----------X

VILLAGE OF
HASTINGS-ON-HUDSON

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING

SEVEN MAPLE AVENUE

HASTINGS-ON-HUDSON, NEW YORK 10706

----------X

HELD MAY 28, 2009

{}]

PRESENT:

Marc Leaf

David-Forbes Watkins

Ray H. Dovell, Jr.

Marianne Stecich, Counsel

Deven Sharma, Building Inspector

CHAIRMAN FORBES-WATKINS: Good evening. This is a regular meeting of the zoning board of appeals for May 28, 2009. The agenda has only one case, the adjourned discussion of Case numbers 4-09, New Cingular Wireless PC AT&T, for the installation of additional panel antennas and associated equipment on the roof of this building.

Just for clarification: Chairman Murphy and Deputy Chairman Pycior, weren't able to attend this evening, so I am the senior remaining member of the board. I am acting as Chairman tonight. One thing that we should say, since there are only three members of the board present, any vote of the zoning board, in order to approve a zoning change or, what have you, requires a majority of the entire board. Therefore, any votes tonight would have to be unanimous amongst the board members for an item to pass.

Marianne, did you want to talk about what the planning board said --

MS. STECICH: The one other thing that we may want to explain is that the Alternate, Matthew Collins, couldn't sit on

this application because of a conflict of interest. This matter was before the planning board last Thursday. And the planning board did vote to recommend the preservation of approval. And also granted the special permit and for personal wireless service facility and sight plan approval, subject to a number of conditions. The first condition would be, subject to DBA view preservation approval. Subject to ARB approval, under our code, it's required that the cables have to be custom cut and tidied up to the satisfaction of the building inspector. That barriers and notice signs that are required for the installation have to be paid for by AT&T. There is just a little confusion, I wanted to elaborate some more and clarify that. And that the existing AT&T antennas must be replaced by 10.8-inch-wide antennas. Right now, they're 16 inches. And then the last one, and this one I need to elaborate some on, is subject to the equipment being permitted under the lease agreement with the village. As you know, the last meeting, I raised that issue because the lease says we are leasing the space shown on Exhibit A. And that Exhibit A refers to certain drawings, and I didn't have the

drawings. And I did not have them before the planning board meeting. So this issue has not come before the planning board. I did get the drawings yesterday. And while they do -- the drawings do show six antennas and four cabinets, that was my concern. The lease was only for two cabinets, it didn't cover. It was for six antennas and it was for four cabinets, so that's okay. But the drawing has the location of the antennas and the equipment in a totally different location from where they are. So I spoke with Deven about it, and Deven pulled out the plans that were approved by the planning board back in 2002, and also this board. In 2002, they appeared for two meetings: One in August of 2002 with just the planning board, and then another meeting in September of 2002, which is a joint meeting with the zoning board and the planning board. It appeared then that the drawings that were approved in 2002 are consistent with what's up there. Or the reverse, what's up there is consistent with the 2002 drawings. So then I checked the minutes just to see if there was some explanation for why it changed. And I think there must have been some negotiations, you know, I don't want to say behind the

scenes, but Meg Walker (phonetic), who was working with them -- and so my thinking was that I could go to the -- ask the applicant to draw up, essentially, a survey of the roof showing where their equipment is, and ask the board of trustees to amend the lease to reflect what is actually up there. Because I'm not comfortable having a lease that doesn't reflect what is really there. But in the course of reviewing the minutes, I also saw that the antenna were supposed to be six-and-a-half-inches wide. And I asked Deven to check the drawings to see -- 'cause that also could have been something that, you know, was changed. But he checked the drawings and the approved drawings, and you can confirm, Deven, it also showed six-and-a-half-inch-wide antennas. So that the antennas would look more like the police antennas that are up there. Somehow they became 16-inch antennas. I would like -- and I think the board might like an explanation. I did call up Keddie Speranza (phonetic). She wasn't in this afternoon, so I'm assuming she'll get back to me. So that's an open question.

CHAIRMAN FORBES-WATKINS: I think, possibly, the first item of business then

would be: Mr. Laub, do you wish to speak to or can you speak, to the question of six-inch versus 16-inch antenna?

MR. LAUB: Good evening, members of the board. For the record: My name is Daniel Laub, and I'm with Cuddy & Feder, here on behalf of AT&T.

