

APPROVED

**TOWN OF PATTERSON
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
December 15, 2009**

AGENDA & MINUTES

**Proposed Quail Ridge Telecommunications Facility
*Special Meeting***

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

P.O. Box 470
1142 Route 311
Patterson, NY 12563

Michelle Russo
Sarah Wagar
Secretary

Richard Williams
Town Planner

Telephone (845) 878-6500
FAX (845) 878-2019



**TOWN OF PATTERSON
PLANNING & ZONING OFFICE**

**ZONING BOARD OF
APPEALS**

Howard Buzzutto, Chairman
Mary Bodor, Vice Chairwoman
Marianne Burdick
Lars Olenius
Gerald Herbst

PLANNING BOARD

Shawn Rogan, Chairman
David Pierro, Vice Chairman
Michael Montesano
Maria DiSalvo
Charles Cook

**Zoning Board of Appeals
December 15, 2009 Meeting Minutes**

Held at the Patterson Town Hall
1142 Route 311
Patterson, NY 12563



Present were: Chairman Howard Buzzutto, Board Member Mary Bodor, Board Member Marianne Burdick, Board Member Gerald Herbst, Board Member Lars Olenius, Carl Lodes, Attorney with Town Attorney's Office Curtiss & Leibell.

Chairman Buzzutto called the meeting to order at 7:07 p.m.

There were approximately 4 members of the audience.

Sarah Wagar was the secretary for this meeting and transcribed the following minutes.

Chairman Buzzutto stated okay, we're open. Sarah, will you read the...

The Secretary did roll call.

Roll Call:

Board Member Bodor	-	here
Board Member Burdick	-	here
Board Member Herbst	-	here
Board Member Olenius	-	here
Chairman Buzzutto	-	here

1) WIRELESS EDGE CASE #22-07

Mr. Neil Alexander, Cuddy & Feder an Mr. Vincent Capparelli, Wireless Edge, were both present.

Chairman Buzzutto stated okay. Do you want to the (inaudible) into the minutes.

The Secretary read the following legal notice:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN BY THE TOWN OF PATTERSON BOARD OF APPEALS of a public hearing to be held on Tuesday, December 15, 2009 at 7:00 p.m. at the Patterson Town Hall, 1142 Route 311, Patterson, Putnam County, New York to consider the following application:

Wireless EDGE Westchester Group LLC & Omnipoint Communications, Inc. Case #22-07; Held over from the November 26, 2007, January 29, 2008, February 26, 2008, August 25, 2009 meeting and October 28, 2009 meetings

Applicants are requesting a use variance and area variances to construct a multiple carrier wireless telecommunications facility. The Patterson Town Code does not permit wireless telecommunications facilities in the R-4 Zoning District. The proposal includes the installation of a 145 foot tall monopole; the Patterson Town Code states the maximum height for a structure is 38'; variance requested is for 107'. The Applicants are also proposing an 8' fence for around the cell tower and to include the equipment buildings and other associated structures. §154-15 of the Patterson Town Code; Fences, stone walls and masonry walls, requires that fences shall not exceed 6' in height, except along the lot frontage where the fence shall not exceed 4'. Variance requested is for 4'. §154-20 of the Patterson Town Code; Required street frontage, requires that there be 225' of road frontage in the R-4 Zoning District; Applicant will have 50'; Variance requested is for 175'. This property is owned by the Quail Ridge Homeowners Association and access will be provided off of Garland Road (R-4 Zoning District).

Chairman Buzzutto stated thank you. You have anything additional to what we discussed at the last meeting. Anything changing.

Mr. Neil Alexander stated for the record, my name is Neil Alexander. I'm partner at the law firm of Cuddy & Feder. I just thought I'd recap. Or if you want to recap. However you want to...

Chairman Buzzutto stated no, you go ahead and...

Mr. Alexander stated okay. A couple of quick things. I don't know, it turns out that it sounds like Sarah gave you a copy of the letter that I was asked to send at the last minute, more for the Planning Board, but we sent it to both Boards so that way both of you knew what was going on. So it's my understanding you have the letter dated today. So here are extras and originals. As you know, your Town Planner, Mr. Williams, I know is at an MS-4 meeting and unable to be here tonight, issued a comment memo on October 28th, and then on a lovely cold and snowy day, December 6th, we had a joint site visit and balloon float with your Board and the Planning Board out at the site. And, you know, we're here tonight to hear your thoughts on what happened when you left the site and walked around and saw the balloon and drove around town. We've received your thoughts previously with regard to, and Planning Board members concerns with regard to Phillard [Road] versus Garland [Road] as an ingress and egress point. We had some ability to discuss that tonight. We have some revised plans that we want to give you tonight that we have not officially submitted. But they incorporate all the changes from Mr. Williams' prior memo as far as, you know, where's the crane setup area, where's the storage area for snow. Twenty-five feet of pavement as you come in. Things of that sort that are up here. And I think where we're trying to head towards and I guess some of our challenges is we need, and I think Sarah read this, is we need a frontage variance as well. So we need a frontage variance, we need a height variance as to overall height, fence height, and a use variance. And looking over our notes, and this is what my letter addresses, I realized we haven't commenced SEQRA. And I think part of that has to do with the fact that there was a lot of discussion about at Putnam Lake PLCC site for a long period of time and we were asked to study many alternatives

and then we came back and said would you consider Quail Ridge. Had a few meetings, and we sort of all agreed that Quail Ridge would be the place to go. It's... We have no preference as to whether you do a coordinated review or uncoordinated review. I think we... As my letter said, we really would prefer uncoordinated review because we'd like to get passed the Zoning Board and on to Planning Board. And we think in many ways the ingress and egress point is an issue we can discuss with the Planning Board as to site planning issues; grading and alike, as opposed to the variance issues. We would need a variance as to lot frontage at either location, because we don't have the 225' that's requisite. It's in both situations essentially, are identical. At the end of Phillard Road, you have a cul-de-sac to blow through. At the end of Garland [Road] you have a cul-de-sac to blow through. So the frontage variance we would need is almost identical. It may be a couple of feet different at one location versus the other. But it's the same notion. I can show you a little bit more about that. So what we would like to be working towards is we believe we've suitably addressed your issues. We would like to be working towards an approval of your issues in January, so we can start... and start working with the Planning Board. It's our intention to submit our site plan application by the end of this month, at worst case scenario, right after the new year to start working on the site planning issues. So, just to go over the plans really quickly, I know some of the... I think two of the residents who both live on Garland [Road] are here. So just for their benefit...

Audience member stated three.

