

VILLAGE OF HASTINGS-ON-HUDSON
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING
SEVEN MAPLE AVENUE
HASTINGS-ON-HUDSON, NEW YORK 10706-1497

Held April 23, 2009 at 8:00 P.M.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

Brian Murphy, Chairman
Stanley Pycior, Deputy Chairman
David Forbes-Watkins, Member
Ray H. Dovell, Jr., Member
Marc Leaf, Alternate

Marianne Stecich, Board Counsel
Deven Sharma, Building Inspector

ALSO PRESENT:

3 Members of the Public (approximately)

TRACI L. COLLINS, R.P.R.
REPORTER

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Good evening
3 everyone. We're here for the April 23,
4 2009 Zoning Board of Appeals meeting. We
5 originally had two cases on the agenda
6 tonight. I understand that the first case,
7 Case No. 3-09, Christina Griffin and Peter
8 Wolfe, 433 Warburton Avenue, that that
9 application has been withdrawn. Is that
10 correct?

11 MR. SHARMA: They have withdrawn
12 the application, yes.

13 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: So we have then
14 only one case this evening, Case No. 4-09,
15 New Cingular Wireless PC also AT&T for View
16 Preservation Approval for the construction
17 of three panel antennas and associated
18 electronic equipment on the roof of the
19 Municipal Building.

20 And Mr. Sharma, are the mailings
21 in order for that application?

22 MR. SHARMA: I've been informed
23 by the secretary that the mailings are in
24 order.

25 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: I also

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 understand that in accordance with our
3 procedures, the Planning Board was to have
4 heard the application and made a
5 recommendation to the Zoning Board
6 regarding View Preservation Approval.

7 The Planning Board has not yet
8 made such a recommendation, but having said
9 that, why don't we hear from the applicant
10 who can explain the status of the
11 proceedings. Mr. Laub.

12 MR. LAUB: Good evening, Mr.
13 Chairman, Members of the Board.

14 For the record, my name is Daniel
15 Laub. I'm an attorney with the firm of
16 Cuddy & Feder here on behalf of AT&T and
17 Cingular Wireless.

18 I think you are right,
19 Mr. Chairman, in that procedurally we are
20 still technically before the Planning Board
21 in terms of their approvals, including the
22 referral back to you for the view
23 preservation overlay.

24 As you recall, I was the attorney
25 for the Metro PCS application, in the fall.

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2

3 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: I do.

4 MR. LAUB: And as part of that
5 application, you know, we had come before
6 the Board even -- in the same
7 circumstances. We appeared before the
8 Planning Board once, and then we came
9 before you in the interest of fostering
10 panel awareness, you know, talk early and
11 talk a lot, if you will, instead of just
12 coming in at one time, and certainly, since
13 it's a publicly noticed meeting, it
14 seemed -- I didn't realize we were going to
15 be your only customer tonight, but --

16 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Yes, well,
17 times are a little slow, but that's fine
18 with me and fine with the Board.

19 Just so you understand, we won't
20 be voting tonight because we will wait for
21 a recommendation from the Planning Board.
22 But we all have questions. We've read the
23 papers. So, I'm happy to proceed on that
24 basis, if you are.

25 MR. LAUB: Absolutely.

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Why don't you
3 go ahead?

4 MR. LAUB: Sure, sure. I think
5 the site is one you're all familiar with,
6 that's here at Village Hall. This is
7 actually an existing site, unlike the
8 Metro PCS site, which is new here at
9 Village Hall. The AT&T site was approved
10 back in 2002 for a total of six panel
11 antennas on the rooftop as well as
12 associated unmanned equipment in the
13 corner -- Could you put up the roof plan on
14 the tripod so everyone can see it?

15 And since that time the
16 installation, as it was built, was really
17 only a series of three panel antennas
18 around the roof, and only two cabinets --
19 there were four spaces contemplated on the
20 equipment platform.

21 So the current application before
22 you would actually be for adding the three
23 additional antennas, which were originally
24 approved, swapping out one piece -- one
25 cabinet that is up there, and adding

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 another one, which would be a third. So
3 there would be a total of three cabinets
4 since there's two there now. And a total
5 of six panel antennas.

6 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Let me just ask
7 you here, Mr. Laub, do you know why, you
8 know, the time lag between I guess
9 2002/2003 and today in terms of not putting
10 in the three originally approved additional
11 antennas?

12 MR. LAUB: I haven't got the
13 answer to that.

14 Essentially, it seems -- it looks
15 like it was just a matter of having -- I
16 mean, once they contracted the site, were
17 up and running and on the air, they didn't
18 feel that they had the need for the
19 additional equipment at the time.

20 What this -- why it's here now
21 actually is this equipment is really part
22 of an upgrade, a 3G upgrade, which is
23 basically enhanced wireless services,
24 broadband, you know, larger capacity, for
25 services that AT&T provides. So it's part

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 of what they call their UMTS license, the
3 form of technology that they have. So,
4 that's all you see on the drawing, the UMTS
5 cabinet and they're also going to be using
6 the extra antennas to provide that service.

7 One thing I should note from
8 our -- a couple of things I'd like to note
9 from our discussions with the Planning
10 Board.

11 Now I had -- we looked at the
12 antennas that are up there now, and what
13 AT&T is proposing to do is at the present
14 what we know we can actually accommodate is
15 the existing antennas that are up there are
16 about 16 inches wide. Actually, they are
17 16 inches wide. I was here when the
18 engineer measured them. They're 16 inches
19 wide. The proposed antennas before you in
20 the application are 10.8 inches wide. The
21 existing antennas can actually be replaced
22 with antennas that are the same width as
23 the new ones that we're proposing. So
24 everything would be 10.8 inches wide. So
25 you're taking off about five inches, you

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 know, off the existing antennas; so, they
3 would have a narrower silhouette on the
4 rooftop.

5 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Is that a
6 commitment on the part of the applicant to
7 replace the three existing ones?

8 MR. LAUB: Yes, we indicated at
9 the Planning Board last week that we can do
10 that.

11 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Okay.

12 MR. LAUB: Now prior to even
13 filing the application I had requested AT&T
14 to investigate and look to see if the
15 cabinets which they're requesting to put up
16 on the rooftop are the smallest available
17 that they can get. It's been indicated to
18 me that they are, indeed. They don't have
19 any smaller cabinets for this vertical form
20 factor that's needed for this technology.