No, I wasn't aware that the antennas that were up there were different than what the approved drawings -- these are, you know, as we come forward with this, the existing antennas up there are approximately 16-inches. We were able to bring that down to 10.8 inches, you know, the existing antennas. And that's what was also proposed as part of the three new antennas. I would not know at what point there may have been extra need for larger antennas, or perhaps it was because at the time, two antennas per sector were provided -- were approved. And instead they went up with one antenna per sector, making a total of three instead of six.

CHAIRMAN FORBES-WATKINS: If you took two six-inch antennas and put them together, that would still only be 12 inches instead of 16.

MS. STECICH: It would also be a

substitute for all six antennas.

MR. SHARMA: Right. And perhaps you would not need the additional three antennas, if that would be the case.

MS. STECICH: Let me just say one other thing, Mr. Sharma was not the building inspector at the time.

MR. SHARMA: As Marianne explained, the initial reaction was, when we looked at that exhibit attached to the lease and, you know, while I know what's up on the roof, the exhibits attached to the lease are entirely a different layout in the proposed location of antennas. Except when I did look at the plans that were approved by the planning board in 2002, they are consistent with what is up there, is also shown, except with the exception of antennas. The antennas showing here are tubular, that's about six inches by two-and-a-half-inches or six feet or so tall. Whereas the antennas that are there currently, Marianne has pictures or those, they are 16-inches wide by whatever high. And you couldn't find an explanation for it. And, obviously, there wasn't enough time to alert you of this. This only happened this afternoon when we looked into it. So, at

least, at some point -- I mean, if it's possible to make -- by the way, the antennas that are installed by Metro PCS, installed but not connected, not officially, they are only about eight-inches wide, 7.8-inches wide. So just for the board, and if you were planning to make AT&T antennas, the old ones or the new ones, all the same size as the Metro PCS antennas, they would have to be eight-inches wide, not ten-inches.

MR. LAUB: Well, I mean, as far as Metro PCS, they are a different carrier. They work on a different frequency, a different technology that have different needs. So ultimately, their antennas are sometimes different, but they carry the same capacity and traffic as the AT&T antennas would. We did investigate whether we could reduce the size of the existing antennas, and it was written down to the 10.8-inch size. I don't know where the other antennas came from at that time. But I know that this time, they have taken a look at the site, and 10.8 inches was the only frequency we were able to provide. We proposed the additional antennas would be 10.8-inches and we also proposed -- that we replace the existing antennas down to

10.8. So that's where we are at.

CHAIRMAN FORBES-WATKINS: What has been approved then, presumably, by the zoning board of appeals in 2002, was some six -- six-and-a-half-inch view problems. And, now, instead of having approved six-and-a-half-inch -- well, we approved six-and-a-half-inch, but we have 16-inch. So haven't we got ourselves a situation where we are completely out of the zoning board's approval for the 2002 situation? I'm asking.

MS. STECICH: Deven, do you have a complete file on this? I mean, if there were subsequent approved drawings, I don't remember, but that doesn't mean anything either. There wasn't any modification on those?

MR. SHARMA: You see, for all of the planning that happened, happened this afternoon. I have a file, and I brought that file with me. There is nothing in this file that shows antenna to be changed from what is shown here to different. If it was done, I don't have any record of it. But this is the set of plans that has the notation by the planning board, saying that these are the plans approved.

CHAIRMAN FORBES-WATKINS: And they are six-and-a-half-inch antennas.

MR. SHARMA: This is the antenna, tubular longish antenna.

MR. LAUB: Well, I think where we are left at is actually, exactly where we are, which is AT&T proposing two antennas per sector. Each antenna being 10.8-inches wide.

CHAIRMAN FORBES-WATKINS: I think there is a bigger problem here. And that is the credibility of AT&T's claiming proposals. If AT&T proposed to do six-and-a-half-inch antennas and put in 16-inch antennas, then their credibility is highly suspect. And then why would we bother to approve another proposal where, apparently, we have no knowledge of what AT&T was really going to do, even though they proposed this. I'm hot under the collar at the moment about this. It bothers me greatly to be that far away, and we are only talking here. The only thing that comes before the zoning board is view preservation. And so what do you see? You see a six-inch, six-and-a-half-inch, or a 16-inch. That's a big difference in view. The things up there are pretty ugly. They were approved because we need cell phones. I

understand that. But somebody failed greatly here. And I don't think it was a failure of the planning board or the zoning board or the then building inspector. It sounds to me as if it was a flat out failure of AT&T to perform what they committed to. I don't know what you want to say more about that.