Mr. Alexander stated three. Sorry. One more snuck in. Sorry. (Inaudible) before I looked over my shoulder. Essentially, you know, Garland ends. We're proposing a 12' wide gravel road that goes up. First 25' are paved now, per the request of your Town Planner. It's more detailed on the next sheet [referring to the plans]. This sheet really just wants to give you a long overview. It shows how we meet all the setbacks. I think the topo in this area is pretty interesting and worth pointing out as to the gradualness. 560' is the initial contour. I mean, the actual match line's 552'. And as you go back, you work all the way up to 600'. We have extra sets of drawings if you want your own set... it turns out the way this room is setup [referring to the meeting room] I think you can see it pretty well from there. It goes to 600' here, gradually up to 610', and then it starts going back down at which point it looks like the line is about 620' here and 630' on this back corner [referring to the plans]. We have... Here's another great shot that shows you from a tax map [referring to plans]. And this is what we were saying here about Phillard [Road]. See, it's sort of the same idea. You know, this is 50' wide. You need 225' of frontage. So we need 175' variance there. I don't have the exact math answer. But, you know, this is an arch [referring to the plans]. So it would be a radius. But essentially, yes, it looks like on paper here, potentially... I don't have the exact easement to know what the easement size is to go in to the property. But, you know, it's a comparable notion. Unfortunately we don't have all the topo for this area. And when we went online, most of the USGS topography is ten... That's like really readily and easily available, have 10 foot contours. And that doesn't really help get into the notion here. What I will tell you is from a preliminary design standpoint from Phillard [Road] some of the challenges we know we have to look at is you have three wellheads right in this area. You have a community facility building for the community water. So you got to somehow come in here [referring to the plans]. Then there's a lot of exposed ledge. There is... it is, believe it or not, this run here... And it's sort of becomes intuitive. You have 900' of run here and it's similar, probably, grade change, but it's over 900'. Here it's over a third less; it's 600', kind of a thing. So, and that one bank that we all saw, we're looking at definitely having to do a switchback. And we're also concerned that we're not going to be able to do gravel because of the switchback and because of the steepness. So we'd be looking at paving. We're also looking at what... Our other concern that we have is that now we're going to go over an acre of total disturbance, which obviously puts us into having to do a SWPPP, a fuller SWPPP. And that would, honestly, will work against us in the sense of not only the regulatory standpoint, but from a total area disturbance. Once you then have to do SWPPP compliance, now I have to clear more area to actually address my stormwater detention and quality and quantity controls, you know, associated with the

acceleration. So, those are some of the, at least, initial concerns we have. We are going to take a little more of a look and try and give you a (inaudible – coughing) for the record and for the Planning Board. That's why we really... We always used to come in for our design visits from Phillard, and we wanted to do it. And then when they went to try and design and think about it, they said no, no. You've got to come in this way. The other part you have to think about is it's not just the SUV that comes in monthly to do the visits. Because that's all we're talking about here, which really in our opinion, militates in favor of sort of a forest road feel of gravel. I mean, if it's only going to come in once a month, and what we've thought about doing is we're going to really move the gate far back. Our thinking would be to move the gate back, you know, probably 5, 6, maybe even 10 lengths, depending on the field conditions. So that way, what happens is you don't pull in here and stop, and therefore the homes see the vehicle. You pull back in and stop. Give a different feel contextually, and we thought that would ameliorate some of the neighbors concerns that they're not going to... And it's monthly. This is not an in and out like a household. So I think that's important...

Audience member stated excuse me.

Board Member Olenius stated there'll be time for public comment when...

Chairman Buzzutto stated no, no.

Board Member Olenius stated they're done with the presentation.

Audience member stated I'm sorry.

Chairman Buzzutto stated that's okay. When he gets done, then we'll... Okay.

Mr. Alexander stated she ruined my train of thought. Hold on one second.

Audience member stated sorry.

Mr. Alexander stated no, I'm teasing. So, in any event, where we are is you can see in these revisions here, we have proposed bollards. We've looked to move even farther back. We have a snow collection area. Twenty-five feet of paved driveway. We also show up at top around the compound that we have changed the compound in this area because you can see from the topo here the bottom corner was at 634', heading up really quickly to 624'. There's like a 10' grade change in about 50', and that would have created a retaining wall need. So we reconfigured the standard 10,000 square foot compound to be smaller. So you have a 67 square foot hypotenuse here. So, where you wind up is we can still fit the 6 carriers plus the municipal, or public governmental compound, you know, equipment in there. On standard compounds, you have the details you were looking for for soil stockpiles, utility trenches and silt fencing. This gives you the new compound area tightened in and shows you how we have pad areas that essentially 10' x 20' s concrete pads for equipment cabinets or equipment shelters, including one for the government antennas should they choose. And naturally it comes back to this last issue. We've asked for 145', which is to the top of the pole with antennas at 140'. It would go up to about 154', is what we calculated roughly, of you put the public safety antennas on. That we did as an accommodation. That would be rent free, so as a result of the balloon float, as you know, we wound up letting out ten more feet as it turned out this time. So you probably got a real sense of how tall that would be. It makes no never mind to be colloquial to what happens. This is, you know, above here [referring to the height of the tower] doesn't matter to us which way the Town decides to go on the variance. As we had talked, we want to do triangular mounts as opposed to internal mounting to keep the height down. And given our experience of the visuals, we felt

that all the views were from great enough distance that it made more sense to keep the overall height lower, even though it meant it was a slightly wider girth than let's say at the Mal Dunn pole, where all the antennas are inside. Here's your grade...access drive grade. And max slope is 10% under the existing. And I think to accommodate that same result is going to take a lot more to come in from Phillard [Road], as much as we're cognizant of people wanting to see that happen. And I think that's pretty much where we are. Vincent is, as you remember from the site visit, is from Wireless Edge here tonight. And I don't...Anything I left out Vincent, you think at this point.

Mr. Vincent Capparelli stated no.

Mr. Alexander stated thank you.

Chairman Buzzutto stated okay. On Garland Road and Phillard Road, about how many people do you think or how many...You say once a month. But suppose then there's five carriers on there.

Mr. Alexander stated right. So that would be, you know, five...Everyone's pretty much a once a month. A lot of the monitoring is done remotely. And generally speaking, most carriers have a battery backup system...

Chairman Buzzutto stated right.

Mr. Alexander stated that last for a few hours. Let me...I want to pull down that tax map one [referring to the plans]. So you could take a look at that one and get a sense of what the tax maps look like for Garland [Road] versus Phillard [Road] area.

