

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

STATE OF NEW YORK : COUNTY OF ORANGE
TOWN OF NEWBURGH PLANNING BOARD

----- X

In the Matter of

THE RIDGE (f/k/a The Loop)
(2017-01)

Routes 300 & 52
IB & R-3 Zones

----- X

SIXTH AMENDED SITE PLAN

Date: June 15, 2017
Time: 7:00 p.m.
Place: Town of Newburgh
Town Hall
1496 Route 300
Newburgh, NY 12550

BOARD MEMBERS: JOHN P. EWASUTYN, Chairman
FRANK S. GALLI
KENNETH MENNERICH
DAVID DOMINICK
JOHN A. WARD

ALSO PRESENT: MICHAEL H. DONNELLY, ESQ.
PATRICK HINES
GERALD CANFIELD
KENNETH WERSTED

APPLICANT'S REPRESENTATIVE: THOMAS GODFREY

----- X

MICHELLE L. CONERO
10 Westview Drive
Wallkill, New York 12589
(845)541-4163

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Good evening.
Welcome to the Town of Newburgh Planning
Board meeting of the 15th of June. This
evening we have four items on the agenda.

At this time we'll call the
meeting to order with a roll call vote
starting with Frank Galli.

MR. GALLI: Present.

MR. MENNERICH: Present.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Present.

MR. DOMINICK: Present.

MR. WARD: Present.

MR. DONNELLY: Michael Donnelly,
Planning Board Attorney.

MS. CONERO: Michelle Conero,
Stenographer.

MR. CANFIELD: Jerry Canfield, Code
Compliance Supervisor.

MR. HINES: Pat Hines with McGoey,
Hauser & Edsall Consulting Engineers.

MR. WERSTED: Ken Wersted, Creighton
Manning Engineering, Traffic Consultant.

MR. WARD: Stand to say the Pledge.

(Pledge of Allegiance.)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

THE RIDGE

3

MR. WARD: Please turn your phones off or put them on vibrate. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: The first item of business this evening is The Ridge. It's located on Route 300 and Route 52. It's in an IB and R-3 Zone. It's being represented by Tom Godfrey and Mark Gratz. It's here for the sixth amended site plan.

MR. GODFREY: Good evening. Tom Godfrey. With me tonight is Mark Gratz and Phil Grealy.

I'd just like to briefly touch on the site plan resolution that we presented and drafted and made some changes to. We basically incorporated all prior conditions from all the prior site plan approvals into our proposed draft, as well as we made some changes and things like that in the form we have here.

I do have three or four small typos I'd like to cover at the appropriate time.

In addition to the resolution, we've gone through and done a draft of the amended findings. I've presented those as well. We're aware of at least one condition that should be

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

added. We have one additional bond that requires posting. Most of the bonds -- I think all of the bonds for the project have been already posted through the prior site plan approvals. We have one additional bond, that being a landscape bond that is required that we will have to post. That's one condition that was in prior approvals and it's something that we understand.

MR. DONNELLY: Tom, I spoke to Jerry earlier. He believes, and maybe it's an expired bond, that there was a landscape bond that was posted.

MR. GODFREY: There might have been a long time ago. I believe there was a Town ordinance that was either amended or drafted that deferred the posting of that bond. I think it was a note on the site plan approval number 5 plans that bonding not be issued, the landscape bond only, pursuant to a Town ordinance which I think has expired.

MR. DONNELLY: You don't get the benefit. Jerry is saying there is a bond.

MR. GODFREY: I think from a -- we do have a few bonds posted. We have a stormwater

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

bond posted for about \$860,000, we have a bond posted for Brookside, we have some escrow accounts, a site work monitoring escrow. I think we have --

MR. DONNELLY: We're not going to make you post it twice. If that one is still in effect, we'll take care of it.

MR. GODFREY: We'll make sure it's been renewed and active and the amount is appropriate.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: We're sort of at a loss because we've never read the draft resolution. We never read the draft findings statements. At this point we're going to be dependent upon you to guide us.

MR. DONNELLY: I can go through the resolution. Pat had some comments.

MR. HINES: This is the fourth amended findings statement. There is a reference to the whole series of findings statements and addendums. We're suggesting that those be provided in a binder so that -- they're referenced in here but with the history of the project being twelve to fourteen years old, there's a time gap there. I don't want to have

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

to, and I don't think Jerry's office wants to have to find those at some point in the future. I think just to update everything, all those ones that are referenced be incorporated so we're not chasing them.

Otherwise we read the proposed findings. A lot of it just has the changes, the fence changes, the changes to the square footage, the emergency access road, and then it references all the other previous findings statements that the Board reviewed. Certainly everything is within the original footprint that was reviewed. The square footages have decreased throughout the project based on the original findings of, 850,000 square feet I think was the original finding. So with that, we take no exception to the new proposed findings statement.

MR. DONNELLY: Pat, then we don't need any sign-off letter from you before the plans are signed because everything is in order?

MR. HINES: Correct.

MR. DONNELLY: Ken, is there anything we need for a sign-off letter from you?

MR. WERSTED: I don't know if I

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

THE RIDGE

7

received it or not. I've reviewed the amended findings --

MR. DONNELLY: I meant in terms of the plans themselves. I just want to make sure -- usually if there are outstanding issues you had raised in a memo. I don't think there were any.

MR. WERSTED: The site plans I think have addressed all of my comments.

MR. DONNELLY: In terms of the conditions, we'll start with what we usually do when it's an amended approval, and that is except as modified in this resolution, all prior conditions that apply remain in effect.

We talked a little bit about the Brookside demolition and the cul-de-sac. There is a bond in place to complete that work. The bond doesn't control the time when that's done, it just provides security for it's completion. I don't know what the position is of the Board in terms of when you'd like to see that work done or whether you feel a need to tie that completion to something else. Obviously the easiest time for the applicant to do that work is while they're doing work in the field. My suggestion would be

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

THE RIDGE

8

if you need to keep that under control, that you impose a condition that requires that demolition and cul-de-sac completion before the first certificate of occupancy is issued for a store, that way you know it's going to be done at the time when the premise is actually opened to the public. If you have some other desire, I'll include that as a condition. If that seems appropriate, I will say that the Brookside demolition and the cul-de-sac reconfiguration must be completed to the satisfaction of the Code Compliance Department before the first certificate of occupancy for a store is issued.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Let's stop on that point. We're talking about what timeframe? We have neighbors who live on that road. My understanding of the conversation that night is that was something that was going to occur in a reasonably short period of time. If you're talking about building and COs, we may be bringing this out for how long?