21 But as per our discussions with
22 the Planning Board, I've asked AT&T to go
23 back again and see if they can find
24 anything on the market. If you recall,
25 Metro PCS was able to find something that

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 was smaller.

3 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Right.

4 MR. LAUB: Compact cabinets that
5 were able to, you know, still work for
6 their site.

7 The difference being Metro PCS
8 works on a different technology. They're
9 much more voice orientated, less data
10 oriented, and the capacity for the site in
11 terms of the traffic and the people that
12 they believe are going to be using it, they
13 were able to reduce the size of the
14 cabinets.

15 They aren't able to do that at
16 all sites, as a matter of fact. I know
17 that because I was working with Metro PCS
18 on another application in another
19 municipality where they couldn't do that
20 because of the anticipated traffic, where
21 it was located and what they were doing.
22 So, it does depend on the technology that's
23 being employed by the carrier and what
24 their capacities are and what they're
25 anticipating in terms of traffic.

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 But I have asked, just so the
3 Board knows, AT&T to go back and see if
4 they can find anything on the market that's
5 available for -- in a smaller form factor
6 or horizontal form factor or something that
7 would bring it down a little bit.

8 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Is that still
9 an open question?

10 MR. LAUB: That's still an open
11 question right now. But the preliminary
12 answers I've received so far, is that no,
13 we don't have anything. But I just wanted
14 to let the Board know that we are
15 continuing in that investigation.

16 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Okay.

17 MR. LAUB: I think that's -- you
18 know, it's basically, the site would be
19 using the existing lease area, using the
20 existing equipment platform on the roof,
21 looking at, you know, the top of the
22 cabinets, the highest cabinet would be
23 approximately nine feet ten inches from the
24 top of the roof.

25 As I mentioned, the top -- well,

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 the top of the parapet is approximately
3 34 feet from above grade. I believe the
4 top of the equipment cabinet would then be
5 approximately 38 feet 1 inch above grade.

6 So it's going to be like --

7 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Four to

8 five feet --

9 MR. LAUB: Four to five feet --

10 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: -- above the
11 parapet.

12 MR. LAUB: -- above the
13 parapet --

14 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: -- in terms of
15 the view.

16 MR. LAUB: -- in terms of the
17 view.

18 Getting to the view, in terms of
19 what you'll actually be able to see,
20 because of the high parapet on the rooftop,
21 anything -- if you don't -- if you aren't
22 able to see it now, you wouldn't be able to
23 see it. You're not able to see the
24 platform that's up there, for example.

25 But other than that, it's really

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 not much of a -- we provided you photo
3 simulations of what it would look like, and
4 we also included in those photo simulations
5 what the forthcoming Metro PCS application
6 will look like. You know, we
7 anticipated --

8 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: I appreciate
9 that. That's helpful to actually see a
10 fully loaded roof.

11 MR. LAUB: But obviously the one
12 difference being that the existing antennas
13 which are in the photos, and they are
14 existing so it's not like we can, you know,
15 scan them out, but those would be slightly
16 more narrow.

17 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Tell me first,
18 can you be more specific, just about the
19 type of service upgrades, specifically,
20 that the equipment -- the new equipment is
21 designed to accommodate?

22 MR. LAUB: Sure.

23 First of all, it's about speed in
24 terms of data. It's your typical 3G
25 upgrade, which is third generation of

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 wireless technology, which has basically
3 been international, you know, agreements
4 about what kind of standards they're using.
5 This is the third one that came out. It's
6 been out for probably about ten years now,
7 commercially available. It first started
8 in Japan, then in Europe, and then in
9 America.

10 It's the kind of technology that
11 allows you to have greater data downloads
12 to your handsets; to be able to do, you
13 know, videoconferencing on your handsets or
14 on a wireless laptop, if you're familiar
15 with the wireless cards that go into your
16 laptops or even your desktop computers;
17 that would basically give you the same
18 speeds as broadband technology for uploads
19 and downloads and obviously still being
20 able to accommodate voice data or voice
21 traffic as well.

22 So, it's really, you know, the
23 expanded nature of the whole wireless
24 technologies that are -- you know, that
25 people are using.

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: And this 3G, is
3 that the current state of the art?

4 MR. LAUB: That's the current
5 state of the art. I mean, there is a 4G
6 that's been in development. As far as I
7 know, that's not been employed by anyone in
8 the United States.

9 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Do you know if,
10 when the original planning was done for the
11 AT&T cabinetry for this location, whether
12 it was built to accommodate the 4G or the
13 next generation as well?

14 MR. LAUB: I think that the idea
15 of having the equipment platform the size
16 that it was and again there were -- you
17 know, I looked back at the old drawings and
18 you could see that there were two cabinets
19 that were approved, but there was also an
20 outline on those drawings of two additional
21 locations for cabinets. So I think the
22 idea was whatever's coming, let's plan and
23 see if we can have it, so. I think it's
24 one of those things where I think you're
25 never quite sure where technology may go,

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 but I think they were fairly certain that
3 they would probably need additional
4 cabinets at some point in the future.

5 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: If you don't
6 mind, you know, my concern is just in
7 thinking as best we can down the road that
8 in terms of the location of the cabinets,
9 we're not talking about needing to expand
10 the size of the structure that supports the
11 cabinets, that we're not talking about
12 moving the location on the roof or in any
13 way altering the location, because I think
14 what we -- what we -- I think what was
15 good, if you will, about this location is
16 that it's in the back northwest corner of
17 the building. So, in terms of view
18 preservation, it's hardly visible, the
19 cabinetry, and it's the cabinetry that has
20 the bulk, particularly to the extent that
21 it rises above the parapet four to
22 five feet, and each piece of equipment is,
23 I forgot, roughly three to four feet in
24 width. Again, it's pretty bulky; it's not
25 very attractive, and you've hidden it as

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 best you can, and so I'm sure if smaller
3 cabinets are available, that's great.

4 It was a bigger problem for
5 Metro PCS because the cabinets were located
6 towards the front of the building. So, at
7 least -- my view is I have less concern
8 because of the location of the platform and
9 the cabinets, although anything the company
10 can do to minimize the height is probably
11 the important issue in terms of view
12 preservation, for me.