Chairman Buzzutto stated where does Phillard Road go into where those...What are those, lots there.

Mr. Alexander stated these are the lots.

Chairman Buzzutto stated yes. Phillard Road goes between those.

Mr. Alexander stated yes. So basically, from a rough standpoint, and I'm more than willing to be corrected here, but my sense is that this house here, you have that row of evergreens right around here.

Chairman Buzzutto stated yes.

Mr. Alexander stated and then the community building is right in this area; the community water building. And then you have wellheads right in there. And that's part of the challenge, too, is what kind of weight can these wellheads withstand for heavy construction vehicles. It's important to understand that tower comes in on 20' segments of steel. And these trucks are like 40' long that bring the steel in. So, you have to design a road that basically...That's really the hard part here, in a lot of ways, is that the construction road requires substantially more than what your maintenance and access road requires. So you'd be probably...you're going to be engineering a road that handle a truck of that kind of weight, that kind of distance so it doesn't turn over, and that kind of slope. And we've asked our engineers to put together a little bit more to get a better sense...rough sense, of what it would entail. But, you know, we have concerns that, you know, you have to thread a needle between this building here, right, the wellheads here. This is really where you want to go, right. But then you're going to have to swing sort of this way to get down to the grade...Probably switchbacks somehow, and then come in. It's not going to be the easiest of approaches. And then we saw wetness and we don't know if that was a result of...If you go to DEC's

website, there's no wetlands in the area. I mean, they're further, actually, down in here believe it or not [referring to the plans]. But we saw wetness in here. So there's only so far we can go, comfortably, I guess that would be west.

Board Member Bodor stated you're talking about construction vehicles which are heavy and having to carry in the steel and etcetera. But that's a one time event. Is there no way that these wellheads, or whatever else there that might be in the way, could be bridged for the construction...

Mr. Alexander stated these...

Board Member Bodor stated and then removed later.

Mr. Alexander stated there are things we have to look at. I think what we're really concerned about is these vehicles, depending on the grade of what we...I think what it comes down to is look; You can engineer anything at what cost, right. And I think what we're looking at and what our concerns are, is that in order to actually get the construction vehicles in, the type of road you're going to have to build is going to require substantially greater area of disturbance than this road. Total disturbance, even though the distance is shorter, is going to require much more of a clear-cut of a wider swath because you're going to need a switchback. And then we're also really concerned that it's going to have to have either blasting, because there's some ledge, or digging down deep because we may have to pave it because of the slope that you're trying to get down. So, if you stay at under 10%, like at this road, you're probably going to have a vaster area than if you go to 12% with switchbacks. But if you go to 12%, you're going to need to pave it, which then means you're going to need to do some different types of stormwater management because now you have a paved road as opposed to a gravel road. And I don't have final answers for you. But these are...I wanted to highlight, especially since the public's here, to get them to understand that there are some substantial challenges and, you know, we believe fewer trees, less area of total disturbance, ultimately gravel as opposed to...We're concerned, like, maybe the solution is bridging over the wellheads so you can get in no problem. The wellhead...You've now jumped the wellhead issue. But you can't get around the topography issue. And so we feel you're going to wind up with paved switchbacks, larger area of disturbance, and it's just not going to be as desirable. We're trying to do, within reasonable cost expenditures, because, as you know, we started with one site, we've looked at well over 18 sites around here. We've had an incredible amount of cost associated with trying to develop this, that many other carriers and tower builders would not have been as willing to be sympathetic about in order to achieve providing service. So, I mean, I think Jonathan Arthur and Vince and Wireless Edge, has really been an exceptional tower builder; they've looked at numerous alternatives as you asked. And they, you know, withdrew an application that many people didn't like and have been trying to work with you. But, you know, there's only so far we're going to, I mean...He's going to study it, but only, you know, up to a certain level in fairness to him on cost.

Board Member Bodor stated I would like to see the possible entrance to the tower site from Phillard [Road], studied more so. I would like to know, there may be blasting, maybe there's not blasting. There maybe a switchback, may not be a switchback. There's a lot of questions here...

Mr. Alexander stated yes.

Board Member Bodor stated that I don't think have been resolved.

Audience member stated Ma'am. Can I ask a question...

Board Member Bodor stated excuse me, I have the floor. And I think that I'm looking for a more detailed engineering study with the possibility of going in from Phillard [Road]. And I'd like to back up also, Buzzy asked you about suppose there's more than one carrier. You mentioned once a month a vehicle going in there. Now, wouldn't each carrier have to go in once a month.

Mr. Alexander stated yes.

Board Member Bodor stated so if you have five carriers, you've got five vehicles going in...

Mr. Alexander stated yes.

Board Member Bodor stated on a monthly basis. Okay.

Mr. Alexander stated so it's like once a week.

Board Member Bodor stated right. Okay.

Chairman Buzzutto stated okay.

Board Member Bodor stated and also, backing up further, when you were giving your explanation, Garland is not a cul-de-sac. It's a dead end road. You referred to it as a cul-de-sac. It's not a turnaround.

Mr. Alexander stated the tax map showed it as a...Your town GIS shows it as a cul-de-sac.

Board Member Bodor stated well, it's just a straight road.

Mr. Alexander stated I understand the way it was built...

Board Member Bodor stated yes.

Mr. Alexander stated but the tax map on...

Board Member Bodor stated but it's not a...

Mr. Alexander stated your town's GIS show it as a cul-de-sac.

Board Member Bodor stated it's not developed as a cul-de-sac.

Mr. Alexander stated the fact that you didn't come back at them in the 30's and 40's when it was built, is...

Board Member Bodor stated well, I'm looking at the tax map and I can say there's no developed cul-de-sac there. Whereas there is one on Phillard [Road]. So, those are my comments.

Mr. Alexander stated and I think it's important. Your town GIS, if I jumped onto your website, pulled up the assessor's webpage and pulled up the map for this, would show a cul-de-sac. And I think it's important. It shows it as a cul-de-sac.

Board Member Bodor stated okay. It's not developed as such though. We have to agree on that one.

Mr. Alexander stated yes.

Chairman Buzzutto stated do you agree with hardships coming up Phillard [Road] because you walked out there.

Board Member Olenius stated I'll be honest with you, through the site walk, it appeared to me that running parallel to the Garland Road entrance to the west side...or the east side of your proposed, it looked like a more of an active body of water than from the high side; from Phillard Road. I know there's no wetlands on, you know, any of your submissions here. It's noted in the notes, actually, no wetlands shown. But that stream, I actually walked it with Mr. Williams. On our way back, we walked right to the edge of it and followed it along while the other members were walking down and were just kind of gauging distance. And it looked...It got pretty close at some points. So I'd be leery to...You had requested a SEQRA declaration. I'm a little bit leery on doing that until I have some distances to that, being that there was running water in it when we were on the site walk.