MR. GALLI: About a year.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: I don't think that was the purpose of the public hearing.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

THE RIDGE

9

MR. DONNELLY: Would you like to fix it in terms of the number of months then?

MR. GALLI: Do you guys have a plan in place that you want to do that?

MR. GODFREY: We would start site work late this summer. We'll mobilize at some point later this summer to begin drilling and blasting so we have equipment on site. There will be no paving equipment but to do the circle relocation.

The demolition of the houses is almost a separate contract. We need to do some asbestos abatement work and demolish the houses. That's not directly related to any of the site work.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Do you plan on doing your paving work? Paving is something that could be subbed out to just about anyone.

MR. GODFREY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Are you going to have the same paving contractor pave the entire site?

MR. GODFREY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: You are?

MR. GODFREY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: You don't think he

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

THE RIDGE

10

can mobilize --

MR. GODFREY: We can mobilize when we do Brookside.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Then it's contingent upon whether the asphalt plants are open. Generally speaking, they're open to mid December. I think you can accomplish that.

MR. DONNELLY: Could we say six months from when site work resumes? Is that too long, too short?

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Again, we're talking about timeframes that are sort of up in the air. I think we have an obligation to the public to get that completed ASAP. If they plan on demo'ing that building, whenever that is, in January, I think it's more than possible to pave it this season.

Pat?

MR. HINES: It's certainly doable. I think we just need to --

MR. DONNELLY: Within so many days of tonight's meeting rather than when construction begins?

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Dave Dominick may

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

THE RIDGE

11

have an idea.

MR. DOMINICK: I think we owe it to the community, that neighborhood, to start that portion very soon. It's been neglected for a considerably long amount of time. I think we need to at least push to have that done as a priority.

MR. DONNELLY: December 31st of this year, is that too late?

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: I think that's reasonable. That would be still this season.

MR. DONNELLY: I'll include that as a condition.

Next, this is a housekeeping item but I want to include it as a condition. You'll need to have proof that all the prior undertakings, developers' agreements and documents that had been signed by Wilder, Balter Partners have either been assigned or assumed by you. That includes the bonds and everything else. I believe it's all been done. As a checklist item we'll need a letter from Mark Taylor that indicates that all that is in place.

We've required throughout, and we'll

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

mention it again, that all the mitigation measures that were within the SEQRA findings statement and the amended findings are incorporated into this resolution. We will reference the Zoning Board of Appeal's decision, and it is subject to that as if that decision were set forth at length in this resolution.

Transit Orange and the recommendation of the Orange County Planning Department requires that they have further discussions of the feasibility of bus stops, and we'll include that as a condition.

Similarly, the DOT, the pedestrian facilities and the additional sidewalk connection has been made and they have provided the County with a detailed plan. As that ongoing discussion happens the applicant will copy us on the correspondence.

We need to make specific mention of what is obvious here, and that is that no more than 530 square feet of retail space may be constructed --

MR. CANFIELD: Thousand.

MR. DONNELLY: -- 530,000. That

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

wouldn't be worth much to you -- without the third access point being constructed. Although we say we carryover all earlier conditions, there are some that are particularly important, and those are related to the fair share traffic improvement, the traffic monitoring program and the traffic management plan participation and the commitment to the lifestyle center. For those we will reference the earlier conditions of the approval and note that those continue are to be conditions of this approval.

We carry forth the same conditions we did before regarding ARB approval. That will require individual approvals as the stores come before the Board. We reserve the right to impose that Architectural Review Board approval as those site plans are brought before the Board.

We talked about the landscaping security. It will either be posted or proved that the existing landscape bond is still in effect.

Stormwater security. We need both an inspection fee and the signing of the stormwater control facilities maintenance agreement.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

There is a bond in place for that one,
am I correct? Okay.

MR. HINES: Yeah. The inspection fee I
think was included in the overall agreement for
the site monitoring agreement. There's funding
through a different mechanism for that.

MR. DONNELLY: And finally, the
standard condition that says that nothing may be
built on the site that is not shown on the
approved site plan without amended site plan
approval.

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

MR. CANFIELD: One outstanding item. I
don't remember if we discussed it earlier. There
is a stormwater maintenance agreement to be fully
executed. That needs to be put in place.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Okay. John Ward,
questions or comments?

MR. WARD: No comments.

MR. DOMINICK: Nothing.

MR. DONNELLY: The resolution would
obviously include issuance of that fourth amended
SEQRA findings statement and the resolution of

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

the sixth amended site plan approval.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Having heard the statement from Mike Donnelly that the resolution will contain the fourth amended findings statement and cover the sixth amended site plan, I'll move for a motion to grant final approval for The Ridge subject to those conditions.

MR. DOMINICK: So moved.

MR. WARD: Second.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Motion by Dave Dominick. Second by John Ward. Roll call vote starting with Frank Galli.

MR. GALLI: Aye.

MR. MENNERICH: Aye.

MR. DOMINICK: Aye.

MR. WARD: Aye.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Aye.

Okay. Let's hope you can keep things in order, minimize the complaints and be -- it's not a laughing matter -- be diligent in what goes on there.

MR. GODFREY: Yes. We will be very courteous and thoughtful of our neighbors. We have to deal with them for the next probably

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

eighteen months of construction as well as for quite awhile after that.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: I don't know if you're dealing with them but working in cooperation with them.

MR. GODFREY: Yup.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: It's not a card game.

MR. GODFREY: Mm'hm'.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Thanks.

MR. GODFREY: Thank you very much.

(Time noted: 7:14 p.m.)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

I, MICHELLE CONERO, a Notary Public
for and within the State of New York, do hereby
certify:

That hereinbefore set forth is a
true record of the proceedings.