13 But I did have some questions I
14 wanted to ask you. I read the structural
15 engineer's letter. This is your Exhibit E.
16 This is the letter from Lulay Illescas
17 Engineering (phonetic).

18 On the first page of the
19 engineer's letter -- this is from
20 Mr. Lulay -- he gives the mechanical
21 specifications. Are those the three pieces
22 of equipment that are going to go up on the
23 roof?

24 MR. LAUB: Well, I think one is
25 existing, and I believe that's the Nokia

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 that's already there.

3 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: How about the
4 so called Argus piece of equipment, the
5 battery cabinet and the UMTS cabinet?

6 MR. LAUB: I believe that's what
7 we are talking about, yes. So basically
8 he's taking into account what the site, as
9 proposed, would be.

10 MR. DOVELL, JR.: Could you point
11 to the drawing and show us -- orient us as
12 to the locations of these things?

13 MR. DEDRICK: This is the AT&T
14 setup right now, and I think these two
15 darker ones are the two cabinets, the
16 cabinet and the battery.

17 MR. LAUB: Do we have a profile
18 here?

19 (OFF THE RECORD DISCUSSION)

20 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Ray, is that
21 the drawing you'd like to focus on?

22 MR. DOVELL, JR.: I think what
23 would be useful is to look at the plan and
24 look at the elevations from the west and
25 from the south.

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 MR. DEDRICK: This one is the
3 south.

4 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Now, that
5 drawing has both the existing three AT&T
6 antennas, the three proposed antennas, and
7 also the proposed Metro PCS antennas. Do I
8 have that right?

9 MR. DEDRICK: Yes.

10 MR. DOVELL, JR.: The cabinets
11 are to the other side, correct; the
12 cabinets are to the west?

13 MR. DEDRICK: Yes.

14 MR. DOVELL, JR.: Can you
15 describe for us what's existing and what is
16 proposed there, in terms of the cabinetry
17 above the roofline?

18 MR. DEDRICK: In this one, I
19 believe that this middle cabinet is the one
20 that's existing, and then there's one on
21 either side of it. One is a battery
22 cabinet and one is an equipment cabinet.
23 So they'd be on either side of this.

24 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: How far back
25 are those set from the front of the

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 Municipal Building?

3 In other words, the south
4 elevation, we're looking at the front of
5 the Municipal Building. We've got the
6 Metro PCS cabinets, which are closer to the
7 front of the building, and then we've got
8 the applicant's location, which is further
9 to the west and further to the north, if
10 you will, back deeper into the roof of the
11 building; right?

12 MR. DEDRICK: Yes.

13 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: So, are you
14 showing the Metro PCS cabinets there as
15 well?

16 MR. DEDRICK: That's right here.

17 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: And how high
18 above the parapet, do you have an exact
19 measurement of the height above the parapet
20 where the new cabinets are going in?

21 MR. LAUB: The top of the
22 equipment is approximately four feet above
23 the parapet.

24 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: What I'm
25 driving at is how does that compare, if you

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 know, to the height of the Metro PCS
3 cabinets that we approved in terms of their
4 height above the roofline --

5 MR. DEDRICK: I believe the
6 Metro PCS --

7 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: In terms of
8 their height above the parapet particularly
9 from the south view.

10 MR. LAUB: The top of the highest
11 Metro PCS cabinet, if I can use above grade
12 level, is 36 feet 6 inches. So -- and the
13 parapet, for your reference, is 34 feet.
14 So, the Metro PCS is about two-and-a-half
15 feet above the parapet.

16 And now the existing cabinets are
17 approximately 37 feet above grade level.
18 So, that's approximately three feet. So,
19 this would be an additional foot.

20 MR. DOVELL, JR.: In your
21 sightline drawings, is there a corridor in
22 which these are visible?

23 MR. LAUB: My understanding is
24 that it's really the corridor as you're in
25 front of the building and you go directly

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 in front of the library, and then if you
3 walk around the back of the parking lot,
4 that's where you'll be able to see that.
5 You have to walk right in front of the
6 library here because if you start walking
7 further inland from the library, further
8 east, it starts to get blocked from the --
9 apparently from the portico that's in front
10 of the --

11 MR. DOVELL, JR.: That view is
12 not illustrated in your photo montage?

13 MR. LAUB: No.

14 MR. DOVELL, JR.: I think it
15 would be useful to illustrate that as well.
16 It is part of the public way, and it does
17 affect the view of the -- the view further
18 up the river.

19 It looks as if it's going to be
20 minimally visible, but I think we'd like to
21 see that demonstrated.

22 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Yes, because I
23 guess they're about a foot-and-a-half
24 higher than the Metro PCS cabinets, but
25 because they're further to the north, away

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 from the front of the building, the impact
3 is probably somewhat less, but if the
4 applicant can find replacement cabinets
5 that are smaller yet, which is what
6 Metro PCS did, that would obviously be a
7 favorable reduction in the view impact. So
8 we would encourage you to explore every
9 opportunity to try to do that.

10 I'm sure the Planning Board has
11 already asked you that.

12 MR. LAUB: From our prior
13 dialogues, I did press on that. I
14 anticipated that.

15 MS. STECICH: Do these photo
16 simulations, they don't have the Metro PCS
17 cabinets on them either, do they? I just
18 see antennas.

19 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: They're
20 antennas, yes.

21 MS. STECICH: So you can't see
22 them?

23 MR. LAUB: You might not be able
24 to see them from the perspective of --

25 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: No, you could.

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 I was looking at P6 and F6, which is what I
3 call the fully loaded photograph. P6 is as
4 current, and F6 is with all the antennas
5 both from Metro PCS and AT&T. But there
6 are still no cabinets.

7 MS. STECICH: Well, they're not
8 up there yet, I don't think.

9 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: No. I am
10 saying you could superimpose them.

11 MS. STECICH: Oh, I thought you
12 were saying you couldn't see them.

13 Yes, I think we need photo
14 simulations with the equipment cabinets.

15 MR. LAUB: I'll have them take a
16 look at that. I'm not sure because I think
17 we've had this discussion, but I'll
18 certainly look into it and see what they
19 can do because I know they have a couple of
20 different photos that they've used for
21 these, and I'm wondering if the camera
22 angle here maybe they felt that you
23 couldn't see it, but I think there's
24 another angle where if you moved up kind of
25 more towards the library, I think that's

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 where you may be able to see it, the corner
3 of that would be the equipment, which I
4 know was included in the Metro PCS photos.