Chairman Buzzutto stated did he say that Garland Road was not part of the...Quail Ridge.

Board Member Bodor stated no. It's a Town road.

Board Member Olenius stated I had another question, too, about utilities. From...I'm not assuming that we're going in from either road right now. Would they be underground. Is that...I didn't see drawings on that. Okay.

Mr. Alexander stated in the new set you have...Well, there's a note on it that they'll be running, essentially along...The utilities in an underground trench adjacent to the access drive. And then have actually provided you with a conduit trench detail.

Board Member Olenius stated okay.

Chairman Buzzutto stated alright...

Board Member Olenius stated so now you have a sixth vehicle monthly accessing the site for meter reading.

Mr. Alexander stated the backboard is...Correct. The backboard is up top, right.

Chairman Buzzutto stated you said that some of the carriers do it by remote.

Mr. Alexander stated a lot of the monitoring is remote. So if they can make a software adjustment, they'll make it through software, so...and sometimes even emergency stuff can be handled through software, without sending out an extra vehicle. But you are right. We're proposing six carriers plus a meter reader on the electric. So you're looking at seven trips. Seven vehicles a month.

Chairman Buzzutto stated well, that's not big construction vehicles. That's passenger cars or...

Mr. Alexander stated correct.

Chairman Buzzutto stated pickups.

Mr. Alexander stated correct.

Board Member Herbst stated is five the maximum that you'd be able to get in there.

Mr. Alexander stated I think what we're showing is six plus the (inaudible – coughing) service.

Chairman Buzzutto stated excuse me [referring to coughing].

Mr. Alexander stated we're showing six, but AT&T is...Excuse me. Let me try that again. I got confused on what night I was on. Yes, T-Mobil is the anchor tenant.

Board Member Herbst stated so you're really talking about seven vehicles now.

Mr. Alexander stated one, two, three, four, five, six. Public's could be seven. Eight. Yes. Eight vehicles maybe.

Board Member Herbst stated yes.

Chairman Buzzutto stated the public is...

Mr. Alexander stated that's if and when everyone is using that tower. Obviously, we're building it hoping everyone uses the tower, because it's essentially vertical real estate, as opposed to horizontal I guess (inaudible – coughing).

Chairman Buzzutto stated the public uses what, fire and police and...

Mr. Alexander stated we're making that available to you all, depending upon what your needs are. We don't know what police, fire, EMS...

Chairman Buzzutto stated but that's what you refer to as public.

Mr. Alexander stated needs are. Yes.

Chairman Buzzutto stated yes.

Mr. Alexander stated and that's free rent, free access. You know, that's not a problem.

Chairman Buzzutto stated alright. I'll take some questions from the audience I think. Alright, now I'll take some questions from the audience. Will you come up, give your name and address. And you raise your right hand. Do you solemnly swear...Oh, I don't...That's...Go ahead.

Board Member Bodor stated just comments.

Chairman Buzzutto stated no, that's not a new case.

Board Member Bodor stated be sure to speak into the microphone, though, so it goes on the record.

Chairman Buzzutto stated yes.

Board Member Bodor stated okay, thank you.

Maureen Lerner stated my name is Maureen Lerner. I live at 11 Garland Road in Patterson, New York. I have no opposition to a cell tower being here. However, I don't see any benefit for us on Garland Road, or the wildlife or the vegetation, to go through Garland Road to access this cell tower. I feel like Quail Ridge, if they're getting the benefits from this then they should go through their site. I don't like the vehicles going through. I don't like the construction because it's...I have no benefit from that, you know. I just...To me it's a...to that way, a nuisance. You know, if Quail Ridge wants that, then they should have it go through there. You know, like I said, there's a lot of wildlife and vegetation that's going to get disrupted and I just don't feel that it's right.

Chairman Buzzutto stated okay. Thank you...

Board Member Bodor stated thank you.

Chairman Buzzutto stated for your input. Okay.

Maureen Lerner stated Jim.

Chairman Buzzutto stated give your name, Sir, and...

Jim Capone stated my name is Jim Capone. 10 Garland Road. I'd like to add, I'm a New York State DOT supervisor. And as far as he's saying about blasting and doing all of it, there's other ways of building roads. I mean, obviously instead of going down, you go up. You could put...You bring in item4, you pack it down and you make a road that way. So you could right over and make your own road that way without doing all this stuff that they're talking about doing. And I voice the same opinion is...I don't want tractor trailers driving...I moved up here...I came from Mount Vernon. I lived in the city. I came up here to get away from it. I personally could care less if I have a cell tower or not. We have two people that live at the end of the block that had cancer. They don't need no extra aggravation from this place. Or, I know it's not proven, but we all know it's definitely a possibility and it's a big children's neighborhood. My son, himself, Maureen's children, they play out in Garland Road all the time. All the time. I don't need tractor trailers. I don't need bulldozers. I don't need none of that. We're not getting anything out of it. If the gentleman that wants it...if he wants it, that's his problem. He's getting the money for it, so let him put up with the aggravation for it. Let his people put up with the aggravation. Why should I that have nothing to do...nothing to gain from it, have to put up with aggravation like that. I don't need it, believe me. And I'm not going to stand for it. Believe me, if I find a tractor trailer or a bulldozer, or anything like that in front of my property, I'm calling the cops. I ain't having that. If I get one thing even blocking my view or anywhere near me, there's going to be hell pay because I ain't putting up with it. I'm not. That's ridiculous. It's not my problem. There's a million woods around here. A million woods. Why the hell you parking it right in the middle of people's houses. That's ridiculous. You go down the end of Fairfield Drive or whatever, there's mountains. Mountains. Nowhere near anything. Why are we putting it over there. Why we putting it over there. Or, I mean, you had...I'm sure you had....

Mr. Alexander stated we had a lot of fun on the south end of the lake.

Jim Capone stated I mean, geez.

(Laughter)

Jim Capone stated no, not the south end. No, no, no, no, no, no.

Mr. Alexander stated would you like us to go back to the south end of the lake application, because I think we had a lot of fun with that. I think you're also confused here. You're talking about two...less than two month construction period. And it's not even active all those 60 days. It's a phasing and time thing. What I was talking about is when you're actually bringing...the days when you bring in the steel.

