

February 1, 2010

1

TOWN OF CORNWALL

PLANNING BOARD

February 1, 2010

MEMBERS PRESENT: NEIL NOVESKY, CHAIRMAN  
KENNETH BRODMERKEL  
WYNN GOLD  
WILLIAM GRABE  
HELEN BUNT  
MICHAEL LOBLANCO

ALSO PRESENT: DOMINIC CORDISCO, ESQ.  
PLANNING BOARD ATTORNEY

JOHN SZAROWSKI, P.E.  
PLANNING BOARD ENGINEER

LESLIE DOTSON  
PLANNING BOARD CONSULTANT

GARY VINSON  
BUILDING INSPECTOR

ABSENT: LED KLOSKY

REGULAR\_MEETING \_\_\_\_\_

MR. NOVESKY: I'd like to call the February 1, 2010 meeting of the Town of Cornwall Planning Board to order. All are present except Mr. Klosky who is attending a funeral of a friend.

CORRESPONDENCE \_\_\_\_\_

MR. NOVESKY: Correspondence we'll flip over to you, Fran, in 30 seconds.

APPROVAL\_OF\_MINUTES \_\_\_\_\_

MR. NOVESKY: Approval of the minutes, everybody receive their minutes? Any questions? They were perfectly done, Fran. I'll take a motion to accept the minutes.

MR. LOBLANCO: Make the motion.

MR. GOLD: Second it.

ROLL CALL

MR. LOBLANCO	AYE
MR. GRABE	AYE
MR. GOLD	AYE
MS. BUNT	ABSTAIN
MR. BRODMERKEL	AYE
MR. NOVESKY	AYE

RESOLUTIONS \_\_\_\_\_

MR. NOVESKY: Resolutions, we do have a resolution which we'll considerate at the time we discuss it.

METRO\_PCS\_NEW\_YORK\_SITE\_PLAN\_(10-01)

---

MR. NOVESKY: We have no public hearings tonight, we'll move directly into our first project which is Metro PCS New York.

MR. FURST: Good evening, my name is John Furst, I'm an attorney at Cuddy & Feder, we represent the applicants, Metro PCS. I have here with me the architect for the project, he's going to get out the boards and I'll briefly go through the project. I think you guys all have the plans with you but he'll set it up so you can give it a look see.

MR. NOVESKY: This is a co-location?

MR. FURST: Yes, on an existing telecommunications tower, it's 140 feet located at 20 Industry Drive in Mountainville by the Star properties, special use and site plan approval underneath your ordinance. Just to give you a little bit of history, Metro PCS they are an FCC licensed provider of digital wireless personal communications, just like AT&T, just like Verizon, just like all the other carriers. They offer the same services, just new to this market. In fact, they just went on air in New York City and working their way up to the suburbs. So I don't think they have any sites on air in Orange County, they're building their infrastructure from scratch so it's a monumental task, they prefer to co-locate as is the situation here. And they are looking to provide coverage along New York State Thruway, Route 32, Taylor Road, Long Hill and Pleasant Hill Road so that western portion of the town between 32 and Cornwall. The site is 36.9 acres, it's planned industrial and office zone. It presently contains a building that's used for commercial purposes. And again, as I said, there's an existing 140 foot lattice tower right now they've got AT&T, Mobile Sprint and Verizon already on the tower. They have their equipment on the ground, we're going to add

six panel antennas, the center line height is going to be about 120 feet so we're going to be below AT&T's antennas but they'll be above Verizon and Sprint's antennas, they'll be sandwiched right in the middle, they're the fifth carrier, there's four existing, the height of the tower is going to remain the same, we're not touching that. And then at the base of the tower within an existing fenced in compound Metro PCS is going to place their unmanned equipment which consists of three or four equipment cabinets, phone, an 8 x 20 concrete slab, again, it's already like I said it's in the existing fenced-in compound which is surrounded by vegetation. Here's the elevation equipment at the base of the tower within the existing fenced-in compound, Metro PCS is right here in the middle, center line 120, top of the tower is 140 above grade. Town encourages co-location in their wireless ordinance. We're requesting an expedited review and waiver of the public hearing since we're co-locating and placing our equipment within the existing compound. We have submitted a structural integrity report to show that the tower can handle the additional antenna weight. We have also submitted FCC compliance report that shows, basically concludes that the emissions between Metro PCS's proposed antennas as well as the existing antennas will be 107 times below the FCC limits so the analysis includes all the antennas and will be 107 times below the FCC.

