we can act as far as declaring a negative |
| 22 | declaration and setting the 16th of June for a |
| 23 | public hearing with the fact that between today, |
| 24 | being May 6th, and the time of the public |

25

hearing, being June 16th, that you'll have

received a structural analysis that you would 2 find satisfactory to the Board? 3 MR. MUSSO: I think subject to that, that would be, Mr. Chairman, the one outstanding 5 item that we do anticipate getting resolved. 6 7 Having worked with the same structural engineers at this same site on other applications, I do 9 think the application is comprehensive enough to 10 make those decisions. MR. DONNELLY: I think the date is the 11 17th of June. 12 13 CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Thank you ever so 14 much. Thank you. I appreciate that. 15 Any additional comments? 16 MR. FOGARTY: During the work session I 17 had some concerns about the weight and the load 18 on the pole. What would occur if this causes the 19 weight to go over the max? Are there things done 20 to the pole to reinforce it or once it goes over 21 the max that's it, you have to look at another 22 equipment location? 23 MR. MUSSO: That's an item we're 24 looking at. If you remember, with another application with the lattice tower there was 25

| 2 | reinforcing proposed on some of those members. A |
|----|---|
| 3 | monopole is a different type of structure. We |
| 4 | want to confirm there is adequate capacity, |
| 5 | existing loads, proposed loads, and then also any |
| 6 | wind or icing conditions that are put on top of |
| 7 | that. So certainly it has to be below that |
| 8 | criteria, and that's what we're working on now to |
| 9 | confirm. |
| 10 | MR. FOGARTY: Thanks. |
| 11 | CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Additional |
| 12 | comments? |
| 13 | MR. MENNERICH: Just a question. Mike, |
| 14 | earlier you mentioned there's some work going on |
| 15 | at the site on the landscaping. |
| 16 | MR. MUSSO: Yeah. |
| 17 | MR. MENNERICH: Is that from the |
| 18 | previous application that work is being done |
| 19 | under? |
| 20 | MR. MUSSO: Yes. There's no |
| 21 | landscaping proposed as part of this application. |
| 22 | In speaking at the work session tonight just |
| 23 | reminded me, as I often do with Karen Arent, |
| 24 | Landscape Architect, we want to make sure that |

things that may have been done got carried

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

break from one another after this week.

_

Reporter and Notary Public within and for
the State of New York, do hereby certify
that I recorded stenographically the
proceedings herein at the time and place
noted in the heading hereof, and that the

knowledge and belief.

foregoing is an accurate and complete

transcript of same to the best of my

CERTIFICATION

I, Michelle Conero, a Shorthand

DATED: June 1, 2010

25

proposing to subdivide that into two lots.

MAGYAR SUBDIVISION

existing house will be on the 1.15 acre parcel.

The proposed new residence will be put on the

1.67 acre parcel.

The house will be served by a well and subsurface disposal system. The existing house has a subsurface disposal system.

They're connected to Town water, however we would carry a line in from Route 9W to this site.

Joe Magyar is proposing to build a house and live there. This site has been in the family for quite a few number of years. The existing house was built in 1920.

Access will be through Larabee Lane which is a private road. Like I said, the house was built in 1920, so that's been there for quite some time.

That is basically the presentation.

The septic system, we did conduct the percolation tests and deep tests last Saturday. We did find it had excellent results.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Thank you. At this point I'll turn to Jerry Canfield, Code Compliance.

| 1 | MAGYAR SUBDIVISION 30 |
|----|---|
| 2 | MR. CANFIELD: We have nothing. |
| 3 | CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Okay. Pat Hines, |
| 4 | Drainage Consultant? |
| 5 | MR. HINES: We were looking for |
| 6 | information on the water supply for existing lot |
| 7 | 1, if you know where that is. I was a little |
| 8 | surprised to see that was connected to the Town |
| 9 | water. |
| 10 | MR. VALDINA: It is connected to Town |
| 11 | water. There really aren't any valves here. We |
| 12 | can show where it comes into the house but |
| 13 | there's a valve out here on 9W. It is on the |
| 14 | Town records. They do have a meter and they do |
| 15 | pay. |
| 16 | MR. HINES: It's just a three-quarter |
| 17 | inch service lateral? |
| 18 | MR. VALDINA: Three-quarter inch. It |
| 19 | comes in from the west. This lot is on the east, |
| 20 | the east side of the lot. |
| 21 | MR. HINES: Considering the distance, I |
| 22 | would recommend that a well be installed then. I |
| 23 | don't want to put another house 600 and some feet |
| 24 | in on a three-quarter inch water main again. |

The existing bulk table identifies a

front yard setback insufficiency. As Bryant will explain his comments, it needs to go to ZBA.