I further certify that I am not
related to any of the parties to this proceeding by
blood or by marriage and that I am in no way
interested in the outcome of this matter.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto
set my hand this 30th day of June 2017.

Michelle Conero

MICHELLE CONERO

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

STATE OF NEW YORK : COUNTY OF ORANGE
TOWN OF NEWBURGH PLANNING BOARD

----- X

In the Matter of

RAM HOTELS, INC.
(2016-21)

Unity Place
Section 97; Block 2; Lot 37
IB Zone

----- X

SITE PLAN

Date: June 15, 2017
Time: 7:15 p.m.
Place: Town of Newburgh
Town Hall
1496 Route 300
Newburgh, NY 12550

BOARD MEMBERS: JOHN P. EWASUTYN, Chairman
FRANK S. GALLI
KENNETH MENNERICH
DAVID DOMINICK
JOHN A. WARD

ALSO PRESENT: MICHAEL H. DONNELLY, ESQ.
PATRICK HINES
GERALD CANFIELD
KENNETH WERSTED

APPLICANT'S REPRESENTATIVE: LAWRENCE MARSHALL

----- X

MICHELLE L. CONERO
10 Westview Drive
Wallkill, New York 12589
(845)541-4163

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: The next item on the agenda is RAM Hotels. It's located on Unity Place in an IB Zone. It's a site plan being represented by Larry Marshall.

MR. MARSHALL: Good evening. We were last before the Board at the end of April, on the 20th of April, for the public hearing for this project. At that time there was a significant number of questions raised by a neighbor's representative in the form of a sixteen-page comment letter. Since that time we've taken the opportunity to revise the site plan and address the concerns that were raised in that letter. I've provided a point-by-point response to each of the comments to the Board.

The main aspects that were raised by or in those comment letters, there was quite a number of clean-up items, labeling of radii, typographical errors and things like that that were all fixed.

One of the major concerns that you can see by the site plan is the revisions to the stormwater detention basin. That concern was raised by the representative and we've taken the

1
2 opportunity to utilize that. The stormwater
3 basin, the detention basin has been enlarged
4 substantially from the previous proposal, and
5 that's to handle the additional stormwater that
6 would be coming off of lot 2. We've also revised
7 the stormwater pollution prevention plan to
8 reflect that. Obviously without knowing what
9 exactly would occur on lot 2, we assumed 80
10 percent coverage of that lot, which is the
11 maximum coverage that's permitted by zoning. We
12 feel that's a conservative estimate because in
13 all likelihood the development would be less than
14 that. That's a fairly substantial amount of
15 coverage for that parcel. Anyway, we ran through
16 the calculations, making assumptions as required,
17 and provided a revised stormwater pollution
18 prevention plan for the stormwater basin, the
19 detention basin.

20 In addition to that, there were some
21 concerns over the number of parking spaces that
22 were provided on the site. We had provided a
23 parking analysis to the Board. We also received
24 a letter late this afternoon from Karen Whitman
25 of Hilton Worldwide. If the Board would please,

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

I do have copies if you want to see that. It basically outlines Hilton's review of this site plan and the number of parking spaces that are being proposed on it.

On the site plan we've added the potential for 19 additional parking spaces on the site. We have 117, as we previously proposed, and then we've added an additional 19 parking spaces that we've labeled as banked. If the Board pleases, if you want to see those built, we can certainly discuss that. Based upon past usage, the former Hilton Garden Inn that was over on Crossroads Court and the number of parking spaces they had there, the occupancy and utilization of that building, plus the over 730 Hilton Garden Inns that are currently in operation, Hilton has decided that the 117 parking spaces are adequate for this proposed use. But again, if the Board wishes, we can certainly construct those. At this time we've shown them as banked spaces. There would be an opportunity to construct those in the future if the site plan deemed it necessary.

In addition to the revisions to the

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

site plan, we have also provided to the Board updated elevations of the building. You can see that in the glossy photograph which is from Hilton Garden Inn. It's basically the promotional material. The architect for the project has also provided renderings of the building. It better illustrates the colors that are being proposed and also the finishes. Primarily the hotel will be finished with an EIFS or a stucco finish with varying colors. There's a Dorian gray over on the sides, in the middle there's a darker gray. Ider white is the white areas that you see. Then there's a Humbled Gold they call it up in the yellowish areas. That is provided with an accent of cultured stone which is Rural Country Limestone in the Echo Ridge color scheme.

We've also provided -- at the request of the Board we've provided the proposed sign package. The sign package will require -- the proposed signs on the site will require variances. We ask that the Board consider the site plan and subdivision on it's merits and we come back at a later date for the sign package.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

RAM HOTELS, INC.

23

Basically the signs would include a main sign over the entrance as you see depicted on the rendering. It's basically the logo with the Hilton Garden Inn. There would be, on the north side of the building -- or west side there would also be a Hilton Garden Inn, a smaller sign as shown in the sign package. There would be a pylon sign near the corner of the parking area, a monument sign, and a welcome entrance sign located near the northerly entrance. Also just a directional sign, again indicating where guests could enter at the southerly entrance. We've provided the renderings for each of the signs.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Larry, for the record, your proposed signage exceeds the square footage by approximately how many square feet?

MR. MARSHALL: Bear with me.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: If you want, can you do two things at once?

MR. MARSHALL: Yes. I can try. I'm usually not very good at it.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Can we have copies of Ms. Whitman's letter?

MR. MARSHALL: Yes. From Karen

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Whitman. Yes.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: I'll take care of that, distributing them, while you --

MR. MARSHALL: Thank you, John.

Based upon the requirement -- the permitted sign area of half a square foot per linear foot, the project site is permitted a total of 298.99 square feet of signage. The total proposed sign area is 940.2 square feet. This exceeds the permitted area by 641.21 feet.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Thank you.

MR. MARSHALL: That includes both sides of the signs, the pylon sign and the two ground mounted signs or monument signs at the entrances.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Frank, at this point do you have any questions or comments?

MR. GALLI: Larry, when you were discussing the parking, how many total do you have banked?

MR. MARSHALL: 19.

MR. GALLI: Everything else has to be built right now and only 19 --

MR. MARSHALL: We have 117 proposed on the site to be constructed at initial

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

construction. We have an additional 19 that are able to be built if deemed necessary at a later date.