Jim Capone stated I know. Yes. I'm aware of that.

Mr. Alexander stated it's like two or three days you're talking about on that. So I think...

Jim Capone stated well...

Mr. Alexander stated I think you're overestimating the amount of construction that's entailed as far as vehicles being involved with...

Jim Capone stated I've been dealing...I have dealt with many construction firms...

Maureen Lerner stated yes, but (inaudible – too distant) construction....

Chairman Buzzutto stated hold on. Hold on [referring to too many speaking at once].

Jim Capone stated they tell...

Chairman Buzzutto stated one at a time please.

Jim Capone stated people...I appreciate what you're saying. I truly do. I appreciate what you say, but believe me, I haven't seen a construction company come in with a proper time in their life. So, I'm not even going to try to say it's going to go for two or three weeks though because, believe me, you're talking to the wrong guy because I've dealt with...Like I said, I'm a supervisor. I deal with...

Mr. Alexander stated no, I know.

Jim Capone stated construction...

Mr. Alexander stated it's a little different than...

Jim Capone stated and...

Mr. Alexander stated (inaudible) your Yonkers contractor.

Jim Capone stated you know, believe me...

Mr. Alexander stated it's a little smaller in scale.

Jim Capone stated right. So, and like I said, if that...if they're, whatever...Quail, whatever, wants to have it, let them put up with it. Let their people put up with it. They're the ones that are getting the gain from. We're not getting any gain, nothing from it. And I know all these people on the block, and it's just going to be the inconvenience. And like I said, we have young kids that are constantly playing on the road; playing

stickball. They play right in front of my house which is Garland Road. Right...no. Right at the corner of Hanover [Road] and Garland [Road]. That's where I live, right over there [referring to the plans]. Right here. I guess number 11, or somewhere around there. That's where I live. And the kids are out there. And that's my concern. And the concern of the construction equipment and all that other stuff. And believe me, the people on the block, they don't want it. Whether they're not here or not, you know, but I can speak for them; they don't want it. The Sampayo's, the Burns'. They're the ones that are the last two that are on the end of Haviland...Haviland, excuse me. On Garland, excuse me. They don't want it. You know, they...That's all I can say. I mean, I just...I can't emphasize enough that if you people want to do it, it's their property, and I can't stop that. I can't stop progress and I can't stop anything. But I want to stop is people disturbing my privacy in my own neighborhood, so...And you don't have to blast. There's other ways of making roads. I mean, besides the other damage that is going to be done to it. When I sit on my deck, I got to look up and see the cell tower. You know, that's not what I moved up there for. I moved up there to hear the birds, not some humming machine up there. Okay.

Chairman Buzzutto stated I don't think you'll see a cell tower, though.

Jim Capone stated you don't think so.

Chairman Buzzutto stated I don't think so.

Jim Capone stated okay. We'll see. We'll see. I can't, you know, I can't tell you people to stop.

Chairman Buzzutto stated I couldn't even see the balloon...

Jim Capone stated okay. I can't...

Chairman Buzzutto stated (inaudible – too many talking).

Jim Capone stated I can't speak on that and I know there's a lot of woods back there.

Chairman Buzzutto stated yes.

Jim Capone stated I can't...unless things get cleared and stuff, I don't know what's going to go on. You know, again, progress. We need cell towers, that's fine. But to me, there's woods all over the place, away from everybody. I can't believe we can't find a (inaudible) site...

Chairman Buzzutto stated well...

Jim Capone stated that does that.

Chairman Buzzutto stated I think location is a vital part in placing a tower though.

Jim Capone stated obviously. I mean, this is the only location that we could find. He said there was 18.

Chairman Buzzutto stated well, he said he...you tried...

Mr. Alexander stated we've looked at, over the past three years, over 18 sites.

Jim Capone stated that's what I'm saying. You said 18.

Mr. Alexander stated we looked at a ton of sites and you would have thought you had a lot of County property...

Chairman Buzzutto stated Sarah, are you picking that up on the...[referring to the conversation being loud enough to get recorded for the minutes]

Mr. Alexander stated I'm sorry. I didn't mean to...We've looked at...

Chairman Buzzutto stated thank you for your input.

Mr. Alexander stated a couple of quick things I realized. Let me hand you the short...the small set so you can take away the revised drawings so you can take them away and look at them and, you know, in the coming days, which are essentially these drawings. We'll make a formal submission of those as well.

Board Member Bodor stated these are something that we don't have until tonight.

Mr. Alexander stated correct. That is correct. And Mr. Williams hasn't seen them yet, either. They were just done to address the comments...

Board Member Bodor stated we need a couple more [referring to the sets of plans]. Thank you.

Mr. Alexander stated and we can...We will make a formal submission of the revised drawings. And when we make our submission for site plan to the Planning Board shortly, we will also make it a joint submission so you would receive copies of what they receive copies...Of which they receive copies rather. As you know, and this is more for the public, I know you've lived through this, the need and the ability of carriers to provide service to the Putnam Lake community has been an ongoing saga for probably 5 years. I think Sprint came in with the monocross in around '04, '05. I mean, I know the Board knows that. I think the public needs to take away through this tape and other means that, you know, at least 18 sites that I know of have been looked at. And this really is the best site. If I could just get a sense of from the site visit...Because we saw you at the site visit, but we didn't see you after you walked around. Is my estimation correct that essentially, especially as we've revised the compound, you don't have a problem with the compound. You don't really have a problem with the height. Maybe the new height, maybe, more than what you're comfortable with. But essentially you don't really have a problem with the height. You don't have a problem with the compound. And at least two of you would like to see more data and a better understanding of why Phillard [Road]...why we think Phillard is a lesser access point, notwithstanding the fact that, you know, some of the neighbors have come out tonight and made it very clear they'd like to see it not come through their neighborhood, and they'd prefer to see it come through Phillard. Is it...Is my finger on the right pulse.

Board Member Burdick stated I would also like to see more information from the Phillard site, so, three.

Mr. Alexander stated okay, so there is...So unanimously the Board would like to see more information on the (inaudible – too many talking).

Chairman Buzzutto stated Phillard [Road]. No.

(Laughter)

Mr. Alexander stated they'll be at the next meeting.

(Laughter)

Audience member stated they're from Garland [Road], I haven't (inaudible – too distant) yet.

Chairman Buzzutto stated okay.

Board Member Bodor stated in all fairness to you though, we did...I know I did it, and I know most of the other Board Members and the Planning Board also, got in our cars...

Chairman Buzzutto stated yes.