We're looking for the ownership of
Larabee Lane and if it has a maintenance
agreement or if there ever was one filed. I'll
refer everything to Mike on that.

MR. VALDINA: Like I say, the house was built in 1920. It has a private road sign there. There was a subdivision adjacent to this in 1981 which was filed. The filed deed does indicate this parcel has access over Larabee Lane to Route 9W. That's the extent of it. It's been maintained for the last ninety years.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Mike Donnelly.

MR. DONNELLY: Let me see that deed if you would. I don't mean tonight. Send it to me.

MR. DONNELLY: It might be sensible, since we're going to have two lots, at least these two lots that you control, to record some kind of maintenance agreement so if they go into separate ownership that at least these two lots can maintain the private road.

Right now who is paying to maintain the road now.

| 1 | MAGYAR SUBDIVISION 32 |
|----|---|
| 2 | MR. VALDINA: Basically the Magyars. |
| 3 | MR. DONNELLY: Why don't you make sure. |
| 4 | So when there's two separate owners what's |
| 5 | going to happen is people are going to show up at |
| 6 | the Town Hall complaining to the Town Board about |
| 7 | how the Planning Board let this happen. Let's |
| 8 | record a maintenance agreement if one doesn't |
| 9 | exist. |
| 10 | CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Thank you. |
| 11 | Pat? |
| 12 | MR. HINES: We're looking for the topo |
| 13 | to be added to the future plans. |
| 14 | Deep and percolation testing which you |
| 15 | mentioned, we'll look for those, and review the |
| 16 | septic system, and then we have some clean-up |
| 17 | notes you received. |
| 18 | MR. VALDINA: No, I didn't. |
| 19 | MR. HINES: You didn't? |
| 20 | MR. VALDINA: No. |
| 21 | MR. HINES: We'll get you a copy. |
| 22 | With that we believe it has sufficient |
| 23 | information for sketch. That's all we have. |
| 24 | CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Bryant Cocks, |

Planning Consultant?

25

As mentioned, the private road

MAGYAR SUBDIVISION

2 maintenance agreement.

1

3

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

There's going to be a \$2,000 parkland fee for this lot. You're able to defer that to the time of building permit. If you want to do that, there's a note you're going to have to put on the plan.

The E.A.F. has to be revised to state from the DEC whether there's threatened or endangered species on the site.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Karen, do you have anything to add?

MS. ARENT: No.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Board Members?

MR. MENNERICH: No questions.

MR. PROFACI: Nothing additional.

MR. FOGARTY: No comment.

MR. WARD: No comments.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: My only minor comment was I think at some point in time there will need to be a stop sign, I didn't notice one when I was out there, at the end of that road. I think that's a requirement even with private roads.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Jerry, would they

MAGYAR SUBDIVISION

2 have to have stop signs?

3 MR. CANFIELD: Back then I don't know.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: I mean now they're

5 updating it is what I'm saying.

MR. CANFIELD: It would be a good idea.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: I think it's part

of the code. Okay.

I'll move for a motion to circulate this to the Orange County Planning Department and also have Mike Donnelly speak on behalf of the referral to the ZBA for a front yard variance.

Mike.

MR. DONNELLY: Right. As Bryant mentioned, when a deficiency, even a pre-existing one, that's protected is subject to a subdivision, the protection is lost and you need to apply for a variance. Because we don't have the exact dimension, I would suggest I mention then in the approval letter that the proper dimension of the variance sought will be supplied in the application made directly to the ZBA rather than hold up the referral until we have that information.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Okay.

MR. WARD: Aye.

 $\underline{\text{C} \text{ E R T I F I C A T I O N}}$

I, Michelle Conero, a Shorthand Reporter and Notary Public within and for the State of New York, do hereby certify that I recorded stenographically the proceedings herein at the time and place noted in the heading hereof, and that the foregoing is an accurate and complete transcript of same to the best of my knowledge and belief.