5 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: That's
6 Mr. Dovell's point, that from the view of
7 P6 and F6, which is I guess, southeast,
8 but, you know, you may not really see the
9 cabinets, the AT&T cabinets. I think you
10 would see the Metro PCS cabinets.

11 MR. LEAF: There's a public park
12 just outside the --

13 MR. LAUB: Right.

14 MR. LEAF: -- of the library,
15 which is much higher in grade than this
16 intersection, and it is directly south of
17 the facade of the Municipal Building, and
18 that would be a great place to be able to
19 check the view from since there is seating
20 there for the public; there are tables and
21 seating, and the point of the park is, you
22 know, Hudson River views, and so this will
23 clearly impose upon them.

24 If it's visible from any place,
25 it's visible from there, and it is

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 important to know that.

3 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Right. So, we
4 would at least like to see it.

5 MR. FORBES-WATKINS: Can I add
6 another esthetics issue?

7 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Go ahead.

8 MR. FORBES-WATKINS: Which is
9 inevitably a problem with wiring. The
10 wiring up there now looks like spaghetti,
11 badly designed spaghetti bowls. It needs
12 to be tied down and made neat. That would
13 help our view preservation quite
14 substantially.

15 MR. LAUB: Actually, I did -- I'm
16 sorry.

17 MR. SHARMA: As part of this
18 process and application, I was definitely
19 going to bring that to everyone's
20 attention; to ensure that all this cabling
21 is somehow either camouflaged or put in a
22 cabinet, in some way to make it less
23 offensive.

24 MR. LAUB: I thought we mentioned
25 that. Mr. Sharma had brought that to my

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 attention. He actually brought up that
3 exact point; that the cabling up there
4 should be more -- I'm fairly certain it
5 could be put in a cabinet; so we'll see
6 what we can do about that, and certainly,
7 that will help reduce the profile of the,
8 you know, appearance.

9 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: I had a few
10 questions going back to the engineer's
11 letter, Mr. Lulay, and this is probably
12 more of a Planning Board issue than our
13 issue, but it at least struck me.

14 In his letter he was kind of
15 conservative in what he was saying. He
16 said if the existing beams for the cabinet
17 frame, if they were installed the right way
18 back in 2002, then they can safely support
19 the new equipment.

20 Well, that's not much of an
21 answer. Yeah, if they were installed
22 properly, it's going to work, but if they
23 weren't, it's a problem. So I think
24 somebody should get an answer to that
25 question.

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 MS. STECICH: The Planning Board
3 asked a structural engineer to take a look
4 at it.

5 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Okay. Good.

6 MS. STECICH: Number one, to see
7 whether the roof could handle it. This is
8 the first time I focused on the weight.
9 It's more than two tons of additional
10 cabinets.

11 So, anyway, there is a structural
12 engineer who's going to come and take a
13 look at it.

14 MR. SHARMA: Their engineer won't
15 certify the structure of the way it was
16 built and can it actually handle the weight
17 of the new equipment, and then our engineer
18 will come and check and confirm that what
19 they're saying is okay.

20 MS. STECICH: There's a lot of
21 other measures. I mean, don't forget
22 there's a lease, and we have to make sure
23 that, you know, it's consistent with the
24 lease and everything.

25 MR. DOVELL, JR.: Is the platform

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 bearing on the parapets walls on dunnage
3 steel?

4 MR. LAUB: Yes, the dunnage steel
5 connects into the load-bearing portions of
6 the parapet walls on the portions, if you
7 will, kind of in between where windows
8 might be. So it basically goes from there
9 straight down the foundation.

10 MR. DOVELL, JR.: And how high is
11 that above the roof level?

12 MR. SHARMA: About 18 inches.

13 MR. LAUB: I mean, typically it's
14 around 18 inches to allow anybody to get
15 under the platform to work. So if there
16 needs to be any roof maintenance or
17 anything, you can get -- if you're doing
18 work for leaks or any kind of servicing for
19 the roof that you would need that space.
20 So, it doesn't actually touch the roof
21 itself. So it only spans over it. I think
22 the only thing that would come down is a
23 utility ladder that comes down on to it.

24 MR. DOVELL, JR.: It's 18 inches
25 or 16 inches from the roof to the top of

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 the --

3 MR. LAUB: To the bottom of

4 the --

5 MR. DOVELL, JR.: There's

6 18 inches clear underneath it?

7 MR. LAUB: Yes.

8 MS. STECICH: Brian, I just want

9 to say something further to what Deven said

10 on the question you raised, which is, you

11 know, if it was installed on the way it's

12 shown on the 2002 drawings, it would be

13 able to hold it, and then they'll certify

14 it. Now so just be aware, and I'm sure you

15 would be, that he isn't saying in this

16 letter that it can't hold it.

17 MR. SHARMA: No, this part I

18 know --

19 MS. STECICH: Well, I don't know.

20 This is what they submitted in support of

21 the structural integrity. So, I think we

22 really have to rely on the Village's

23 engineer to do an independent assessment of

24 whether they could do it rather than --

25 MR. SHARMA: I understand. I'm

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 just saying in respect of what they say in
3 this letter, in the view process, they're
4 going to have their engineers say not if,
5 that it, indeed, is.

6 MR. LAUB: The nature of the
7 letter, I agree, is prospective. You know,
8 it's saying knowing the site the way we do,
9 we believe this works fine.

10 I think once we get to the
11 construction drawing stage versus the
12 zoning drawing stage -- once you get to the
13 construction drawing stage, you'll have
14 more particulars about how things will
15 work. Obviously, the construction drawings
16 won't be too involved, you know, much more
17 beyond this.

18 When we get to that point,
19 they'll have structural engineering
20 calculations and things like that, but my
21 intention was to actually discuss with
22 Mr. Sharma what information he further
23 needed to relate to the Village engineering
24 consultant.

25 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: One more

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 question on this engineer's letter. He
3 talks about new TMA's and di-plexors and I
4 have no idea what those are or how big they
5 are. But he said they should be installed
6 either behind the antenna or below the
7 parapet. And I presume if they were
8 installed below the parapet, they would not
9 generate any view preservation problems,
10 but can you comment on that?