Board Member Bodor stated tried to spot that balloon from many, many locations around the lake and even up on Phillard [Road]. I couldn't find it anywhere. I could not see...I went down to the south end of the lake. It was one of the Planning Board members that said, well I saw it. And he held up a pair of binoculars. He saw it with binoculars. But with the naked eye, it could not be seen. And that was through...a time there were no leaves on the trees at all. So if you're going to see it, I would think, you would have seen it.

Mr. Alexander stated and orange is good to see against white.

Board Member Bodor stated exactly. And you know, and so the fact that it was there somewhere, was not visible.

Board Member Olenius stated I did want to ask that question, and I'm sorry. I didn't mean to interrupt you.

Board Member Bodor stated that's all right.

Board Member Olenius stated how long did you stay after we left the site, with the balloon.

Mr. Capparelli stated well, the balloon stayed up for at least the next, like, three hours.

Board Member Olenius stated and the wind didn't affect it. That's why I wanted to make sure it didn't pop.

Mr. Capparelli stated no. It didn't pop.

Board Member Olenius stated okay.

Mr. Capparelli stated the balloon was there, but, I mean the wind obviously...When we were there, we saw it swinging back and forth...

Board Member Olenius stated right.

Mr. Capparelli stated you really...Visibility you have to kind of walk as close to the lake as possible...

Board Member Bodor stated yes.

Mr. Capparelli stated and really look because it blends in with the backdrop.

Board Member Bodor stated oh yes.

Board Member Olenius stated no, I agree. And I did see it. I just wanted to hear that it did in fact stay up and I wasn't driving around aimlessly looking for a balloon that popped.

Mr. Capparelli stated no. It stayed up. It did stay up.

Board Member Olenius stated okay.

Mr. Capparelli stated and basically, like I said, if you walked to the edge of...I believe on, I forget the name of the road. It's like right on the edge of the lakeside, there was like a clear shot that you could actually see when we left.

Board Member Olenius stated it was only visible to me from the east side of the lake. I couldn't see it at all from the west side. And I did get out of the vehicle...

Mr. Capparelli stated it is visible from the west side.

Board Member Olenius stated several times at different spots to look, and...

Mr. Capparelli stated yes.

Board Member Olenius stated it really...I was impressed with the...

Mr. Capparelli stated it blends in with the background, basically, so...

Board Member Olenius stated yes.

Mr. Capparelli stated it's going to be painted brown, I believe, so I mean, actually the white background that we had Sunday was perfect to actually see it. But like you said, it's, you know, the top of the tower is not very large, so...

Board Member Bodor stated yes.

Mr. Capparelli stated the array of antennas will be a little bit larger, wider. So, you know, it will be more visible as in the width, but...

Board Member Bodor stated and the fact that the wind was blowing it too, the motion, the red motion...orange motion up there, but that was, you know, that might have caught somebody's eye.

Mr. Capparelli stated right.

Board Member Bodor stated not mine.

Chairman Buzzutto stated I didn't see it either. I went around.

Board Member Bodor stated there's another couple here, and I would like to invite them to speak [referring to members in the audience].

Chairman Buzzutto stated okay.

Tracy Lamorte stated I'm Tracy Lamorte. I live in 15 Garland [Road]. I'm against the tower. I don't particularly want it near my house. I want to have kids one day. I don't want my kids growing up around it. Yes, they say there's nothing...you know, you can't do anything now, but who's to say in 10 or 20 years that they're going to change their minds. I like my quiet road. I moved there two years ago because I like the quietness of the road. And, alright, so the construction is only going to be for a few weeks or whatever, but you have all those other cars going up there; I don't want it. I went around and talked to all my neighbors last night and tried getting them to come tonight. I didn't talk to one person that knew about the meeting tonight. I didn't talk to anyone that wants the tower. And I, you know, I was walking around with one of my neighbors that had cancer and she doesn't want it. So, that's what I have to say and I just really don't want it. Thank you.

Board Member Bodor stated thank you.

Board Member Olenius stated thank you.

Chairman Buzzutto stated the tower itself is what, 900 feet.

Mr. Alexander stated that's what I was going to do, Chairman.

Chairman Buzzutto stated well, yes.

Mr. Alexander stated a couple of things on that which, again, it's not meant to do anything other than provide some information. The tower's proposed...the tower compound, so the tower itself is proposed to be over 900' from Garland...from the end of Garland Road. And then 915' from the property line going due, I guess that's west, at that location. And then it's about 600 feet from the edge of the house, nearest property off of Phillard [Road] which, roughly eyeballing it I'm saying, let's call it 650, 700 feet back to Phillard. I think what's also important is that, you know, tower setting is a very difficult job. And it's difficult on many levels. It becomes very difficult for a town when numerous sites have been reviewed and rejected, essentially. It become incumbent upon a town at some point to sort of say we have to go somewhere. So that really where the federal case law is on the Telecommunications Act. I don't say that in a threatening way. I say that to have the public understand the job that you've had over the past four or five years; that you've looked at numerous, numerous sites and you know that nobody really wants a quote on quote, in their backyard. But it...You know, pursuant to federal law which ties your hands, you have to find some place for it. And particularly, when you have a really densely populated area like the Putnam Lake community, the courts are going to say, you know, pick your poison. And I think to a large extent what we've done is over...the industry over the past five years has really finally found that site. It's found the site that you don't really see it, as one of the Board Members said. It's set back really far from all properties. I mean, especially if you compare how close together the housing is in this area to how far away this is to any of the property boundaries. I think that's a really interesting juxtaposition to keep in mind as to what's an appropriate place. I mean, it's not like there are existing towers. There's not like there's commercial property nearby. This is a residential area, and we just found one of the largest pieces of residentially zoned property in the area that's undeveloped, and we're essentially putting it dead smack in the middle of that property, which is about as far away as you can get it from anybody. So we feel like we've done a lot of hard work and while we appreciate the public is not going to embrace the tower, they'll

embrace the technology. I think everything other...they figured out the penetration in the American market of cell phones is something like 80% of all Americans have cell phones. So they've embraced the technology, they use it, they're upset if their kid can't watch Kung-Fu Panda when they're in the doctor's office waiting for an appointment, but, you know, we have to put the tower to provide that service somewhere. So thank you.

Maureen Lerner stated excuse me. Can I ask you something.

Chairman Buzzutto stated come up to the mic because this goes into the tapes...the cassettes. Thank you.

Maureen Lerner stated okay, so I'm looking at this map here, but what about going from the west side. That's not feasible for you from...

Mr. Alexander stated it's wet.