MR. BRODMERKEL: What does the 107 times below mean?

MR. FURST: Here's the limit, we're 107 times below that.

MR. BRODMERKEL: I have no idea what that means. Does that mean it's 5 percent of what is allowed?

MR. FURST: I think it's like 1 percent.

MR. BRODMERKEL: That I understand.

MR. FURST: When I say the percentages, most people don't understand that part so I guess you're smarter than most.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Yes, I am, thank you.

MR. CORDISCO: Smarter than the average bear.

MR. FURST: Just to quickly conclude, the facility is unobtrusive and will have a diminimous visual impact on the surrounding areas. Its compliance is encouraged by your code, we have a radio frequency engineer who can explain the coverage maps and the plots if you need it.

MR. NOVESKY: Is this service already available?

MR. FURST: Not in Orange County, in New York City. We've got to build a network then we can start selling up there.

MR. NOVESKY: We can move right to the technical advisors here.

MS. DOTSON: Just to supplement what he said, they did submit a comprehensive application package that was designed to address all the requirements of the code. There's one thing I requested that they submit a full EAF because the portion of the site in which the tower's located is substantially contiguous to two National Register Historic Places sites which requires a full EAF that's typically what you've done. It's really just a procedural requirement, does not give you any additional information on a technical basis. You already have pretty much what you need but it is a requirement. Even though they did not submit photo simulations as part of their application and as part of the visual impact analysis, I still think that we can safely conclude that there's going to be no impact on these two historic structures just because of the fact

that this is not proposing anything unusual in terms of size or dimension for the panels and all the ground matted equipment is going to be below the level of what else is screened from the existing properties. There are trees and other cabinets screening other properties in between that. So we suggest that you can waive the requirements of the code for public hearing for special permit because the intent is to encourage applicants to co-locate as they have done. This is eligible for a hearing waiver.

MR. NOVESKY: Thank you. Dominic?

MR. CORDISCO: At this point, Leslie I think has covered it all. As she mentioned, the code does encourage co-locations which is what they're trying to accomplish and as Leslie had mentioned, the board can waive its public hearing and towards that end, we went ahead and prepared a resolution that would grant approval to this application if the board finds no issues.

MR. NOVESKY: Approval for waiving public hearing? What resolution did you draw?

MR. CORDISCO: Well, we drew up two, one resolution adopting the negative declaration that Leslie prepared and the second one granting site plan and special use permit approval where the waiver of public hearing would be noted in that resolution.

MR. NOVESKY: Motion would be the resolution in my very hands.

MR. CORDISCO: Yes.

MR. NOVESKY: Thank you for doing that.

MR. SZAROWSKI: Mark really didn't have any issues. Everything that they're doing is inside the fenced in

area so he doesn't know of anything that would preclude an action by the board.

MR. NOVESKY: Any board member wishing to comment?

MR. BRODMERKEL: No, sir.

MR. LOBLANCO: No.

MS. BUNT: No.

MR. NOVESKY: I'd ask for a motion to waive the public hearing.

MR. LOBLANCO: I'll make that.

MS. BUNT: Second it.

ROLL CALL

MR. LOBLANCO	AYE
MR. GRABE	AYE
MR. GOLD	AYE
MS. BUNT	AYE
MR. BRODMERKEL	AYE
MR. NOVESKY	AYE

MR. NOVESKY: You have your waiver of the public hearing. Second?

MR. CORDISCO: It would be a motion to adopt the negative declaration would be the next.

MR. NOVESKY: There it is, hidden behind the other resolution adopting negative declaration for site plan approval.

MR. LOBLANCO: I'll make that motion.

MS. BUNT: Second it.