MR. GALLI: Okay.

MR. MARSHALL: That's what we show on the site plan that was submitted to the Board.

MR. GALLI: I just wanted to clarify. That was all I had.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Ken Mennerich?

MR. MENNERICH: Larry, on the signage, it is far in excess of what you're allowed under the code. The pylon sign, how tall is that going to be?

MR. MARSHALL: The pylon sign has a total overall height of 40 feet proposed. The intention of that is to provide visibility from passerbys on 17K.

MR. MENNERICH: Okay. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Dave Dominick?

MR. DOMINICK: Larry, at the southwest corner of the building you have -- speaking of parking -- 6 banked spaces?

MR. MARSHALL: Yes.

MR. DOMINICK: It looks like 2.5 of

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

RAM HOTELS, INC.

26

those spaces we talked about in workshop cover a loading dock or entryway. What is that area?

MR. MARSHALL: That area is just an entryway. Basically what would happen in that area is -- that's more of a convenience, not a necessity. It's not something -- it's for deliveries into the site but it's not something that is required by Hilton Garden Inn. It's more of a convenience of having it. So we would remove that loading area or -- a drive-up area is really what it is. It's a drive-up area -- in favor of a walkway.

MR. GALLI: You might get a bread truck, that type of thing?

MR. MARSHALL: Exactly.

MR. GALLI: You don't get tractor trailers?

MR. MARSHALL: This does not accommodate large tractor trailers.

MR. DOMINICK: The entrance to that area, is that a swinging door, is that a roll up door?

MR. MARSHALL: No, no. Swing doors. It's faint but there is a -- do you see the

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

RAM HOTELS, INC.

27

little alcove there?

MR. DOMINICK: Yes.

MR. MARSHALL: In that alcove area, on the west side there's a door and then directly on the north side, basically in the northeast corner of that area on the north wall is a door -- is a swing door, and then there is a door in the northwest corner on the west wall of that alcove.

MR. DOMINICK: So if you were to put those 6 banked parking spaces there, how would you then get deliveries into that area?

MR. MARSHALL: We would likely put a sidewalk to the west so that if people were utilizing that area, they could utilize a sidewalk on the westerly side with a ramp and park near the refuse enclosure and then pull in and unload.

MR. DOMINICK: That's all, John. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: John Ward?

MR. WARD: What you just said, you should put the sidewalk with a ramp, if it's banked it's already made.

MR. MARSHALL: Okay.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MR. WARD: At the same time, at work session our traffic consultant, Ken, suggested an idea, I don't know if you've seen it, about proposing 7 more spots that you could work in there.

MR. MARSHALL: I read his comment letter. I did read that comment of adding an additional 7. I didn't see any sketches.

MR. DOMINICK: It's on the back.

MR. MARSHALL: Did I miss it?

I'm sorry, Ken, and the rest of the Board.

MR. DONNELLY: The recommendation is that you provide, whether built or land banked, the full compliment of required spaces under the code.

MR. MARSHALL: Based upon a very quick review, I don't see any problem with adding these 7 additional parking spaces.

MR. DONNELLY: The Board also felt that perhaps a handful of them, and the Board has to look to Ken to make the recommendation, be built now.

MR. MARSHALL: Okay. Is there a

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

specific number or which ones in particular the Board would like to --

MR. WARD: All 7.

MR. WERSTED: If I could jump in. You have shown 117 spaces being constructed as proposed in your parking analysis. You identified 143 as the total required when you factored in the public meeting space. You had proposed to land bank up to a total of 26. You are just 7 spaces shy of that. So that depiction shows where you can get another 7, I think in relative easy fashion. That would bring the total land banked from 19 up to a total of 26. I would suggest that the Board may want to consider actually constructing half of those, say construct 13, leave 13. Probably the 13 that are hardest to build still land bank.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Is the Board in agreement with that?

MR. GALLI: I'm okay with that.

MR. MENNERICH: Yes.

MR. DOMINICK: Yes.

MR. WARD: Yes.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Let the record show

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

RAM HOTELS, INC.

30

that the Planning Board is in favor of the recommendation by Ken Wersted, our Traffic Consultant, that the applicant, of the 26 proposed land banked parking spaces, build 13 of them as part of the actual construction of the project.

MR. MARSHALL: Is there a particular set of spaces the Board would like or we leave that to our discretion?

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: I think we'll leave that up to the working endeavors of yourself and Ken Wersted.

MR. MARSHALL: Okay.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: If the Board is in agreement with that. Okay.

MR. WARD: I'm done.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: You have something?

MR. WARD: I said I'm done. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Jerry Canfield, do you have anything you want to add to the parking calculation?

MR. CANFIELD: No. I'm okay with the solution that was come up with.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Pat Hines, at this

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

point?

MR. HINES: Just along with the parking, I'm just interested in what the trigger is and how that's going to be handled. Triggering the land bank.

MR. DONNELLY: I think it's the Town's discretion based upon inspections. The sole discretion to invoke the requirement of completing the spaces will be the Town.

MR. MARSHALL: Or the applicant.

MR. DONNELLY: Sure. You can do it yourself earlier.

MR. MARSHALL: If they find a need for it before the Town does.

MR. DONNELLY: Absolutely.

MR. MARSHALL: Okay. And we don't take any exception to that.

MR. HINES: A concept plan for lot 2 of the subdivision was provided. The bulk table identifies the 6.43 acres. It's actually 2 acres. That just needs to be addressed in the bulk table.

The third comment I have, we discussed the parking here.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

There's a letter from Ecological Analysts, your wetland consultant, and it states that the pre-construction notification has been submitted. We're just looking for a copy of that also to complete the Planning Board's files, then we can track the date as well as for that 45 days that the Army Corp has to react or grant a default approval.

MR. MARSHALL: Sure.

MR. HINES: We're looking for that.

Also in that same letter report that addresses the comments from the public hearing, the fourth paragraph identifies that the regulations regarding the DEC's jurisdiction on wetlands contains a 150 meter disconnect. It goes on to state that the culvert is in excess of 300 feet. 150 meters is somewhat longer than 450 feet. We're going to need that clarified and addressed in that letter. There seems to be a disconnect there.