MR. LAUB: I think that we are looking at how to -- the question comes to how we rectify the situation. So the situation would be AT&T looking back at it and saying: What are you going to do about the situation; what antennas do you actually need there? We actually need 10.8. We went back, and we are proposing to make all of these antennas 10.8. How this came about, whether it was because they installed it and they figured out they needed something else, -- you know, a change, a field change, as part of the building permit. That really should have come back to zoning. I do not know. I think as far as credibility goes, I mean, I don't think that's -- I think, in this instance, we've already gone back and asked, AT&T what they can provide in this situation. And they are looking at 10.8-inch antennas and making them both, the existing as well as proposed, to be

10.8. I'm not sure, as part of this process, what we would do other than fulfilling what we would have to do otherwise. Which is go through the building permit process, and make sure that all of our antennas as installed, before we get a certificate of completion or a certificate of occupancy, that it all matches the approved drawings and plans as needed.

CHAIRMAN FORBES-WATKINS: Let me clarify: This all came to light this afternoon?

MS. STECICH: I just got the drawings yesterday. I'm sorry, you know, obviously, I would have brought them sooner.

CHAIRMAN FORBES-WATKINS: That's all right.

MS. STECICH: Yeah, it came yesterday and then, late last night, I sent it to Deven, and then we talked about it.

CHAIRMAN FORBES-WATKINS: I don't think -- I'll be very honest, I don't feel prepared to proceed here when there are some questions that need to be answered --

MS. STECICH: There could be an explanation for it.

CHAIRMAN FORBES-WATKINS: I'd like to hear the explanation.

MS. STECICH: I know. It's possible -- I agree with you. It seems to me that if there were a field change --

CHAIRMAN FORBES-WATKINS: At least, it should have gone through the building inspector.

MS. STECICH: We don't know. Mr. Sharma wasn't the building inspector at the time. We don't know what happened. It was a different building inspector. So that's why I'm suggesting that -- and obviously there is nothing in the village files. Deven also didn't see anything, but maybe somebody at AT&T would have records of what happened. And so maybe they have some explanation. If they do, I would say, though, that probably -- and if it didn't come back to the zoning and the planning board at the time, that it probably needs to. Then the application needs to be recapped to ask for six -- 10 -- 10.6 or whatever, 10.8-inch antennas.

MR. LAUB: Right. And that's what our proposal is now.

CHAIRMAN FORBES-WATKINS: No. Your proposal is to recast from 16-inch panels. That's the proposal that's before us.

MS. STECICH: I thought this

proposal was for three 10-inch antennas?

MR. LAUB: And we've also made the offer to replace the existing antennas with the 10-inch antennas.

CHAIRMAN FORBES-WATKINS: That I accept as the proposal, but the proposal is exchanging from something that wasn't approved to begin with.

MR. LAUB: So procedurally, if we go on the assumption that those antennas are not the ones that are supposed to be there, the idea whether or not they would have removed or reduced, the idea would be AT&T would look at this, and they'd know that they can reduce it down to 10.8. I've never seen -- I do a lot of AT&T applications. I have not seen them do six-inch-something antennas. I know 10.8 is as narrow as they get on applications such as this. So, you know, that is where -- you know, where we are at, is where we are at.

MS. STECICH: You see the other issue is if you look at the exhibits you gave, the lease drawing, really just has antennas that are as wide as the police antennas. They are not panels. They are, you know, just the poles.

MR. LAUB: But those lease exhibits

though, I think, were certainly, at the time, what everybody was trying to contemplate. There's a lot of things about those lease exhibits that have changed. For example, the ECO was supposed to be replaced. It was going to be an extension of the fire escape to the roof. I think there were problems with putting the equipment on, 'cause part of the idea contemplated, who was going to put the equipment over here. I know, from looking at the record that we have in our files, it was contemplated there was going to be some screening around, actually.

MS. STECICH: And there was discussion of all of that stuff in the mix, but nothing about the size of the antennas. There was one meeting, it was stated what it was. The following meeting somebody asked, wait, what size are all of these antennas. And, I guess, Mr. Jaufry (phonetic), who's from you firm, said the antennas are about five-feet-one-inch in height and 16-and-a-half inches in width. And I saw no discussion about it. That's why you might want to check and see what happened. We don't have anything in our files.

CHAIRMAN FORBES-WATKINS: I think we

will have to wait to hear further on this particular issue. We are not going to get a resolution on this one tonight. So can we pretend that this is over there and move onto dealing with other questions that were presented at our last meeting. For instance, did AT&T find any smaller cabinets?