11 MR. LAUB: TMA is an acronym
12 for --

13 MR. DEDRICK: They're an
14 amplifier.

15 MR. LAUB: Right. They're an
16 amplifier.

17 What is the acronym for it? It's
18 mounted -- it's something mounted
19 amplifier, and it's a way that the signal,
20 through the antennas, is actually
21 amplified.

22 So it actually allows for a
23 greater signal and greater coverage with
24 smaller equipment. So, they're basically
25 breaking it down to a smaller piece.

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 But, yeah, they would be
3 behind -- that's kind of part of the
4 equipment that can be incorporated behind
5 the actual, you know, fiberglass panel, the
6 white panel. So it's actually --

7 Well, we say that they're an
8 antenna. The -- inside the antenna panel
9 itself is actually a couple of different
10 pieces of equipment --

11 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Yeah, my only
12 point is that whatever that equipment is,
13 it should be mounted below the parapet
14 walls since the engineer is saying that
15 that can be done because then it eliminates
16 any view preservation issues, which is our
17 concern.

18 MR. LAUB: Right. Just so --
19 it's -- I think they're typically --
20 they're incorporated as part of that white
21 panel, in that space; so, I think they're
22 small rods or they're -- or they're a low
23 process, but they could be underneath
24 before they begin to come up.

25 And then I think typically, too,

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 what I would say is for anything, you
3 know -- because the actual antennas have to
4 be, you know, wired to that and so there is
5 a portion of the wire that comes up and I
6 think that the -- what I would say would
7 work here is the same thing that worked for
8 Metro PCS, which is to make sure that those
9 things are painted white so that they don't
10 contrast with the existing parapet, the
11 parapet wall.

12 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: I think this is
13 sort of a followup to what
14 Mr. Forbes-Watkins was saying to Mr. Sharma
15 was that in terms of the wires being
16 neatened up, if this can be installed in a
17 way that it's less visible and fewer wires,
18 I think that would be helpful.

19 But I think the important thing,
20 as Mr. Leaf and Mr. Dovell said, we would
21 like to see the view kind of due south
22 either from the park or that vicinity, the
23 south elevation, the south view. Because
24 that's really probably the most direct and
25 only significant view preservation impact

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 that there's going to be.

3 And depending on the elevation,
4 what the angle is, at least we'd like to
5 see a mockup of what that would look like
6 for this -- these pieces of equipment that
7 you're proposing.

8 And then for the antennas, I
9 guess for me, the best view is probably
10 what you've submitted on S6. It looks like
11 we're going to have a wireless jungle of
12 antennas on our Municipal Building. I'm
13 not sure there's much to be done about
14 that. I guess I had the same comment with
15 Metro PCS; either we want enhanced cellular
16 service or we don't.

17 MR. DOVELL, JR.: But the issue
18 here is the orientation of the antennas;
19 that's a point I brought up last time. The
20 issue for view is the orientation of the
21 antennas.

22 MR. LAUB: In terms of?

23 MR. DOVELL, JR.: In terms of its
24 effectiveness in transmitting a signal.
25 It's the orientation of it?

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 MR. LAUB: Right.

3 MR. DOVELL, JR.: It's not the
4 planned dimension in relationship to the
5 inside walls of the parapet. So, in
6 effect, all these antennas could be
7 clustered towards the middle of the roof
8 and you wouldn't see anything,
9 theoretically.

10 I mean, that is the concept
11 behind these trees that you see on I-95 --

12 MR. LAUB: Right.

13 MR. DOVELL, JR.: -- where
14 they're all clustered together.

15 MR. LAUB: Right, if you put them
16 together.

17 The problem that you get with
18 that is, and we did investigate this as
19 part of the -- you know, I just know this
20 from investigating this as part of
21 Metro PCS, is there's no place on the roof
22 that could be determined could be
23 structurally feasible to support the
24 antennas.

25 MR. DOVELL, JR.: How much do

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 they weigh?

3 MR. LAUB: Well, they need
4 ballasts to keep them there attached to the
5 roof. So I think the ballast ends up being
6 hundreds of pounds -- if they're not pipe
7 mounted to the roof. So basically you
8 have --

9 MR. DOVELL, JR.: But
10 conceptually, a structure could be built --
11 a dunnage structure could be built towards
12 the middle of the roof and a cluster of
13 antennas could come up and you wouldn't see
14 any of them.

15 MR. LAUB: Well, no, you're going
16 to have to see them because it's
17 essentially a line of sight --

18 MR. DOVELL, JR.: No, I
19 understand that it's line of sight, but the
20 fact that they're all clustered at the edge
21 of the parapet, if you were to pull them --
22 keep them at the same elevation, but pull
23 them back from the edge of the roof --

24 MR. LAUB: They couldn't be at
25 the same elevation if you pulled them back

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 from the edge of the roof.

3 MR. DOVELL, JR.: So, they're
4 slightly taller.

5 MR. LAUB: Right. They would
6 have to start going up a couple of feet.

7 MR. DOVELL, JR.: What is really
8 disruptive and I think what everyone is
9 reacting to is it's beginning to look like
10 a bunch of broken teeth at the top of the
11 roof and it's just simply not very
12 appealing.

13 And I'm sure that geometry signal
14 transmission would let you think about a
15 reconfiguration.

16 MR. LAUB: Well, there's a couple
17 of challenges to it and I'm only bringing
18 it up because we did -- we went through
19 this exercise with the Metro PCS
20 application.

21 There's a couple of issues. One
22 is you do have to increase height because
23 what you need to do is be able to clear the
24 corner of the roof. So as you move
25 antennas back towards the center of the

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 roof, they'd have to go up in order to
3 clear, you know, the corner so you don't
4 get a shadow, in effect.

5 Then you have the structural
6 problem, which is when our engineers went
7 up -- we had site visits up on the roof,
8 and, you know, we had old building
9 drawings, we actually -- I know Tectonic
10 was able to have old architectural drawings
11 that we provided the Building Department
12 that I don't think that even they had on
13 file, but there was still no place that you
14 could really see where -- that you could
15 comfortably feel that you could start
16 mounting antennas in the middle of the roof
17 area. So that's the structural issue.

18 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: You'd have to
19 build a support structure to do that.