Then the status of the City of Newburgh flow acceptance letter. I don't believe that's been received yet.

MR. MARSHALL: I have not received a

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

copy. That was submitted by Jim Osborne on
February 27th.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: You ought to look
into that one.

MR. MARSHALL: It's been nearly four
months on that. Okay. I'll reach out to either
Jim or Pat and find out who I need to contact.

MR. HINES: You may want to reach out
to Jason Morris, the city engineer.

MR. MARSHALL: I will reach out to him
tomorrow.

MR. HINES: That's what we have at this
point.

The lack of the City of Newburgh flow
acceptance letter is a non-starter for the Board
at this point.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: We can't act on it
until we receive the City flow acceptance letter.

MR. MARSHALL: Understood.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: We'll make it an
agenda item for final approval at which time
you'll submit drawings of the proposed 13 parking
spaces that you and Ken Wersted worked on.

Anything else?

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

RAM HOTELS, INC.

34

MR. GALLI: No. That's it.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: I would work quickly on that, the City. It's a long time.

MR. MARSHALL: It's unusually long. Okay.

A question for Mike Donnelly. Is there a concern over the 62 days? Has that begun yet?

MR. DONNELLY: When did we close the public hearing?

MR. MARSHALL: April 20th.

MR. DONNELLY: Would you waive the 62-day requirement then?

MR. MARSHALL: Yes.

MR. DONNELLY: Thank you.

MR. CANFIELD: John, on the signage, are we proceeding with the site plan without the signage and that will be a separate submission?

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: I think that's what Larry Marshall said.

MR. MARSHALL: That's the request of the applicant, if the Board would entertain that. Yes.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Yeah. We've done that many times.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

RAM HOTELS, INC.

35

MR. MARSHALL: Okay. So we will revise the plans, get the flow acceptance letter and resubmit for the Board.

All right. Thank you.

At the next agenda would we be able to go through the ARB as well?

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Yes. We'll put that all together.

MR. MARSHALL: We looked at it many times. I don't think the Board made any --

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: I have it down for ARB also.

MR. DONNELLY: It was approved.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: No. We have to do ARB.

(Time noted: 7:36 p.m.)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

I, MICHELLE CONERO, a Notary Public
for and within the State of New York, do hereby
certify:

That hereinbefore set forth is a
true record of the proceedings.

I further certify that I am not
related to any of the parties to this proceeding by
blood or by marriage and that I am in no way
interested in the outcome of this matter.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto
set my hand this 30th day of June 2017.

Michelle Conero

MICHELLE CONERO

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

STATE OF NEW YORK : COUNTY OF ORANGE
TOWN OF NEWBURGH PLANNING BOARD

----- X
In the Matter of

GARDNER RIDGE
(2002-29)

Gardnertown Road
Section 75; Block 1; Lot 4.12
R-3 Zone

----- X

SITE PLAN - MULTI-FAMILY

Date: June 15, 2017
Time: 7:37 p.m.
Place: Town of Newburgh
Town Hall
1496 Route 300
Newburgh, NY 12550

BOARD MEMBERS: JOHN P. EWASUTYN, Chairman
FRANK S. GALLI
KENNETH MENNERICH
DAVID DOMINICK
JOHN A. WARD

ALSO PRESENT: MICHAEL H. DONNELLY, ESQ.
PATRICK HINES
GERALD CANFIELD
KENNETH WERSTED

APPLICANT'S REPRESENTATIVE: DARREN DOCE

----- X

MICHELLE L. CONERO
10 Westview Drive
Wallkill, New York 12589
(845)541-4163

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: The third item on the agenda this evening is Gardner Ridge. It's located on Gardnertown Road near Gidney Avenue. It's in an R-3 Zone. It's being represented by Darren Doce and Tom Olley.

MR. DOCE: Good evening. I'm Darren Doce here tonight with Tom Olley, the project engineer. I also have our traffic consultant, Phil Grealy; and project architect, Marshall Rosenblum.

We're proposing a 144 unit apartment project. It's going to consist of a mixture of non-senior and senior units. Of the 144 units, 108 of them will be non-senior apartments and 36 will be senior apartments.

At our last appearance before the Board we received a number of comments from the consultants and the Planning Board that have been addressed. We've submitted these revised plans that we have here tonight.

I will have Tom Olley either go over the changes or answer any specific questions the Board has.

The goal this evening is proceeding to

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

a negative dec, hopefully, so that we can move on with the project. We'd also have to reappear before the Town Board because we are requesting a density bonus of 9 units per acre. In order to receive that we have to finalize SEQRA.

Would you like Tom to outline the changes or do you have any specific questions?

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Tom, how would you like to move forward?

MR. OLLEY: I'll be very brief because the actual layout of the project really didn't change as a result of the revisions.

Probably the two significant pieces of information that we supplied had to do with the architecture and the landscape architecture of the project. The second item was enclosing the loop on the stormwater management plan and the stormwater pollution prevention plan. What we found is that the areas that were on -- the storm drainage, the areas that we would provide our detention basins and most of our infiltration basins is underlaid with very good gravel that will allow us to percolate that water into the ground. Once we were able to confirm that we

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

were able to stick with our original design and layout of the building.

Marshall Rosenblum has developed some conceptual building elevations that we took to the landscape architect to prepare an integrated landscape plan for the site. Those are the bigger outstanding items that we had from the last review.

We've gotten Pat's and Ken's comments and there are really none here that would affect the layout of the site.

I think just to address two of those comments if I could. Ken was asking about the configuration of this point in the entrance road. What we've done, Ken, is we really have left, as you put it, an opportunity to extend that road either to the west or to the north to accommodate future development of the WPA Acquisition site. We have an easement across their site. It would be a combined entrance for both properties. That could be a T intersection in either direction without coming back later and interrupting the access into the site since all vehicular traffic is going to be out to North Plank Road and only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

emergency access will be out the back side. So we figured it would be best to configure that so there wouldn't be an interruption of the traffic flow in the future.