DATED: June 1, 2010

MR. PROFACI: The final item on this

evening's agenda is Kristopher J. Noto, site plan

and ARB, located on Route 52 and Old South Plank

Road, Section 64; Block 3; Lot 8.2 in the B Zone,

represented by Justin Dates.

MR. DATES: I'm Justin Dates with Maser Consulting. I have Linda Zwart, the project architect, and also the applicant, Mr. and Mrs. Kris Noto.

Would you like me to just update the Planning Board? It's been some time since we were last here.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Sure.

MR. DATES: Actually we were last here April of 2009 in which a conceptual approval was granted for the project.

The project is located in the B

District. The lot is 1.43 acres and it is

naturally subdivided by the right-of-way for Old

South Plank Road. There is a portion of the lot

on either side of South Plank Road.

The proposed development is focused on .56 acres in the B Zoning District. This lot has frontage to the north on Old South Plank Road and

then on the south on Route 52. The site is also located in the Town water and sewer district.

We're proposing a 3,000 square foot eating and drinking establishment, a single story building. We have the required parking based on Town code, twenty spaces here off to the east of the site.

There are two access points to the site itself. The main access for customers for the parking lot is off of Route 52, and then on the back side off Old South Plank Road is more of the service access to the building. The dumpster is located in the rear there as well. That would be picked up through the Old South Plank Road access point.

Stormwater design is per the Town and State regs. We're using a subsurface storm tech system in this area of the parking lot to treat stormwater.

Basically the grade of the site is from left to right, the high point being on the left lower right-hand side of the site. So our grading plan kind of mimics that natural grade putting the low point for the storm tech system

in that area. The stormwater itself from the west of the site is conveyed through a grass swale. The curb breaks in the parking lot which would allow stormwater to runoff into that swale there.

The building is proposed to be serviced by Town water and sewer through connections in Old South Plank Road and the existing mains.

We did develop full lighting and landscaping plans for the project site taking into consideration the design standards. We have some stonewalls proposed on either side of the access there on 52 and then also adjacent to the -- on the east and west side of the building there.

I think that sums up the project.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Do you want to show us some -- go through your ARB? Do you have any samples with you of material?

MS. ZWART: Yes, I do.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: For the record would you give your name, please?

MS. ZWART: It's Linda Zwart, and I'm a licensed architect.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Do you have a business card, by chance, for the Stenographer?

If not it's all right.

MS. ZWART: Yes, I do.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Would you mind giving it to the Stenographer.

MS. ZWART: Hopefully this doesn't tip over. Okay. The drawing here reflects what you have in your packet.

Basically what we're trying to do is go with some earth tones that are generally pleasing with some of the other buildings in the area.

The lower portion of the building is going to be the cultured brick and then the -- its exterior finish and insulation system, that is going to be the big wall area, and then the trim around it.

There's going to be a couple canopies over the front entrance doors and the side entrance doors. They're going to be in the style of this shown, and they're going to be more of a burgundy color. This is just showing like a shape and a style.

For the most part it's going to be, you know, landscaped all around per the landscape

refer to the plan that you have there, you can

see that the center portion just pops out about eighteen inches just to break up the side, give it a little bit of balance. Because of the shape of the site, you know, it is going to be a long facade. We wanted to break it up, make it look interesting, make it look inviting. This is going to be the front from the parking lot.

MR. MENNERICH: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Joe Profaci?

MR. PROFACI: How high is the cultured brick going to be versus the Drive It?

MS. ZWART: The Drive It goes up -- the soffit there is about twenty-two foot and this is going to be approximately three-and-a-half to four feet. If you'd like also, for your records, because I noticed one of the comments that had come in is you wanted the materials labeled. I also have this. I prefer to do this type because it's a little bit more accurate on what it's going to be looking like. The computer tends to make it a little monomatic, but at least this comes with actual, you know, labels. It lists the shingles, what's being called out and that sort of thing. There's several copies if you'd

like to add it to the packet.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: You can put one in the basket if you don't mind. You can distribute them to people. Give one to Bryant Cocks, Karen Arent and give one to Jerry Canfield.

MR. PROFACI: That's all I have, John.
CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Tom Fogarty?

MR. FOGARTY: Not on this. There was a concern in one of the memos that I read insofar as Ken Wersted was supposed to make a comment on the delivery area and whether or not the trucks would be able to make the turn in the delivery area. I don't know if that was addressed or not.

MR. DATES: I didn't get any comments from Ken.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: We didn't get one either.