ROLL CALL

MR. LOBLANCO	AYE
MR. GRABE	AYE
MR. GOLD	AYE
MS. BUNT	AYE
MR. BRODMERKEL	AYE
MR. NOVESKY	AYE

MR. NOVESKY: This is the most cumbersome part where I have to write this down. I'll take a motion for the second resolution which is the granting of the site plan approval and special use permit.

MR. GOLD: So moved.

MR. LOBLANCO: Second it.

ROLL CALL

MR. LOBLANCO	AYE
MR. GRABE	AYE
MR. GOLD	AYE
MS. BUNT	AYE
MR. BRODMERKEL	AYE
MR. NOVESKY	AYE

MR. NOVESKY: You're all set.

MR. FURST: Thank you very much.

TED\_BUHL\_SITE\_PLAN\_AMENDMENT\_(10-2)

---

MR. NOVESKY: Subdivision lands of Ted Buhl.

MR. AXELROD: Good evening, my name is Alan Axelrod, attorney for Doug and Monica Johnson. Mr. Johnson is here. We've submitted the application and a letter that I think is self-explanatory, I don't know if the board has had an opportunity to read the letter.

MR. NOVESKY: Board members have an chance to read the letter?

MR. GOLD: Yes.

MR. LOBLANCO: Yes.

MR. NOVESKY: Okay.

MR. AXELROD: So I'm not going to waste the board's time reiterating what's in the letter, I think it kind of speaks for itself. Basically looking to remove that note which did cost them the contract that did fall through. As a result, they can't sell the property without removing this note. So if there's any questions, I'm sure Mr. Johnson or I will be glad to answer them.

MR. NOVESKY: We'll hold the questions until the technical information has been put on the floor so we can move this forward. Okay, Leslie?

MS. DOTSON: I don't have too much to say. He's submitted us a copy of the existing filed map, we're going to need a revised version that has the note that offends that you updated. In the meantime, I think you can schedule a public hearing subject to the submission of the revised map. Your counsel has already explained to you that you cannot amend the maps to remove the note without a public hearing so that's what needs to

be done. I have referred this to Orange County Planning so that next month you should be able to make this to avoid any delay because February's a short month. And I have already spoken with the county so they know what's happening.

MR. NOVESKY: Okay, thank you.

MR. BRODMERKEL: I'll wait.

MR. NOVESKY: Thank you, Leslie. Is that the end of your comments?

MS. DOTSON: Yes.

MR. NOVESKY: Okay, Dominic?

MR. CORDISCO: As Mr. Axelrod explained it and it's my understanding there was also a discussion last month, they're merely seeking to remove a note restriction to reflect the reality of how this particular subdivision was built out. There have been, they are not proposing any changes to the plat itself nor any physical changes on the ground and that this process does of course involve basically a resubdivision approval with the ultimate goal for them to have a new subdivision plat that can be filed in the County Clerk's Office which would then be on record so that anyone that was going to ensure title for a transaction for a buyer could see the new subdivision plat and see that the restriction no longer applied to them. And that way, a buyer could get title insurance and these people can sell their home. It's my understanding that the current sale, the sale that you were discussing at last month's meeting has fallen through.

MR. NOVESKY: The North Carolina thing.

MR. AXELROD: My clients now live in North Carolina but the buyer was local but they couldn't wait.

MR. CORDISCO: But they were in a bind and they need to resolve this issue for any future transaction now that it's out there. But it does require public hearing in a sense that the other lot owners in that particular subdivision may have something to say about this because this is a subdivision plat that affects them as well. And so the board would be required to have a public hearing and I think and I concur with Leslie that it could be scheduled for next month's meeting subject to conditioned upon them submitting a new subdivision plat. Bear in mind that the new subdivision plat is going to be identical to the existing subdivision plat except it's going to have a new note on it saying that the restriction that this particular lot access Holloran Avenue would not apply to make it clear for any title insurer thereafter.

MR. NOVESKY: John?