Maureen Lerner stated it's wet.

Mr. Alexander stated yes.

Maureen Lerner stated well, what about from the east side.

Jim Capone stated say from Brimstone [Road] on the other side.

Mr. Alexander stated there's...Honestly folks, we've looked at every way. And there's no question, I think the Board will tell you from walking in the field, you can come in from Garland [Road]. You can come in from Phillard [Road]. We're going to provide more information...

Maureen Lerner stated so, it's just...

Mr. Alexander stated as to why not Phillard. That's it.

Maureen Lerner stated it just...North or south.

Mr. Alexander stated yes. It's not an exponential...

Maureen Lerner stated right.

Mr. Alexander stated opportunities to get in.

Maureen Lerner stated so I'm hoping it's north.

Mr. Alexander stated that's the only question I sort of have with you all is, you know, not trying to be overly redundant here is, I understand we need a variance for lot frontage, and we're going to need that for either location. But are we doing this...What I'm concerned about is we're going to do this same exercise with both Boards, as to the access drive. I mean, given relative jurisdictions, I'm wondering, you know...We have no problem submitting the information to both Boards, but should we be going through that review with both Boards on the road itself.

Chairman Buzzutto stated no...

Mr. Alexander stated that's what I'm trying to figure out. I'm trying to figure out is it possible for you all to issue a SEQRA negative declaration, grant us our area variances and our use variance for either location, subject to obtaining Planning Board review and letting them do the site plan review, which is really what the access ingress and egress road would be. I think it would help us with the carriers that are interested in using the tower to realize that a tower is coming at this location and that we're down to a last issue that we'll deal with the Planning Board. I'm not trying to usurp anything, I just don't want to do it twice either.

Chairman Buzzutto stated well, I think once the Zoning Board gives a variance, then it's put in the hands of the Planning Board. Isn't that the way...They set it up after that, right. If we grant it of course.

Carl Lodes stated you have to address a specific, I think...

Chairman Buzzutto stated yes.

Carl Lodes stated the Board would feel more comfortable addressing a specific road. Which one they pick, I don't know.

Chairman Buzzutto stated yes.

Carl Lodes stated (inaudible) dealt with here first before it goes to the Planning Board. And I think the Planning Board then is, in effect, stuck with that road.

Mr. Alexander stated but then, I mean, we've kind of eviscerated site plan review at that point. There's nothing left. What's the Planning Board's jurisdiction at that point. And I'm not trying to be a stick in the mud. I mean, I'm just trying to...I don't want to get to the Planning Board and all of the sudden have them say the opposite and say to me, you know we really like the...I mean, I have a feeling they're going to say they like...they prefer to see Phillard [Road] and if we can deliver it or if...But it could become an interesting sticky wick, particularly if the environmental impacts associated with coming in off of Phillard play out as we anticipate, which are going to be much more extravagant than the environmental impacts associated with coming in off of Garland [Road].

Board Member Burdick stated personally, I think I would like to know that information for sure rather than we might need to do a switchback. We may need to do this. It's going to be an acre, it might not be, before I vote on it. I understand your, you know, premise that the Planning Board has their role, and I agree with you there. But I would feel more comfortable with knowing more about the environmental impact on the Phillard Road before I make a decision. I don't know how the rest of the Board...

Board Member Olenius stated yes, I would be very reluctant to issue any SEQRA declaration without knowing where the egress is coming from, because they are two very different areas. And, you know, as I've stated, I saw the one stream from the Garland Road entrance, and there was wetlands that I think were avoidable from the Phillard side. I didn't think you had to get that close as we spoke when we were walking because they were further away. But, I just...I'm not comfortable making a determination without knowing if it's feasible.

Board Member Herbst stated I kind of agree, too, because it's like a shot in the dark. You know, we don't know where you're going to go.

Jim Capone stated second of all, I don't like anything being done secretly. I don't like anything being done secretly. It should be...Everything should be out in the open. That's all I'm saying. So everybody knows what's going on, or be aware of what's going on.

Board Member Burdick stated there's nothing...

Chairman Buzzutto stated well, what...

Board Member Burdick stated being done secretly.

Chairman Buzzutto stated what would you say is being done...

Mr. Alexander stated we were saying SEQRA. The State Environmental Quality Review...No, no, no. We were saying SEQRA, which is an acronym for the State Environmental Quality Review Act.

Jim Capone stated oh. I apologize.

Mr. Alexander stated no, no, no.

Jim Capone stated this secret thing, I was like, I don't want to hear this.

Chairman Buzzutto stated no.

Board Member Herbst stated there's no secret. That's why all of these are open.

Chairman Buzzutto stated the Board don't work like that.

Jim Capone stated I'm sorry. My fault.

Board Member Bodor stated that's alright.

Mr. Alexander stated alright. I mean, are there other...I mean, that's pretty much the issue at this point.

Chairman Buzzutto stated yes.

Mr. Alexander stated is just getting an understanding of the relative merits and demerits of the two access...potential access points. Okay.

Chairman Buzzutto stated what about the affidavit I asked you for about the restricted area last week. What...

Mr. Alexander stated we took a...We don't, I mean...I think what Rich brought up, there are two different issues in there. Rich brought up the fact that the deed restriction says that there can be no further development of this property without Planning Board approval, which could be easily addressed by you all by approving the project subject to us obtaining the requisite approval from the Planning Board, which is in this case site plan approval. At one point, a member of the public made a claim that there is a deed restriction limiting the use of the property. And we don't agree with that claim by any stretch. And then there's a very clear case law on this subject. And I can give you the case citation, I have it written down with me. But basically it's very simple. Your charge as a zoning board is to review for compliance with

regard to the zoning code and to determine whether a variance should or should not be granted. You do not get to sit, just because someone in the public raises a question...a title question as essentially a supreme court of the State of New York on a title question. And there's a case that goes all the way up to the Court of Appeals on exactly this issue, and exactly a tower setting in the town of Pound Ridge that we were actually involved with. Where basically there was a deed restriction on a piece of property, and it said no towers, essentially, to keep it all simple. And the court upheld, basically the town gave all the approvals for the tower to be built, and an Article 78 was brought, challenging those approvals on the grounds that how could you give the approval given the deed restriction. The court was very clear. It said, the deed restriction is not within the purview of the municipal boards. They review for compliance with the code and whether a variance should be granted. That has nothing to do with whether there's a private party dispute as to whether someone was a beneficiary of a covenant that they have a right to enforce. And if you just give me two seconds, I'll look it up. I think it's Chambers v. the Town of Pound Ridge, but hold on a sec. Yes, I think since council's here...It's Chambers v. Old Stone Hill. It's 8-0...It's 774 N.Y.S.2d 866 (2004) and it relied on Friends of the Shawangunks v. Knowlton, which is 487 N.Y.S.2d 543 from 1985. So, basically it said the Pound Ridge Town Board could not consider the restrictive covenant nor deny, in that case it was Verizon's application, based on the restrictive covenant. So, we don't believe there's a restrictive covenant that encumbers the property, period. I mean, that's sort of the full stop. But even if they were, that case is very clear from New York State Court of Appeals that the person who believes that they are beneficiary of any such covenant would have to bring that as an Article 15 Quiet Title proceeding, and not...this is not the venue for that...