MR. DATES: The service access is for a large box truck. No semis. Large box trucks and garbage trucks would be utilizing that access.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Bryant, if you'd make it a point to e-mail Ken Wersted on that.

MR. FOGARTY: Thank you.

MR. WARD: The only question I had is

2 it's going to be facing 52. Is there a reason 3 why can't you put any windows on that side?

MS. ZWART: This center section here does have windows. In general for an eating/ drinking establishment, if you have a lot of windows on the edges sometimes it dictates more exactly where your tables and that sort of thing are going to be. For example, head into Fridays, TGIFs or something like that, a typical restaurant like that, if you look at the facade there's usually a grouping of windows and then it's more blank just so you get a little bit more flexibility in what you can do with the interior. It gets a little more cozy when you're getting into the actual layout.

MR. HINES: It will keep them from putting neon signs in the windows, too. That's notorious on that strip.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Comments from our consultants on the ARB. Jerry Canfield?

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$ CANFIELD: I have nothing on the ARB.

MR. HINES: Nothing.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Bryant Cocks?

MR. COCKS: Just the signage that's going to be on the plan, just a signage chart has to be labeled with the ARB drawings and the site plan showing allowable amount of signage and what the proposed amount of signage is.

MS. ZWART: Okay.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Karen Arent?

MS. ARENT: I have the same comment as Bryant, just the signage.

I had one other comment. The mechanical units, do you know where they'll go? The air conditioning compressor units. Just as long as they're not in the front if it's possible.

 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{MS}}$. ZWART: No, we wouldn't do that to you.

MS. ARENT: If they have to be, make your building function well, just show them so they can be screened. If you can just address that.

MS. ZWART: That's fine. We can do that.

MS. ARENT: That's it.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Thank you. Would

did have to go to the ZBA for this project.

Because of the linear dimensions of the site, we did need to get two front yard setbacks and a variance for lot depth, which we did get all three variances.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Okay. At this point I'll turn to Jerry Canfield, Code Compliance.

MR. CANFIELD: We have no outstanding site issues.

We had commented earlier about accessibility which has been corrected.

Also there's good accessibility for firefighting from Route 52.

We have nothing outstanding. There was a comment about the water line, but Pat will discuss that.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Okay. Pat Hines,
Drainage Consultant?

MR. HINES: A City of Newburgh flow acceptance letter is required. If you can send a narrative report of the project along with the anticipated flow from the project to Jim Osborne, he'll forward that on to the City. It's a

procedural step that we need to complete before any approvals.

The sprinkler service connection needs to be in compliance with the Town code where if the fire suppression sprinklers are set off the potable water supply to the building is also shut off. If you need that we can supply that typical detail to you.

We're looking for the depth of the percolation deep tests at the bottom of the infiltration system.

Drainage manhole number 1, it looks like it needs an adjustment to the grades there. You're about .2 feet higher at the catch basin and your discharge to the infiltrator is --

MR. DATES: We can take care of that.

MR. HINES: Also we need a note on the map requiring the execution of an enforceable agreement for operation and maintenance of the stormwater and submission of an annual report to the code compliance office. And then we ask that you consider putting rip rap between the drop curbs and the swale on the final plans.

MR. DATES: Okay.

| 1 | KRISTOPHER J. NOTO 52 |
|----|---|
| 2 | MR. HINES: That's all we have. |
| 3 | CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Bryant Cocks? |
| 4 | MR. COCKS: My first comment is just |
| 5 | regarding the sidewalks on the plan. They're |
| 6 | listed at five feet and in the narrative you said |
| 7 | it will be six feet. |
| 8 | MR. DATES: It will be five feet. |
| 9 | MR. COCKS: The garbage enclosure, just |
| 10 | indicate the color of the vinyl slats. |
| 11 | We did send this to the Orange County |
| 12 | Planning Department. They issued a Local |
| 13 | determination and didn't have any comments. |
| 14 | We're going to need approvals from the |
| 15 | Town of Newburgh Highway Department and the New |
| 16 | York State DOT. |
| 17 | You mentioned the ZBA determination. |
| 18 | If you guys want to defer the landscape |
| 19 | bond until the time of building permit, there's a |
| 20 | note that needs to go on the plans. If you want |
| 21 | to do that, e-mail me and I'll send it to you. |
| 22 | MR. DATES: Okay. |
| 23 | CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Karen Arent, |
| 24 | Landscape Architect? |
| | 1 |