MR. SZAROWSKI: Mark actually has suggested a note here that you could add to the amended plat, we'll need to see the plat, obviously, he basically defers to Dominic, refers to the attorney for discretion and strongly encourages a private road maintenance agreement. That's the extent of his comments.

MR. CORDISCO: In regards to the private road maintenance agreement, there's apparently a private road maintenance agreement that has been signed and is in effect amongst the lot owners out there, at least as far as I understand it, but it's a bit complicated in the fact that it has not unfortunately been recorded.

MR. AXELROD: It's also not signed by the people of this particular subdivision. I did send certified letters to them, I only heard from one so--

MR. CORDISCO: While it would be preferable given the fact that we're talking about an existing subdivision

and an existing situation, I don't think that the board could actually require it while we would encourage everyone to have and in the case of a private road to have a private road maintenance agreement so you can avoid any kind of disputes in the future everyone would know their rights. At this point, what we're trying to do is to make the map correspond with the reality of how it was built.

MR. NOVESKY: John, did you have anymore comments?

MR. SZAROWSKI: No.

MR. NOVESKY: Okay, board?

MR. LOBLANCO: Nothing.

MR. GRABE: No comments.

MR. GOLD: No.

MS. BUNT: No.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Did we see a map previously or was the map we saw last week different or last month?

MR. AXELROD: Well, the map was the original subdivision.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Did you show us a different map last month?

MR. AXELROD: No, we actually have the map prepared but I was told not to submit it tonight.

MR. BRODMERKEL: It looks very different.

MS. DOTSON: You had just had the lot itself, you were just focusing on the lot itself.

MR. AXELROD: I had the new survey that was done by the potential purchaser showing the driveway on Anthony and representative of Eustance and Horowitz had some discussion with Mr. Edsall.

MR. BRODMERKEL: I have no problem with anything, just looked very different.

MR. AXELROD: We'll submit it probably by next week.

MR. NOVESKY: Okay, I'd ask for a motion to call for a public hearing which is mandated, correct?

MR. CORDISCO: Correct.

MR. LOBLANCO: So moved.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Second it.

ROLL CALL

MR. LOBLANCO	AYE
MR. GRABE	AYE
MR. GOLD	AYE
MS. BUNT	AYE
MR. BRODMERKEL	AYE
MR. NOVESKY	AYE

MR. NOVESKY: With that shall we ask that Dominic to prepare the appropriate paperwork.

MR. BRODMERKEL: So moved.

MR. LOBLANCO: Second it.

ROLL CALL

MR. LOBLANCO	AYE
MR. GRABE	AYE
MR. GOLD	AYE

February 1, 2010

14

MS. BUNT	AYE
MR. BRODMERKEL	AYE
MR. NOVESKY	AYE

MR. NOVESKY: Thank you.

MR. AXELROD: Thank you.

HUDSON\_VALLEY\_VIEW\_ESTATES\_MAJOR\_SUBDIVISION\_(09-03)

---

MR. NOVESKY: Next is Hudson Valley View Estates.

MR. QUEENAN: Good evening, my name is John Queenan from Lanc & Tully Engineering representing the applicant. We were before you once before with this subdivision plan a while back, I believe it was in April and proposed subdivision plan of about a 40 acre parcel located in the Sky Drive-Mountain Brook Road area. The parcel lies right here, this is Mountain Brook Road, this is Sky Drive that swings around that's off Mine Hill Road. Currently, the property's comprised of two tax parcels, one being the outer parcel and landlocked parcel internal to that site has access off two location points, one terminus off Mountainbrook Road and the other is a private road Valley View Lane which comes off the corner of Sky Drive and swings into the site, services an existing dwelling on the site.

MR. BRODMERKEL: One labeled gravel drive?