Just to point out one thing for Pat. We did have the surveyor go out and locate and shoot the sewer line in North Plank Road. His information is shown on these plans, the revised profile. What may have been confusing in our cover letter was that I had spoken to Jim Osborne and he was getting some as-built plans. We just wanted to verify and coordinate and make sure we weren't missing anything. Our plans reflect that field work.

The only other item that I want to just touch on is we received the flow confirmation letter from the City of Newburgh just this morning. I gave Pat a copy of it. I will formally submit that to the Board tomorrow.

Phil, is there anything on the traffic?

MR. GREALY: Philip Grealy, Maser Consulting. We received Ken's comments of June 14th. We have no problems with those. We'll be getting a permit from New York State

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

GARDNER RIDGE

42

DOT for the access improvements, some signaled timing adjustments.

As Ken pointed out, we analyzed this without any credit for the senior units, so we're a little conservative in our estimates. Unless there's any questions from the Board, I think we're fine with those comments.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Any questions from the Board?

MR. GALLI: It's going to be private roads, not Town roads?

MR. DOCE: Yes.

MR. OLLEY: Yes, private roads.

MR. GALLI: The specs that they're being built to, it could not be Town roads.

MR. OLLEY: Right.

MR. GALLI: That's all I had, John.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Ken Mennerich?

MR. MENNERICH: No.

MR. WARD: The bridge itself was built. Was that under code or whatever at the time? When the bridge for the entrance was going in, was it ever --

MR. CANFIELD: The bridge that was

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

built, there was a building permit secured by the adjoining property owner. A certificate of completion was issued. Maybe Mike can talk about the access agreement and any agreements that are in place for the rights of using the bridge and all of that. At some point we'll need that.

MR. DONNELLY: There's a long history to that. We will need to see that agreement before the plans are signed.

MR. OLLEY: Okay.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Pat Hines?

MR. HINES: We have some technical comments. The water and sewer notes on the plans are outdated. That's a 2015 version. It said they are attached. I don't know --

MR. OLLEY: They weren't but I'll get them to you.

MR. HINES: Your cover letter and the stormwater report identifies infiltration testing. That information should be included in both the SWPPP and on the plans.

The bio-retention system shows under drain -- identifies under drains in the report but not on the detail.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

There's a lot of stormwater pipes and such that aren't labeled on the plans.

MR. OLLEY: I think there are two or three of them. One is actually on sheet 5 but it's missing on sheet 6. I realized that.

MR. HINES: One of the things, and we talked about it at work session, because the grading plan and the utility plan are one in the same, they are difficult to follow because the grading crosses the lettering and the lettering crosses the grading. I don't know if they can be broken out.

MR. OLLEY: We can break them out. We'll separate those two. It's not a problem.

MR. HINES: Along with that, Jim Osborne has looked at the project as well and he has some concerns. We talked at work session, Jerry and I have talked and Jerry and Jim Osborne have talked. We're looking to have a group review of this through the code department, through Jim Osborne's office and my office to provide some technical comments on water, sewer and utilities. Things like flow and pressure on the water system, some of the information on the

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

sewer. So we'll be getting a set of technical comments back to you from that group meeting just to tie this all together. It's a 2002 project. It's been around awhile, as you stated.

The Board had experience with the project located, I guess it's to your southwest, on the other side of Gardnertown Road. It had a fairly contentious public hearing. Some items that were addressed such as blasting was a significant issue in the neighborhood. I don't know if you can address that now. Is there blasting proposed or do you even have enough information to determine that? That was a large issue from the neighbors to the other side there.

MR. OLLEY: I don't have enough information to answer that tonight as to how that would be handled. You know, with the rock on the adjacent site it's anticipated we will run into some rock on the site. How they're going to excavate that I'm not sure.

MR. HINES: Okay. I'll defer to the Board. They sat through the public hearing and heard those concerns.

MR. DONNELLY: We can include a

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

condition that in the event there's blasting, it has to comply with the chapter, the protocol and the advanced notice and everything that comes with it.

MR. HINES: Yes. If the Board is okay with that. On the other project they did some testing and identified the location of the bedrock and the extent of bedrock on the site. I don't know if the Board is looking for something. We are heading towards a public hearing with possibly the same folks in the audience.

MR. MENNERICH: The fill areas are going to come from materials off the site?

MR. HINES: That's one of my other comments. It's been a recurring comment on this project. I'll use the first non-senior building on your way in there. There is approximately a 30 foot fill under that building. It's been a concern of my office as well as the Town Board has had picked up on that. We think some additional information -- some additional design information will be required moving forward on that. There's a concern about the amount of fill, the buildings on the east side of the

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

project.

MR. OLLEY: Right. That one has, I think it's about 24 feet at it's maximum. That foundation system and fill system will be designed by a geo-technical engineer. There will be test borings done to determine the amount of consolidation that could be expected of the soils that are in place there and other things.

MR. DONNELLY: It sounds like maybe we're moving toward getting him involved now because you're asking for a SEQRA negative declaration. Maybe there should be some preliminary report of those two issues.

MR. OLLEY: The only variable in that fill is really the compaction of that material and if there's --

MR. DONNELLY: Where it's coming from.

MR. OLLEY: We have a balanced cut and fill. We're not importing material.

MR. HINES: The question is is the on-site material appropriate. We ran into that at the Matrix site where they ended up exporting a significant volume of material, and importing.

MR. OLLEY: We would have that

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

information by the public hearing. We've done some test pits out there. I just don't have it off the top of my head that I can answer as to how much rock excavation. What we did find was that there were some fairly significant areas of gravel underlaying certain portions of the site.

MR. DONNELLY: The problem with that, Tom, is generally this Board doesn't schedule a public hearing until it's issued a negative declaration. That type of information is the sort of information the Board would need to issue that negative declaration.

MR. GALLI: I think the Board needs quite a bit of information before it can issue a negative dec according to what Pat is saying, the stormwater and the meeting that they've got to have with Jim Osborne and stuff.

MR. DOMINICK: Especially when you have a public hearing you're going to need the information about blasting. That's a very big concern. It's a very big concern with the group we had here and of the Board. We'll need that information.

MR. HINES: Our next comment, there's

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

an Army Corp of Engineers wetland that kind of traverses the site. It's a drainage course. I can't find the pipe to convey that through.