MS. ARENT: The Planning Board is fine

| | 3 | |
|---|---|--|
| | 4 | |
| | 5 | |
| | 6 | |
| | 7 | |
| | 8 | |
| | 9 | |
| 1 | 0 | |
| 1 | 1 | |
| 1 | 2 | |
| 1 | 3 | |
| 1 | 4 | |
| 1 | 5 | |
| 1 | 6 | |
| 1 | 7 | |
| 1 | 8 | |
| 1 | 9 | |
| 2 | 0 | |
| 2 | 1 | |
| 2 | 2 | |
| 2 | 3 | |
| 2 | 4 | |
| _ | _ | |

1

2

with no sidewalk across the front.

The thirty-inch high walls are fine.

If you can consider possibly a little more screening of the parking area from Route 52, from the highway.

MR. DATES: Where? Old South Plank?

MS. ARENT: Old South Plank.

MR. DATES: We are preserving a good buffer of the existing mature vegetation there, and we do have supplemental shrub plantings.

MS. ARENT: Right. For the parking area. I was concerned about the other side.

MR. HINES: The Route 52 side.

MS. ARENT: Route 52. I'm sorry. You had I think some Spirea.

MR. DATES: We have some Inkberry, we have some Matea. We have a couple clusters along with the stonewall. There's a cluster planting here and here to kind of take care of some screening from the road.

MS. ARENT: It's up to the Planning
Board if they want any more screening. Do you
feel that the back of the building is adequately
screened in the winter, the service area?

MR. DATES: We are maintaining the existing vegetation there with some foundation plantings along there. You can see it from the architect's rendering here.

MS. ARENT: More the dumpster area. I thought there's a little bit of view in from the back of the dumpster area. That's again a Planning Board decision, whether or not they feel --

MR. DATES: We do have the full enclosure on that along with some evergreens.

MS. ARENT: That was the portion of the building that will be visible. It's up to the Planning Board whether or not they would want screening.

Is there going to be a free-standing sign or are all the signs going to be on the building?

MR. NOTO: I never thought about -yeah, I would like a free-standing sign.

MS. ARENT: You should consider it now just to show what it would look like, either on the architectural drawings or the site plan, and include both sides of it in your calculation for

square footage of signage.

MR. NOTO: Okay.

MS. ARENT: You have two front yards -two roads, so you're probably allowed, you know,
a fairly -- I don't think a free-standing sign
would trigger any variances because you have so
much -- it's one half of the linear footage of
signage -- square foot of signage for every
linear footage of road frontage. Sorry.

MR. COCKS: You were right the first time.

MS. ARENT: So you probably have more than enough road frontage to put a free-standing sign if so desired. And the design guidelines show you what kind of signs.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Comments from Board Members. Ken Mennerich?

MR. MENNERICH: One thing relative to signage that Karen was talking about. Since there is a lot of road frontage you could end up with a huge sign, but I think it should be in proportion to the size of the building so it doesn't stand out.

MR. NOTO: We're not going to get

2 carried away with it.

MR. MENNERICH: The other thing was the color of the slats for the garbage enclosure gate. Linda, do you have some thoughts on what color that would be? To go with the building or --

MS. ZWART: I would prefer to see something that would go with the building because it's adjacent to the building. Correct?

MR. DATES: Yes.

MS. ZWART: I would prefer to see something that would go with the building. Some of the darker browns that are used, not the lighter browns. That's basically your choice. Either that or like a forest green. Typically it doesn't look good. I mean they really don't. I think I would rather see the earth tone brown or some of the darker ones.

MR. MENNERICH: Yes.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Joe Profaci?

MR. PROFACI: I have nothing further.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Tom Fogarty?

MR. FOGARTY: I have no questions.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: John Ward?

MR. WARD: The stonewall, as long as it looks -- blends in with the building and the contour of the neighbors and everything else, I think that would be nice for the building itself. It would attract people.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: All right. The next thing I have to poll the Board Members on is if the Planning Board wants to hold a public hearing.

MR. MENNERICH: Do you want comments?

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Please. Thank you.

MR. MENNERICH: I guess because there are residential properties to the north of the site, I think we probably should have a public hearing.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Joe Profaci?

MR. PROFACI: Yes.

MR. FOGARTY: I agree.