MR. QUEENAN: Yes, comes in here, that was an old private road services about four lots now, I believe this is an existing dwelling on the property right now services that one and used to service, there was an existing house located on the landlocked parcel some time ago, so basically was serving a total of six lots. Property's located in the ARR zoning district and is contained wholly within the ridge preservation. We're here basically tonight with preliminary plans. Last time you saw it, it was a sketch so five lot subdivision, take the existing two parcels and convert them into five lots, they range in size from about 18 acres, this is just gross, 18 acres to about five acres, all usable acres over three as per the code. The existing dwelling like I said it's on proposed lot 2 that services off Valley View. As part of this subdivision plan, we have designed basically a new lot

which includes well and septic area for that parcel, if that house would ever be taken down, as well as removing the access rights of that dwelling on Valley View and placing it onto the new private road. The overall two access points, lot number 1 would continue to use Valley View Lane not increasing the lot count on that road and the other four lots would use a proposed new private road which would be about 900 feet in length. Overall for the utilities of the site all the lots will be serviced by individual well and septic areas, all of the soils were witnessed by the town engineer consisting of two percs and two deep tests, all lots have acceptable results. And we have designed all the houses as five bedroom homes just so that in the future for whatever reason if they come in with a five bedroom house it's already designed that way, it covers four bedroom, three bedroom as well, the system will be oversized, we have prepared a SWPPP and the drainage plan, we think hopefully in line with the area as more of a rural low impact development scheme and we can get into the technical details in a little bit. But overall what we have done is coming off of Mountain Brook Road it's a very steep incline, unfortunately it's the only location we have to access the property. There is a 50 foot right-of-way that was located, I guess from the old cul-de-sac off Mountain Brook so we're going to come in there, basically put a road through and come to a cul-de-sac here. Main drainage plan is just swales and bioretention area located over here on this lot. All of the facilities will be privately owned and maintained as part of a private road and drainage maintenance agreement, which we'll be preparing. What we tried to do is basically not concentrate the water in any one spot but it has to get out somehow so what we have done we have, there were three areas, basically had drainage going towards Mountain Brook, goes through this lot here and you have drainage that comes off the hillside sheeting this way and drainage that goes off the back of the property. What we have done is looking at the drainage we have

analyzed, we have reduced the flows coming to this area and coming to this area and shifting it and sending it this way. Now I was provided with Mr. Szarowski's comments, I have looked through them and I understand that the main concern you had was with the downstream analysis, I did look at the downstream analysis, what that is saying we're going to increase flow to one area of the property, you're allowed to do an analysis that shows if your property's a certain acreage you have to take a drainage area that's 10% or if you had 100 acres, you'd need to look at like 1,000 square acre drainage area, you compare flows based on having the basin, not having a basin and seeing that if your increases are within a certain level then you can forego the basin. I didn't run this through that complete analysis, it didn't seem that it was going to work, we did a preliminary analysis so instead of constructing the large retention basin, I looked at the flows and said I have a 300 acre drainage basin, the site draining is X acres, I'm only increasing flow by one percent, it can be reduced with the construction of basically a retention basin is what the outcome was. I don't want to really construct a retention basin here right now, we have bioretention with swales, bioretention is completely dry when it rains, fills up, drains through and goes out and stays dry. Retention basin would be much larger, would hold 4 to 6 feet of water throughout all times of the year being privately owned and maintained, I'd rather not have the basins, I'd rather have an area that will drain consistently and dry especially with the proximity to the lot. That's to touch on the drainage why we went this route. And that's about all that I have. So we're here tonight basically to let your consultants take their first crack at our engineering design, I saw that there was numerous technical comments, I had a chance to go through those very quickly, I don't see any problems in addressing any of them except for the direction of the storm water and we would request that the board possibly consider scheduling a public hearing for this.

MR. LOBLANCO: I just have one question. The existing building, is that being planned to be taken down?

MR. QUEENAN: Well, for right now, our client really doesn't have any desire to be a builder, so what they want to do is basically get this approved and sell this. So what we have done was we would leave the house there so that they can still utilize it as a rental or whatever they're doing but it will be taken out so the lot's been designed to basically stand alone.

MR. NOVESKY: With that, we won't get too deeply into the technical discussion because we'll have that opportunity at next work session but for the time being, we'll get into it as deeply as we must. Leslie?