MR. OLLEY: Sheet 5.

MR. HINES: I've got sheet 5 here. I don't know if you want to point to it. It needs to be clear.

MR. OLLEY: Right there.

MR. HINES: I don't see a pipe there. Maybe it's there.

MR. OLLEY: Right here.

MR. HINES: That goes into the utility --

MR. OLLEY: It inverts on both ends of it.

MR. HINES: The water service connections need to comply with the Town's detail. These are some of the comments that Jim Osborne had picked up on.

The Town requires that the fire suppression water coming into the structures leads out such that if the sprinkler system is turned off, the potable water to the structures are turned off. It's an indication so they're

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

not turned off for a significant period of time. There's a standard detail that I can provide for that.

Then the stormwater management report kind of doesn't address the emergency access roads on the Gardnertown Road side. There's a significant amount of roadway and grade there. I just want to have that addressed and those pipe sizes taken a look at. We don't want to have a large volume of water discharging down to Gardnertown Road.

That's the comments at this point. Again, the town engineer, my office and Jerry's office are going to get together and provide the applicants with some additional comments that Jim Osborne, Jerry and myself are going to prepare for them.

MR. CANFIELD: Just one question and comment on that. Would it be possible to see a level of detail for some of these items before we sit down and review this? Some of the issues like utilities. There's an elevation difference, obviously. These buildings will be required to be sprinklered. If we could have some of that

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

info.

Jim and I had talked about utilities crossing the bridge. A detail how you propose to handle that.

There's a couple areas on the site that will require floodplain development permits.

That level of detail would make our job a little bit easier as to what you propose and does it comply type thing.

MR. OLLEY: Okay. Tomorrow morning I have a couple meetings. Can I give you a call tomorrow to flush out what details you're looking for and I can get those right over to you? I think we've worked through the design so it's not -- it shouldn't be a big task for us to give you whatever you need there for that. We want you to have that meeting as soon as possible, so I'll get you that information as soon as we can.

MR. CANFIELD: Some of the items we already discussed. There's a lot of activity going on on these plans. Some of it, if it's broken out and laid out.

MR. OLLEY: Separating the grading and the utilities. No problem. I can do that

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

tomorrow.

MR. CANFIELD: It may require, Tom, another submittal with this broken out rather than me picking and choosing, telling you what you need to put in. It may be here.

MR. OLLEY: I wasn't following what you were -- what details you were seeking, but --

MR. CANFIELD: Are you looking for an answer?

MR. OLLEY: No. I thought Pat had a comment there.

MR. HINES: No.

MR. DONNELLY: I have one question. Tom, you mentioned earlier the Town Board approval on the senior density bonus. I believe it was granted, wasn't it?

MR. DOCE: They gave you permission to review it under the density but they don't formalize it without finalizing SEQRA.

MR. DONNELLY: Got it.

MR. OLLEY: Chicken or egg.

MR. HINES: I want to clarify. When Darren was giving his presentation, the density bonus is 3 units per acre. It's allowed 6. When

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

you said a density bonus of 9 units per acre, I don't want to get that out there in the public.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: If I understand it, you're going to be speaking with Jerry sometime on Friday to work out the details that he feels he needs to see. They'll sooner than later notify you when they'll be meeting with Jim Osborne, and Jerry Canfield, and Pat Hines' group. You'll have a greater understanding as to what you have to do from that point forward. We're dealing with timelines now and we're hoping that everyone will communicate as to when they'll be presenting things, when there will be a meeting and when there will be representing of those revised plans. Pretty much what we're doing now. Am I missing anything?

MR. DONNELLY: That sounds right.

MR. GALLI: Good.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: All right.

MR. OLLEY: Sure.

MR. HINES: The minutes from the public hearing for the project across the street are available. I would suggest you take a quick look through those. You'll see the issues the

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

neighbors had.

MR. GREALY: Thank you.

(Time noted: 8:00 p.m.)

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

I, MICHELLE CONERO, a Notary Public
for and within the State of New York, do hereby
certify:

That hereinbefore set forth is a
true record of the proceedings.

I further certify that I am not
related to any of the parties to this proceeding by
blood or by marriage and that I am in no way
interested in the outcome of this matter.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto
set my hand this 30th day of June 2017.

Michelle Conero

MICHELLE CONERO

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

STATE OF NEW YORK : COUNTY OF ORANGE
TOWN OF NEWBURGH PLANNING BOARD

----- X
In the Matter of

ORANGE COUNTY - POK LLP
d/b/a VERIZON WIRELESS
(2017-15)

181 South Plank Road
Section 60; Block 3; Lot 14.1
B Zone

----- X

PUBLIC HEARING

Date: June 15, 2017
Time: 8:00 p.m.
Place: Town of Newburgh
Town Hall
1496 Route 300
Newburgh, NY 12550

BOARD MEMBERS: JOHN P. EWASUTYN, Chairman
FRANK S. GALLI
KENNETH MENNERICH
DAVID DOMINICK
JOHN A. WARD

ALSO PRESENT: MICHAEL H. DONNELLY, ESQ.
PATRICK HINES
GERALD CANFIELD

APPLICANT'S REPRESENTATIVE: HYDE CLARKE

----- X

MICHELLE L. CONERO
10 Westview Drive
Wallkill, New York 12589
(845)541-4163

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: The final item of business this evening is the public hearing for Orange County - Poughkeepsie LP, Verizon Wireless. It's located on 181 South Plank Road in a B Zone. It's being represented by Young, Sommer. The attorney before us this evening is?

MR. CLARKE: Hyde Clarke.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: At this point Ken Mennerich will read the notice of hearing.

MR. MENNERICH: "Notice of hearing, Town of Newburgh Planning Board. Please take notice that the Planning Board of the Town of Newburgh, Orange County, New York will hold a public hearing pursuant to the Municipal Code of the Town of Newburgh, Chapter 185-57 Section K and Chapter 163-16 Section A, on the application of Verizon Wireless, Route 300/52 micro-communications facility, Town project 2017-15, for an amended site plan and location of a small cell technology wireless communications facility. The project includes the placement of a small cell node on an existing structure. In addition to the small cell node, an 8 by 6 equipment area

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

VERIZON WIRELESS

57

will be located on the northwest side of the existing site. The project is located -- do you have larger print? This is really blurry -- located at 18 South Plank Road in the Town of Newburgh, designated on the Town tax map as Section 60, Block 3, Lot 14.1. The project is located on a --

MR. GALLI: 1.2.