MR. WARD: Yes.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Okay. We actually couldn't act on approving this, even subject to the revised plans, until we get a City flow acceptance letter from the City. So we have that window of time.

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Bryant, I know you'll be away next I'm asking you based upon your assistance week. with the circulation and mailings, if we should set this for the 17th --Mike, thanks for correcting me. -- the 17th of June for a public hearing. MR. COCKS: That's fine. I can get it out tomorrow. CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: If that's the case then we would have it for the -- that would be the 17th -- that would be the first of June. That might be too soon. Okay. I'll move for a motion to set this for a public hearing on the 17th of June.

Jason, if you work with Bryant Cocks for the mailing and circulation. The one thing I'll ask of you is on that Tuesday, which would be the 15th, if you could get to the Planning Board office, let me know that you'll be bringing them in so we can accept it, is your return receipts for the certified mailing.

MR. DATES: Do you think we could -- is there enough time for the early June meeting?

25

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Myself yes.

<u>C E R T I F I C A T I O N</u>

I, Michelle Conero, a Shorthand Reporter and Notary Public within and for the State of New York, do hereby certify that I recorded stenographically the proceedings herein at the time and place noted in the heading hereof, and that the foregoing is an accurate and complete transcript of same to the best of my knowledge and belief.

DATED: June 1, 2010

О

<u>C E R T I F I C A T I O N</u>

I, Michelle Conero, a Shorthand Reporter and Notary Public within and for the State of New York, do hereby certify that I recorded stenographically the proceedings herein at the time and place noted in the heading hereof, and that the foregoing is an accurate and complete transcript of same to the best of my knowledge and belief.

DATED: June 1, 2010

| CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Joe, skip to the |
|---|
| third item next because I think the last item we |
| don't have money for the Stenographer. We'll |
| make that a general discussion. |
| MR. PROFACI: Okay. The next item is |
| Elm Farm Subdivision which is an extension of |
| preliminary approval which expires on May 9, 2010 |
| and will run through November 9, 2010. |
| MR. SULLIVAN: I'm Dan Sullivan, the |
| Attorney. I just came because the last time I |
| understand there were a lot of problems with |
| communications the approval of the minutes, |
| your approval last time, and you got very nervous |
| so I said I would come tonight to see if it was |
| approved. So I could tell them I was here. |
| CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Okay. I'll move |
| for a motion to grant the approval for Elm Farm |
| Subdivision to November 9, 2010. |
| MR. FOGARTY: So moved. |
| MR. PROFACI: Second. |
| CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: I have a motion by |
| Tom Fogarty. I have a second by Joe Profaci. Any |
| discussion of the motion? |
| |

(No response.)

| 1 | ELM FARM SUBDIVISION 67 |
|----|---|
| 2 | CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: I'll move for a |
| 3 | roll call vote starting with Ken Mennerich. |
| 4 | MR. MENNERICH: Aye. |
| 5 | MR. PROFACI: Aye. |
| 6 | MR. FOGARTY: Aye. |
| 7 | MR. WARD: Aye. |
| 8 | CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Myself. Thank you. |
| 9 | I'll move for a motion to close the |
| 10 | Planning Board meeting of the 6th of May. |
| 11 | MR. MENNERICH: So moved. |
| 12 | MR. PROFACI: Second. |
| 13 | CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: I have a motion by |
| 14 | Ken Mennerich and a second by Joe Profaci. I'll |
| 15 | ask for a roll call vote starting with Ken |
| 16 | Mennerich. |
| 17 | MR. MENNERICH: Aye. |
| 18 | MR. PROFACI: Aye. |
| 19 | MR. FOGARTY: Aye. |
| 20 | MR. WARD: Aye. |
| 21 | CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Myself. So |
| 22 | carried. |
| 23 | |
| 24 | (Time noted: 7:54 p.m.) |
| 25 | |

•

 $\underline{\text{C} \ \text{E} \ \text{R} \ \text{T} \ \text{I} \ \text{F} \ \text{I} \ \text{C} \ \text{A} \ \text{T} \ \text{I} \ \text{O} \ \text{N}}}$

I, Michelle Conero, a Shorthand Reporter and Notary Public within and for the State of New York, do hereby certify that I recorded stenographically the proceedings herein at the time and place noted in the heading hereof, and that the foregoing is an accurate and complete transcript of same to the best of my knowledge and belief.

DATED: June 1, 2010