MS. DOTSON: A lot of these are technical details, I don't want to spend a lot of time on them. I'll just hit more of the policy oriented ones, the new proposed private road requires construction of two tiers of retaining walls coming in, the right-of-way for the private road shows one of the walls being included but the other one's kind of hanging out there in the breeze. I was suggesting cause the walls are integral to the grade for the road and their maintenance is integral to the road that made more sense for all the walls to be part of the private road right-of-way and I think that you can flair that out without using lot area enough to reduce that lot.

MR. QUEENAN: What do you mean by the wall?

MS. DOTSON: Both of the walls should be within the private road right-of-way. So, in other words, instead of the 50 feet flair it out so that it's wider in order to accommodate the second wall.

MR. QUEENAN: In this area?

MS. DOTSON: All of the wall, in other words, you've got your private road right-of-way going like so, so I'm suggesting flair it out and have it go like so.

MR. QUEENAN: Okay, I can take a look at this but what I don't want to happen is the wall become too large so we break up the elevation.

MS. DOTSON: I don't care how many walls you have, I'm just saying that the walls should be within the private road right-of-way.

MR. NOVESKY: We're getting too technical, we don't need to do that.

MR. QUEENAN: We'll work with you on that.

MS. DOTSON: Right. Just because I don't see those walls as necessarily requiring a lot of maintenance but when they do need maintenance, it shouldn't be up to the lot owner to do it. The other policy issue relates to the ownership of the private road, they do account for the ownership of the private road as we requested before, before they just kind of hang in this plan lots 4, 2 and 5 at the end of the cul-de-sac are shown owning the fee title to the road, lots 3, lot 3 only has an easement to the road and that's the one that has the storm water pond, I'm just wondering whether the board wants to see all of the lots have some ownership of the private road, you can easily slice that down the center of the cul-de-sac.

MR. QUEENAN: Yeah, however you want.

MS. DOTSON: Generally, the code encourages everybody to own a slice of the private road so--

MR. QUEENAN: What we have done is the private road will have its own dedicated easement just for whatever

reason the town comes to have to take it over there will be an easement associated with the 50 foot right-of-way for the road. What we did as per Leslie's previous comments were to extend ownership of this area to these lots so that somebody will own this area that's outside of the dedicated 50 foot right-of-way easement for the road, that which is this swath through here.

MS. DOTSON: Which is important because there's some drainage features in there so again something that serves the whole subdivision.

MR. QUEENAN: However the board feels more comfortable.

MS. DOTSON: I think the plan should be revised to reflect what the code typically requires, typically, like the code requires dividing to the center line of the road, that doesn't make sense because of the little strip of the land on the opposite side but in this case I think you can do it. I see no problem if the board wants to schedule a public hearing as long as the outstanding questions are resolved before the hearing takes place. He does need to make some plan revisions.

MR. NOVESKY: Thank you, Leslie.

MR. CORDISCO: On that point, we're in February which is a short month and so the turnaround time is actually very tight, the public hearing notice requires ten days mailing and publication prior to the public hearing which means that it would have to go out by February 15 at least to the newspaper in order to meet the deadline for the March meeting. And of course this is up to Mr. Queenan and the board but he would have to get in revised plans prior to that time and have them reviewed. If the board is inclined to make the public hearing conditional on the changes being made, if you're comfortable knowing that, if you're still comfortable trying to make that deadline then the risk

really would be on Mr. Queenan because the flip side of that is that if he does not get the plans in in time and they're not approved prior to February 15 well then the public hearing won't happen until the April meeting.

MR. BRODMERKEL: And the expense of the process would have to be gone through again.

MR. CORDISCO: Correct.

MR. NOVESKY: Say that again.

MR. CORDISCO: Not for publication because we wouldn't actually send out the publication notice, we wouldn't mail and publish it until we know from Leslie and Mark that the plans have addressed their concerns.

MR. NOVESKY: If I might, the first question, the only question is whether or not the public hearing should be conditioned on the maps, revised maps coming in.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Absolutely.

MR. NOVESKY: And your sense?

MR. BRODMERKEL: I haven't heard what the engineer has to say.

MR. QUEENAN: With that being said, I would rather not push it, I'd rather just get it right and have the plans.

MR. NOVESKY: That answers that question.