Chairman Buzzutto stated Carl, can we get a memo on that.

Carl Lodes stated sure.

Chairman Buzzutto stated to the Board from you.

Mr. Alexander stated we just thought that was an easier way to handle it than to dig into title questions in front of your Board. It's just that the bottom line is the title isn't an issue for your Board.

Chairman Buzzutto stated yes. I just have to, you know...

Mr. Alexander stated I understand.

Chairman Buzzutto stated don't want to be responsible for issuing something that there is a restriction on. Even though we may have no jurisdiction to put it into...

Mr. Alexander stated I think the person was mistaken when they claimed there was a restriction...

Chairman Buzzutto stated well...

Mr. Alexander stated because our read is not...

Carl Lodes stated I'll take a look at it, sure.

Chairman Buzzutto stated Yes. okay, fine.

Carl Lodes stated yes.

Chairman Buzzutto stated I appreciate that, yes. Is anybody else from the audience...Okay. So we'll wait for the rest of the data on that. We'll keep the public hearing opened for the next meeting.

Mr. Alexander stated just so you know, we are going to submit for site plan approval in front of Planning Board and we would really welcome you in letting the Planning Board know that you would like them to process as well, at the same time. I think that would really help all of us, to be quite candid.

Chairman Buzzutto stated okay, we'll kind of hasten this up for you.

Maureen Lerner stated when's the next meeting.

Chairman Buzzutto stated I'm sorry.

Maureen Lerner stated the next meeting.

Chairman Buzzutto stated the next meeting, I don't know. That would be January...

Board Member Bodor stated I think we could put this on the regular meeting night...

Chairman Buzzutto stated yes. I think so, too.

Board Member Bodor stated in January. Which would be...

Board Member Burdick stated January 20th.

Board Member Olenius stated yes.

Board Member Bodor stated on a Wednesday. January 20th then.

Maureen Lerner stated Wednesday is (inaudible – too distant).

Board Member Bodor stated January 20th will be the next meeting here. It will be our regular meeting. This was a special meeting because we didn't know how many people were going to be involved.

Chairman Buzzutto stated yes.

Board Member Bodor stated but our normal meetings are Wednesdays. Unless we have to move them around.

Chairman Buzzutto stated January 20th.

Board Member Bodor stated January 20th. Okay.

Chairman Buzzutto stated okay. So we'll table it...not table it, but...Yes, we'll table it. Yes.

Mr. Alexander stated we'll continue it to next time.

Chairman Buzzutto stated we'll continue to next meeting.

Mr. Alexander stated see you next...

Board Member Bodor stated January 20th.

Chairman Buzzutto stated the public hearing will be open. You will not be notified at the next meeting. It will probably be...Will that be published.

Board Member Bodor stated it will be...You know, I saw it for tonight on the Town announcements online.

Chairman Buzzutto stated yes.

Board Member Bodor stated it was there.

Chairman Buzzutto stated yes.

The Secretary stated it's published online.

Chairman Buzzutto stated be here, yes. On January 20th.

Board Member Bodor stated but it won't be published in the paper because this is...

The Secretary stated if there are new cases on the regular meeting, it will get republished.

Board Member Bodor stated and then it will get republished, only if there are new cases to go with it. But if there are no new cases, then it won't be published.

The Secretary stated it's not required to.

Chairman Buzzutto stated okay. Thank you for your input.

Board Member Bodor stated but we're telling you.

Chairman Buzzutto stated we appreciate what you said, and we certainly...Thank you very much.

Board Member Bodor stated thank you for your time.

Chairman Buzzutto stated okay, fine. Thank you.

Board Member Bodor stated have a happy holiday.

Audience member stated you too. Merry Christmas.

Chairman Buzzutto stated okay. Do we have minutes here.

The Secretary stated we have pending minutes, but we can do it at tomorrow night's meeting.

Board Member Bodor stated for tomorrow night.

Chairman Buzzutto stated on the lead agency on this particular thing.

Carl Lodes stated I talked to Rich this morning, I think he wants to look at something. I talked to him about 1 o'clock and he said he hadn't made a recommendation yet. I don't...

Chairman Buzzutto stated I assume make the Planning Board...

Carl Lodes stated I think that's where he was a little (inaudible).

Chairman Buzzutto stated yes.

Board Member Olenius stated I'd like to make a motion to allow the Planning Board to serve as Lead Agency for the SEQRA declaration on Wireless Edge.

Board Member Burdick stated second.

Board Member Bodor stated all in favor. Motion carried by a vote of 5 to 0.

Chairman Buzzutto stated okay.

Board Member Olenius stated then if they get some more done, if they go to their meeting...

Board Member Bodor stated yes.

Board Member Burdick stated that's true.

Board Member Olenius stated because that will be early January.

Chairman Buzzutto stated when is that meeting.

Board Member Burdick stated he had asked us to ask them to move along or give recommendation. Can you send a memo to them that we're just waiting for more information on Phillard [Road]...

Chairman Buzzutto stated did he leave his map here [referring to the plans left by Wireless Edge].

Board Member Burdick stated he's leaving it for Rich.

Chairman Buzzutto stated okay. Fine.

Board Member Burdick stated is that what he was requesting. Did I hear him correctly. For them to be able to move along in the Planning Board meeting.

Board Member Olenius stated yes, I think so. And that's why Planning Board is going to serve as lead agency. That will hopefully accelerate certain aspects of it, too.

Chairman Buzzutto stated okay.

Board Member Olenius stated especially since they site walked it already, as well. I mean, they're aware of the...

Board Member Burdick stated yes.

Board Member Olenius stated topography.

Board Member Bodor stated okay. I make a motion to adjourn.

Board Member Herbst stated second.

Chairman Buzzutto stated all in favor. Motion carries by a vote of 5 to 0.

Meeting was adjourned at 8:05 p.m.