20 MR. LAUB: Right. Well, that's
21 exactly it. Where can you put the support
22 structure?

23 The only reliable places that our
24 engineers could find was the parapet wall.

25 MR. DOVELL, JR.: But there's

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 probably column heads throughout the
3 building that -- that -- the building --
4 it's a load-bearing structure, and there
5 are columns -- it's a framed structure;
6 isn't it? Deven, it's a framed -- this
7 building is a framed --

8 MR. SHARMA: Actually, it's a
9 load-bearing wall, and not really a column.

10 MR. DOVELL, JR.: Yeah, but the
11 interior has got to have either
12 load-bearing walls or there are
13 column heads.

14 MR. SHARMA: It has load-bearing
15 walls.

16 MR. DOVELL, JR.: So there are
17 load-bearing walls on the inside.

18 I'm sure there's a way to bring
19 load down through the building.

20 It's convenient for you to locate
21 the antennas there. It's convenient to
22 locate them on the inside of the parapet
23 wall. I understand that.

24 But I think we'd like to see you
25 explore the notion of perhaps bringing them

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 in more off the edge.

3 MR. LAUB: I mean -- the third --
4 we did explore this as part of Metro PCS.
5 That's all I'm trying to relay. Because
6 there's a third issue which relates to RF
7 emissions. And as you know, there's got to
8 be a certain amount of safety distance
9 allowed for the antennas. And that was
10 something that we also went through with
11 Metro PCS and the Village as well as a
12 consultant, Mr. Konig (phonetic).

13 The idea being that there should
14 be a certain amount of distance, you know,
15 that's cordoned off so that anybody who
16 goes up on the roof is able to stay away
17 from the antennas.

18 So when you start putting the
19 antennas in the middle of the roof, you
20 start increasing that circumference of
21 the -- taking up more of the roof, making
22 it less accessible --

23 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: I don't
24 understand that. Try me again.

25 MR. LAUB: There are certain --

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009
2 there are RF emissions with all of these --
3 with all these antennas, and there's
4 basically what you call far field emissions
5 and near field emissions, and far field
6 would be when you're getting away from the
7 building or you're in the building or
8 you're down below, what are the emissions
9 you're getting from that, you know, and are
10 they within the standards?

11 There is also near field
12 emissions when they're close to the
13 antennas. Essentially --

14 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: You mean
15 someone like a maintenance worker?

16 MR. LAUB: If you're a
17 maintenance worker or you're up on the
18 roof, and then standard -- and that's a
19 standard which has to be -- that's actually
20 a separate standard. And that's part of
21 the work that we had with the Village
22 before, and because all of the municipal
23 whip antennas are all located along that
24 parapet wall, what you'd basically be doing
25 is making most of the roof probably off

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 limits to any regular maintenance work or
3 anything else other than our people without
4 shutting down all the antennas because then
5 you couldn't be going on the roof.

6 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: But my --

7 MR. LAUB: So if you put the
8 antennas all along the parapet, then
9 there's going to be a cordoned off area --
10 when Metro PCS comes in, there's going to
11 be a cordoned off area along the parapet to
12 set that back for safety areas.

13 So, if you move the antennas into
14 the middle, you're talking about moving
15 that into the middle, then you're cordoning
16 off a large area of the roof which --

17 MR. DOVELL, JR.: But you'd also
18 be bracing them up probably over the head
19 of a maintenance worker.

20 MR. LAUB: It would still have to
21 meet -- It would still have to be cordoned
22 off to a certain extent.

23 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Well, I guess
24 our only suggestion is that it ought to be
25 explored probably with the Planning Board

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 as lead agency. I don't know if it's
3 feasible or not.

4 Our only point is that we're here
5 to talk about view preservation. It looks
6 awful. There's no way to make it look good
7 the way they're proposed; so if it's
8 feasible, you know, without some
9 unsurmountable economic problem or, you
10 know, code problems.

11 I mean, I don't know what the
12 regulations require in terms of near field
13 or far field. But if you cluster the
14 antennas -- let's say it was possible to
15 put a support structure towards the center
16 of the roof and cluster all of the
17 Metro PCS and AT&T antennas that way so
18 that they'd be either not visible or very
19 limited visibility, even with their raised
20 height, I believe that would be a much more
21 attractive option for us even with the
22 remaining, you know, municipal antennas
23 that are going to be along the edge of the
24 parapet.

25 Because, you know, when you see

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 the mock-up photo that you provided to us,
3 it's kind of startling to us when you look
4 at all this stuff hanging off the roof.

5 So it's worth exploring I think
6 seriously to get better answers to see
7 whether it's possible and to see just what
8 it would take both, you know, in terms of
9 expense and whether there is really a
10 safety issue for the maintenance workers or
11 safety issues in terms of the Village.

12 MR. LAUB: I shouldn't say -- it
13 wouldn't be a safety issue. It's more of a
14 reduction in the -- of availability and
15 circulation on the roof. That kind of
16 thing.

17 I mean, it can all be
18 accommodated with any kind of -- something
19 like that can be accommodated with
20 protocols, but in terms of the regular
21 day-to-day, anybody going up on the roof,
22 it would be -- a larger swath of the roof
23 would be taken up in this if it's got a
24 cordoned-off area, and you've got to take
25 into account the wireless carriers as well

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 as, you know, the municipal safety whips
3 basically just making, you know --

4 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: I understand.
5 But the only issue there really would be:
6 Is there enough room outside of this
7 cordoned-off area to allow somebody to deal
8 with the municipal antennas when they had
9 to, right?

10 MR. LAUB: Or to any kind of roof
11 maintenance of a regular roof or --

12 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Right. And I
13 mean, tonight we don't know what that
14 restricted area would be. So what we're
15 suggesting is that it makes sense to me
16 that if it's possible, it should be
17 explored.

18 MR. DOVELL, JR.: Well, if you
19 just take a look at the roofline, right now
20 you've got antennas that are facing out
21 from the portico of the building, facing
22 south.

23 What you're saying then is that a
24 worker that's on the parapet roof now, it's
25 problematic for someone to maintain that,

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 understanding how these antennas emanate?

3 MR. LAUB: Well they should
4 have -- there needs to be a cordoned-off
5 area for individuals to understand where --
6 that there are RF emissions there, and
7 going over and basically standing over next
8 to them or sitting down typically -- you
9 know, don't go over and sit and have your
10 lunch under it. You know, don't stand up
11 there.