MR. MENNERICH: -- 1.2 plus or minus acre of property in the B Zone. The public hearing will be held on the 15th day of June 2017 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 8 May 2017."

MR. GALLI: One correction for the record. You said 18 South Plank Road. It's 181.

MR. MENNERICH: 181. Thanks.

I'm sorry for the way I butchered that. The print on this is not the greatest.

MR. CLARKE: That's all right.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Understood.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Do you want to make your presentation?

MR. CLARKE: If I may give a presentation. I was before the Board at the May 4th meeting to go over this proposal. Again, it's a small cell installation, so it's not our typical macro installation. This allows us to provide hotspots of coverage to a busy area if you've got a lot of commercial businesses right around that existing structure. We are going to be co-locating at the peak of the roof, 32 feet tall. With the small cell installation we're going to be at 36.5 feet.

So again, it's a minimal piece of equipment, allows us to provide service within 500 to 1,000 foot radius.

The only change from our application from the May meeting is after discussion with the Board we did amend our application to include a waiver request from the bond amount. The Telecommunications Law in the Town requires a bond of \$75,000. That was written more so for a macro facility, a traditional tower structure.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

We did provide a letter from our MB&C engineer stating that the cost to remove not only that small cell installation but if we had to remove the utility pole that's also proposed, it would be about \$7,500. We made an official request to the Town to reduce that bond amount to \$10,000. We amended our project narrative to state that waiver request.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Michael, are we in a position to waive that bond amount?

MR. DONNELLY: How much bond is in place already?

MR. HINES: Zero.

MR. CANFIELD: It's a new location.

MR. HINES: It's a small cell. It's 24 inches by 7.

MR. DONNELLY: It's not a tower that has to be removed. I don't know that the code specifically covers it but I think since there are revisions underway it would make sense to do it here. It's not fair to hold him to the 75.

MR. CANFIELD: The code provides or permits the Planning Board to make that --

MR. DONNELLY: To make the

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

VERIZON WIRELESS

60

determination.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Jerry, does the fee of \$10,000 seem appropriate?

MR. CANFIELD: Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: That's the amount you're willing to bond?

MR. CLARKE: That's what we're asking, yes.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Is the Board in favor of that?

MR. GALLI: If there's a need to take it down I'll do it.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Does it matter what day of the week?

MR. DOMINICK: I'm with Frank.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: We accomplished that.

At this point I would like to open the meeting to the public. Is there anyone here who has any questions or comments on the Orange County/Verizon Wireless application?

MR. FEDER: Bill Feder, 29 Rockwood Drive.

Is it a typical three-antenna

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

configuration despite them being small antennas?

MR. CLARKE: No, sir. It's a one-cylinder antenna. I can bring this a little closer to you here.

MR. HINES: It's my understanding they're about 7 inches in diameter.

MR. CLARKE: It's about a 5 gallon bucket pretty much. It just sits on the top there. That's the only one that's proposed.

MR. FEDER: Okay. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Any additional questions or comments from the public?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Pat Hines, do you have anything to add at this time?

MR. HINES: We have nothing outstanding.

Mike Musso from HDR, the Town's wireless consultant, has reviewed the project, provided a technical comment letter and recommendations to the Board. I think those could be incorporated into the resolution. Basically it was things such as Workers' Comp insurance and such.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

We don't have any outstanding comments. I think the project has been reviewed by your wireless consultant and it would be appropriate to approve it at this point if the Board wishes.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Okay. Michael Donnelly, do you have something to add?

MR. DONNELLY: I will have our standard resolution. I will recite the waivers that are requested that I think we just discussed that the Board is willing to grant and the bulleted items that HDR has recommended will be the conditions of the resolution.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Okay. Having heard from our consultant, Pat Hines, having heard from Code Compliance, Jerry Canfield as far as the bond amount, Mike Donnelly will outline all of these things in the final resolution, then I'll move for a motion to close the public hearing on the Orange County/Verizon application.

MR. MENNERICH: So moved.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: I have a motion by Ken Mennerich.

MR. GALLI: Second.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: I have a second by

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

VERIZON WIRELESS

63

Frank Galli. I'll ask for a roll call vote starting with Frank Galli.

MR. GALLI: Aye.

MR. MENNERICH: Aye.

MR. DOMINICK: Aye.

MR. WARD: Aye.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Aye. Motion carried.

I'll move for a motion to grant final approval subject to the conditions that were presented in the final resolution by Planning Board Attorney Mike Donnelly.

MR. GALLI: So moved.

MR. WARD: Second.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Motion by Frank Galli. Second by John Ward. Any discussion of the motion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: I'll move for a roll call vote starting with Frank Galli.

MR. GALLI: Aye.

MR. MENNERICH: Aye.

MR. DOMINICK: Aye.

MR. WARD: Aye.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Aye.

Maybe next time we see you you'll carry one of those samples.

MR. CLARKE: I'll see if I can get one from the warehouse. Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: I think we've done what we had to do, so I'll move for a motion to close the Planning Board meeting of the 15th of June.

MR. GALLI: Do we have to do anything with Banta?

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: No. That's already been done through code compliance.

MR. GALLI: I'll make a motion.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: We have a motion by Frank Galli.

MR. WARD: Second.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: A second by John Ward.

MR. GALLI: Aye.

MR. MENNERICH: Aye.

MR. DOMINICK: Aye.

MR. WARD: Aye.

CHAIRMAN EWASUTYN: Aye.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

(Time noted: 8:07 p.m.)

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

I, MICHELLE CONERO, a Notary Public
for and within the State of New York, do hereby
certify:

That hereinbefore set forth is a
true record of the proceedings.

I further certify that I am not
related to any of the parties to this proceeding by
blood or by marriage and that I am in no way
interested in the outcome of this matter.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto
set my hand this 30th day of June 2017.

Michelle Conero

MICHELLE CONERO