MR. LAUB: No. We were not able to find any smaller cabinets. There are something called micro-cabinets, which are about half the size of what's there. But their capacity in what they can run through that in service, is far reduced from what this cabinet would do. So you would need upwards or eight or nine of those to replace the one that we are proposing. So that obviously wasn't a feasible option.

CHAIRMAN FORBES-WATKINS: Were you able to do the photo simulations from the street south view similar to P6 and F6 drawings?

MR. LAUB: We were not. If I may approach, just to --

CHAIRMAN FORBES-WATKINS: Yes.

MR. LAUB: Just for the record: What I handed out is a photo of the village hall from -- standing in front of the library.

So which is pretty much from the public portion of the area, from the village hall. This is probably the only section where you could see AT&T's equipment on top of the roof, other than if you walk in the back of the parking lot, which you can see it from there as well. But as we discussed last week, this is right in front of the library, before you go down the steps, down further. What you see in that space, right now, we don't even have a view of the cabinet that we would change. We are looking at existing cabinets that are not changing. We are not proposing change. And to the left, just behind some branches and things, is actually where the one cabinet begins.

CHAIRMAN FORBES-WATKINS: It's fairly obvious that there might be something viewed from this location in the winter. But the rest of the year, it looks quite obscured.

MR. LAUB: You might be able to see something. The cabinet that is replacing in the one there is approximately eight or nine inches taller than the one that's there right now. There's another one further back from that as well. But basically, it would be a small change. We did send people out to take

a look and see if we could do some photo simulations.

CHAIRMAN FORBES-WATKINS: Shall we talk about the discussion of the central tower, or do you have other things that you want heard first?

MR. LAUB: I think trying to rearrange where you can put antennas on the roof is an important question. I know it's come up with the -- application as well as this one. I went back and had another discussion with the engineers, and there was, again, no comfort level with putting the antennas anywhere interior of the roof, where you could attach them for the purposes of structural feasibility. In concert with what they need to do for our propagation, you would need to move back. From the edge of the roof, you need to go higher, and we've discussed that. So that -- in moving back higher, you are talking about where the wind blows. And you are also talking about how much clearance you could get from the corner of the roof. So maybe -- and then after a discussion with some engineers, maybe somewhere around 12 or 15 feet. It may be as high as 20, but I don't know the need for radio frequency propagation

in order to clear the edges of the roof. It's not something that's really practical from even a structural wind blowing prospective. It's also problematic from the fact that there are already a number of antennas, municipal, county, fire antennas, Metro PCS antennas, that you also have to make sure that you're clear. Because if you are hitting those, you are going to have some problems if you are just banging in the back of somebody else's antenna. That's an issue from a radio frequency perspective. And I think the Village's wireless consultant, who was before the planning board last week, agreed with that. That, typically, in a situation like this, where you have all of the antennas -- need to be there -- circling the antennas behind one another or up higher.

We are also subject to the wireless code, which requires that antennas not be more than six feet above the top of the roof, which the antennas, as proposed, are. So moving them back further would not be --

CHAIRMAN FORBES-WATKINS: This is a code, the wireless code from who?

MR. LAUB: Under the village's wireless code.

CHAIRMAN FORBES-WATKINS: Our zoning code?

MR. LAUB: Yeah, so it regulates personal wireless services facilities. You know, it has some certain dimensional requirements. It does encourage co-location, location on existing structures, Obviously, the need for towers, things like that. Colocations, such -- you know, having multiple carriers in all of the buildings, and then try to keep them low and not too far above the building. So it does require six feet, but the six foot limit going above the top of the roof. So between our propagation issues, there is also the RF emissions issue in terms of safety, and the areas which are being cordoned off. So moving them back would be more difficult for purposes of trying to make sure that the roof is safe and can be easily accessed and have a certain amount of -- so for all of those reasons, we haven't found a solution where we can -- for a tower on the roof. For purposes of view preservation, I think I tower would be -- the intent of view preservation.

CHAIRMAN FORBES-WATKINS: What was the height that you mentioned that --

MR. LAUB: You're talking, at least, the bottom of the antenna going, at least, seven feet above the roof. The top of the antenna being much higher than that.

CHAIRMAN FORBES-WATKINS: How far back off the roof, to the center, for example?