12 It's not -- it's not -- I mean,
13 I've been on these rooftops. I was up on
14 this rooftop. You know, it's not a matter
15 of short-term exposure. It's a matter of
16 standing there and working long-term, but
17 in terms of where you're cordoning off on
18 this roof, you're starting to reduce
19 circulation of what you -- of how long you
20 could be up there. You know, if somebody
21 had to go up there and, say, do work on the
22 skylight, then you start talking about, you
23 know, reducing the area where you can, you
24 know, actually do some long-term work up on
25 the roof.

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 That's what the RF emissions
3 does. That's really my only comment to RF
4 emissions. But more to -- to the other
5 point though, we really did investigate
6 structurally because we -- you know, we
7 were asked, you know, if we could put
8 antennas further back from the parapet
9 wall, you know, and we did explore that,
10 you know, with Metro PCS, and we were
11 trying to find some place to do it either
12 with offset ballasts or ballast mounts
13 somewhere on the roof, and it really wasn't
14 felt that you could find any place that you
15 could do that.

16 MR. DOVELL, JR.: I would
17 disagree with you, that the building --
18 it's a fairly robust building. There are
19 either load-bearing walls or there are
20 column heads that could be located very
21 easily.

22 The loads that you're talking
23 about are not terrific loads. It's no more
24 than -- I can't imagine that it would be
25 much more than a snow load on the roof of

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 the building.

3 So, I think that the
4 investigation could be carried a little
5 further. And you would find -- it's not a
6 small building. It's not just the
7 load-bearing exterior walls that are
8 holding up the floors. There is internal
9 structure. There has to be.

10 And whether it is this wall here
11 or whatever, there is something in here
12 that with column stub-ups and additional
13 dunnage, you'd find a place.

14 MR. SHARMA: If I remember
15 correctly, yes, this issue was discussed,
16 but I do not remember this issue having
17 been explored to a satisfactory conclusion.
18 I think it was discussed.

19 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: It was
20 certainly discussed, but I don't know what
21 the followup was.

22 Wouldn't it make sense,
23 Mr. Sharma, to let the Village's structural
24 engineer know of the suggestion and we'll
25 let the Planning Board know and we'll go

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 through the process and see what can be
3 done?

4 But all we're really talking
5 about is getting some hard data on what's
6 feasible and what's not.

7 MR. SHARMA: The antennas
8 themselves would not weigh much.

9 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Right, but
10 Mr. Laub is talking about ballasts and
11 other issues; so there's going to be weight
12 there; there's going to be height there;
13 and those parameters need to be modified,
14 and say okay, if we did this, this is what
15 would be required; these are the tradeoffs;
16 what are they?

17 And then maybe, you know -- with
18 this information, maybe the Board decides,
19 you know what; it's not worth it. Maybe
20 they decide it is worth it. You know --

21 MR. SHARMA: It would almost be
22 like creating another tower on top of the
23 roof.

24 MS. STECICH: Like a utility
25 tower.

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 MR. SHARMA: So, it could be
3 something like a tower created in the
4 middle of the roof.

5 MR. DOVELL, JR.: And the site
6 line effect could be much reduced from what
7 it is right now.

8 MR. SHARMA: That's something I
9 would certainly like to work with you to
10 explore and, you know, get our engineers
11 involved and see if that's an option and
12 let's all take a look at it.

13 MR. FORBES-WATKINS: It would
14 seem this is really the perfect time to do
15 it; before Metro PCS has actually installed
16 and while AT&T is considering new
17 installations. So both companies have a
18 real chance to work right now.

19 When we were just looking at
20 Metro PCS, well, hey, AT&T is already there
21 and they're stuck, but now is a perfect
22 time to try and put it all together.

23 MR. PYCIOR: Can antennas not be
24 mounted horizontally directly on top of the
25 parapet, and then one could create a false

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 front, elevate the whole building by ten
3 centimeters --

4 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Inches.

5 MR. PYCIOR: -- and give it some
6 sort of facing that's similar to the --

7 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: You mean a
8 facade.

9 MR. PYCIOR: -- a facade.

10 -- And then future antennas
11 would be placed in the facade panel. Can
12 they not be mounted horizontally?

13 MR. LAUB: Horizontally, no.

14 MS. STECICH: You know what; I
15 think this is an issue -- because this is
16 an historic building; right?

17 MR. SHARMA: -- I don't --

18 MS. STECICH: I think it's
19 designated. Am I right, it's designated?

20 MR. LAUB: Well, I think it's
21 got -- it's either designated or it's got
22 the potential to be designated.

23 MS. STECICH: So, there would --
24 there's difficulty changing the building
25 itself, the look of the building itself.

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 I sort of recall that issue
3 coming up.

4 (MULTIPLE SPEAKERS)

5 MS. STECICH: Ironic as it is, it
6 is the truth. There's laws about being
7 able to do that. But I think you're not
8 supposed to take the facade features and
9 change them.

10 MR. DOVELL, JR.: It's on the
11 national register; is that it?

12 MS. STECICH: Why do I think it
13 has some historic designation? I could be
14 wrong.

15 MR. LAUB: I think it's been
16 designated as potentially historic and when
17 AT&T made application in 2001, 2002, SHPO,
18 State SHPO, you know, came down and said,
19 you know, we don't want to see any kind
20 of -- because I think originally what was
21 proposed was screening on the rooftop or
22 around it or at least some sort of
23 screening that was available along the top
24 of the facade or the parapet so that you
25 actually had a false front that, you know,

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 worked, you know, complimented the
3 building, the antennas were kind of behind
4 it and that was actually shut down by SHPO.
5 And that then led to a whole big
6 conversation because I think the eagle was
7 found, and they wanted the eagle to go back
8 up on the roof, and the understanding back
9 then I think was they didn't want the eagle
10 back on the roof; they were concerned that
11 the roof couldn't handle the eagle.

12 This is going back in the file.
13 You know, I've got the papers.

14 But it's -- it is -- in general,
15 it is a problem with potentially historical
16 buildings and SHPO's understanding is that
17 they don't want to see things that change
18 the outline and the lines of the building
19 and change it so that it looks like a
20 structure such that you create a new
21 penthouse effect.

22 I think, more to the point
23 directly, I mean, even if you just put the
24 antennas sideways, I don't think that would
25 be changing the building structurally; that

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 would be you're just changing the
3 northeasterly antenna, but -- I'll double
4 check, but I've never seen that.