MR. QUEENAN: After hearing the reduced timeframes, I'd rather just do it right.

MR. CORDISCO: I mean the reality of it is is that he would have to, John, you'd have to submit plans in the

next week and these guys would have to review the plans the week after that.

MR. NOVESKY: Point taken. Okay, John, do you have comments?

MR. SZAROWSKI: Mark had a number of technical comments, I won't get into those. He did ask that the town highway superintendent look at the private road layout so we'll coordinate that. On the SWPPP side which I can speak to very well, you did half of the downstream analysis, you need to do the--

MR. QUEENAN: I know exactly where you're going, what it was was it was a balance of basically spending a lot of time and effort doing that.

MR. SZAROWSKI: That's the problem with the downstream analysis, they're very involved and it takes a lot to meet the second hurdle which in this case would be about a 3,000 acre drainage area.

MR. QUEENAN: When looking at it you probably can get it to work and that's--

MR. SZAROWSKI: More than likely you can, you're in an area though that has known cul-de-sac deficiencies though so--

MR. QUEENAN: Yes, that's why we chose to go out the back down cause all of this drainage goes down a very steep slope, there's an existing water course that goes through the neighboring property that hits Angola Road which is a pretty large culvert down there, that's why we chose to go that route. I don't think that this property here, I shouldn't say it but probably won't ever be developed, it's like it goes straight down and right at the bottom of the, I shouldn't say the cliff, but there's a water course that basically goes straight and direct to the Moodna. That's why we chose that

route.

MR. SZAROWSKI: There's a discrepancy about the volume of what the culvert can handle.

MR. QUEENAN: We'd do storm water, it's a big guess, that's why we do it two ways, we'll do it, there's two ways you can do the storm water, get the size of the culvert, calculate it, you'll come with up with some--

MR. NOVESKY: This can be done at the workshop.

MR. QUEENAN: I wasn't sure how far you wanted to go.

MR. CORDISCO: I think that's correct, I think at this point I would encourage Mr. Queenan to come back at the February workshop, he can do his work in between now and then, show us what you've done and then submit perhaps for next month's meeting you're scheduling a public hearing for the following.

MR. QUEENAN: For March.

MR. NOVESKY: I don't think the board will have a problem scheduling a public hearing the following month. Do you want to consider that now or wait till February?

MR. CORDISCO: I don't think there's any action to take at this point.

MR. NOVESKY: Okay, that's fair.

MR. QUEENAN: One of the comments was that the board usually desires parking at the bottom of private roads, would the board be considering that in this instance for this private road in here?

MR. BRODMERKEL: The board wants what?

MR. QUEENAN: Designed alternate parking at the bottom of private roads.

MS. DOTSON: Typically, that's done when it's very steep.

MR. BRODMERKEL: I don't see any reason.

MR. NOVESKY: I don't think that would be necessary. Is there a legal, Dominic?

MR. CORDISCO: No.

MS. DOTSON: Practical consideration so that people don't block the town roads but you're right, this is a cul-de-sac.

MR. CORDISCO: I think that that's--

MR. BRODMERKEL: It gives you numbers.

MR. LOBLANCO: We were just discussing Larkin's house is above where we're talking about.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Yes but behind those houses it falls down.

MR. QUEENAN: The slope, Larkin's house is over here, this is a huge hill down and this goes down and then it breaks here, goes this way and goes that way.

MR. BRODMERKEL: They go up and down.

MR. QUEENAN: It comes down consistently this way and as you come over here there's a ridge and goes either way.

MR. NOVESKY: Very good, okay. With that, thank you.

MR. QUEENAN: Thank you.

February 1, 2010

25

MR. NOVESKY: Motion to adjourn.

MR. BRODMERKEL: So moved.

MR. LOBLANCO: Second it.

ROLL CALL

MR. LOBLANCO	AYE
MR. GRABE	AYE
MR. GOLD	AYE
MS. BUNT	AYE
MR. BRODMERKEL	AYE
MR. NOVESKY	AYE

Respectfully Submitted By:

Frances Roth  
Stenographer