5 And I think it's been asked in a
6 number of our applications where it's
7 basically a function of the technology the
8 way the loops have to come out of it. But
9 I'll ask.

10 MR. SHARMA: Can I make one
11 comment?

12 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Yes.

13 MR. SHARMA: View preservation,
14 according to code, is any blockage of the
15 view of the Palisades.

16 So here there are two issues, not
17 so much whether it blocks the view of the
18 Palisades; we're talking the view of the
19 antennas themselves.

20 MS. STECICH: Deven, it
21 definitely affects the view of the Hudson.
22 If you're sitting there and you're looking
23 at the Hudson and the Palisades over it,
24 this is definitely an issue.

25 MR. SHARMA: Yes. I wonder if

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 that's not what we have to concentrate on.

3 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: I mean, I think
4 that the takeaway is our two primary
5 recommendations are let's see the view
6 particularly from the park with the raised
7 elevation that Mr. Leaf requested and
8 Mr. Dovell requested. I'd like to see a
9 serious look at clustering the antennas
10 toward the center.

11 MS. STECICH: I have a separate
12 issue.

13 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Go ahead.

14 MS. STECICH: Now the original
15 lease permitted six antennas, is that
16 right, but you only put up three. Did the
17 original lease allow two equipment
18 cabinets?

19 MR. LAUB: I think it was four
20 slots. I think the lease had four slots.

21 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: I thought there
22 were four slots in the presentation I read,
23 but I don't know.

24 MS. STECICH: You know what I
25 don't have? I did get a copy of the lease,

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 but the lease -- the lease area is included
3 in Exhibit 1, and then Exhibit 1 refers to
4 Drawings LE1 to LE4, and these would have
5 been back in 2002.

6 If you could get me a copy of LE1
7 through LE4, because I was -- as I said,
8 that's not really an issue for you, but
9 while I was here, just so that we can make
10 sure that this is covered by the lease.

11 I don't know why I thought there
12 were two equipment cabinets allowed. Maybe
13 it did allow for three. Maybe it was
14 pretty open-ended.

15 But if you could get me LE1
16 through LE4, those drawings, that would be
17 great.

18 MR. LAUB: Yes. I'll see what I
19 can do.

20 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Anything
21 further from the Board? Comments or
22 questions of Mr. Laub?

23 (NO RESPONSE)

24 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Mr. Laub, do
25 you wish to add anything at this time?

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 MR. LAUB: No.

3 I'd just like to thank the Board
4 for its indulgence in that I was your only
5 customer for the evening, but I think this
6 was a useful discussion. I'm glad we had
7 it now, earlier in the process, rather than
8 later. And now, you know, we have our
9 homework assignment, and we'll come back to
10 you.

11 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Thank you very
12 much.

13 MR. LAUB: Thank you for your
14 time tonight.

15 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Now I guess we
16 should take up the agency --

17 MS. STECICH: Yeah, since this
18 application is going to require SEQRA
19 Review, and it's more than one involved
20 agency; there's at least two, the Zoning
21 Board, the Planning Board, possibly the
22 Board of Trustees; I don't know; it depends
23 on whether or not there's any adjustments
24 needed to the lease; I don't think there
25 will be.

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 The Planning Board, at its last
3 meeting, declared its intent to be the lead
4 agency. And so what they have to do is
5 circulate it to all the involved agencies,
6 which includes the Zoning Board, and either
7 they wait 30 days, or you could let them
8 know within the 30 days you're not really
9 interested in being lead agency and then
10 the Planning Board can be lead agency.

11 So, unless you wish to assume
12 lead agency on this, probably the best
13 thing to do would be to pass a motion, and
14 that will mean the Planning Board will be
15 lead agency.

16 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Yeah, given the
17 complexity of the structural issues, I
18 think it makes a lot of sense for the
19 Planning Board to be lead agency.

20 So do I have a motion --

21 MR. FORBES-WATKINS: So moved.

22 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Second?

23 MR. PYCIOR: I'll second.

24 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: All in favor?

25 (ALL IN FAVOR.)

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: The vote's
3 unanimous that the Planning Board will be
4 lead agency.

5 So, I guess we have just the
6 minutes from -- now our last meeting -- we
7 did not have a meeting in March. So our
8 last meeting was February 26, 2009, a very
9 short transcript.

10 I have just one typo to correct
11 for the record, Page 9, Line 13, the word
12 know, k-n-o-w, should be no, n-o.

13 MR. LEAF: One other typo I
14 happened to notice, it's on Page 11,
15 Line 3. It says "Mr. Leaf: Aye." It
16 wasn't Mr. Leaf. I wasn't here.

17 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: So noted.

18 Okay, with those corrections, can
19 I have a motion to approve the meeting
20 minutes from the February 26, 2009 meeting
21 of the Zoning Board of Appeals?

22 MR. PYCIOR: I'll move to
23 approve.

24 MR. FORBES-WATKINS: Second.

25 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: All in favor?

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 (ALL IN FAVOR.)

3 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: And our next
4 meeting -- I understand Mr. Pycior won't be
5 able to join us at the next meeting; so
6 I'll make sure Mr. Collins, hopefully, is
7 available. But our next meeting should be
8 May 21st, I believe.

9 MS. STECICH: No, it couldn't be
10 the 21st. It would have to be --

11 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: May 28th.

12 For the record, I have a letter
13 that was given to me the other day dated
14 March 30, 2009 from some concerned
15 neighbors in the Warburton Avenue area in
16 the vicinity of 433 Warburton. That was
17 our first case tonight.

18 Since that application is
19 withdrawn, I don't think anything needs to
20 be discussed on that.

21 There is a question raised about
22 parking in front of I guess 422 Warburton,
23 but again, that's been approved and I leave
24 it to our local officials to ensure
25 compliance with the parking regulations.

1 ZONING BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 23, 2009

2 So I don't think this is an
3 issue --

4 MR. LEAF: I'm also not that
5 comfortable responding to unsigned letter
6 issues.

7 CHAIRMAN MURPHY: Yeah, it's not
8 signed by any particular person. So we
9 thank you for bringing it to our attention,
10 but I don't think there's any need to
11 include it.

12 And with that noted, we'll
13 adjourn the meeting. Thank you.

14

15

16 (Whereupon, at 9:02 P.M. this
17 meeting was adjourned.)

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