MR. LAUB: The guess was probably 12 feet, but it may be higher. For example, the antennas -- it's obviously in a rectangular building, so the service going this way would have less distance, say, if you were in the center of the roof going south --

CHAIRMAN FORBES-WATKINS: But the sidelines could be considerably diminished. If you mark that up, the sidelines would indicate that that apparent height would come down. If you are going, it would be a total of seven plus six from the center of the roof, I imagine that when you calculate the sidelines, that drops considerably.

MR. LAUB: The seven feet would be the minimum that you need to -- just need for clearance for RF emissions purposes. You usually don't want antennas to be anywhere where people can walk directly in front of them. So it may have to go higher than that. Like I said, for example, for going east, you

may need as high as an antenna that the top of it will as high as 20 feet. Again, all of this requires antennas to go up further in height, which --

MR. DOVELL: But the objectionable part of this is the currents(sic) line. There's one ornamental feature on this building, which is at the sky, which is where you are interested in the view corridor. It's in the most objectionable place. All of this stuff is in the most objectionable place that it could possibly go. It's on the perimeter of the building, which is what you see. So when something is pushed back, by definition, it has less of an impact. In many regards, the damage has been done. It's just piled with stuff right now. And I think what we are responding to is there's a threshold which gets incredibly junky up there. Now, as far as the structure and the wind loads go, have you run calculations on all of this? Do you really know what the loads are? I just can't imagine that six more feet is going to make a huge difference in the form of the --

MR. LAUB: They do not. They do not right now, no.

MR. DOVELL: Did anyone look into

the loading that you were concerned about last time, the column locations and the bearing walls and things like that?

MR. LAUB: Yes. The engineers have looked at this building before. And the only potential close bearing wall is the one in this room. Which, itself, potentially has a number of gaps in it per doorway and things like that. So you don't know where it runs from roof to the bottom of the building to the foundation.

So there is no comfort level of where to put anything like this. Even going up, you know, eight/nine feet above the roof, you know, putting the bottom of the antenna that far up. They are simply are not comfortable with a design like that.

But again, I -- I mean, perhaps I'm missing something in terms of the view preservation. But aren't we talking about the preservation of the view of the Palisades and the Hudson River, the Village is seeing, right. And I think it's gone on quite awhile now. And I think that there is, you know, an interconnection here between the wireless code and -- the wireless services facilities and preservation overlay, which is minimizing the

number of these locations anywhere in the general village. The personal wireless facilities code strongly encourages and forces any kind of telecommunications carrier to co-locate.

Essentially, there's only been two sights in the village, which are -- and the village hall here. Potentially, these are up the code. These are -- I should say, there is a preference -- colocation, and that's -- what you are seeing with -- and the village hall. The idea here is so that when you have a building that already hosts facilities, it will host others, instead of it proliferating along the horizon and suddenly having a horizon filled with -- a facility on this building, three buildings down, and another facility on that building. So it's been trying to minimize it here. I can't -- I can't disagree with the idea that there's a lot of stuff up there. You know, municipal, county, and the wireless facilities carriers. But, I think, ultimately it's a function of trying to compress everything into one spot. As it happens, it ends up on the village hall.

But I think the idea is to have a colocation and minimize, you know, the spread

of these things along our horizon. It's a choice of -- and I think that works well with the view preservation overlay. For purposes of wireless facilities codes, there is a choice, you know, under those wireless, you know, codes generally, absent, you know, preservation views. Some municipalities do not encourage colocation, maximum colocation. You look in the Town of Greenburgh, for example, they, limit the number of facilities on the building to two -- their idea is they want to proliferate them, so that they are not all concentrated on the building -- it's meant to try to compress these things and make sure that it's not spread across the horizon, and it does kind of preserve the view.

CHAIRMAN FORBES-WATKINS: Do you wish to pursue this further?

MR. DOVELL: Well, ultimately we would like to see some further compression perhaps.

MS. STECICH: This one is two south 12, I think that's it. One other thing that the planning board ask me to send a memo to the board of trusties saying that when a renewal comes up that the board of trusties ensure that whatever equipment is up there is

the least intrusive possible. There has been new technology, and it be replaced with new technology if it will make it smaller.

CHAIRMAN FORBES-WATKINS: Mr. Laub, did you have further that you wish to present at this point?

MR. LAUB: No. I think that probably covers everything. I think only just to update you on, you know, one other thing that, kind of, is a result of -- you know, just for the record. The Village's engineering consultant -- reviewed our proposal and then hasn't reviewed the calculations -- to be sufficient. You know Mr. Gilles(phonetic) had sent a letter to that effect. I wasn't sure if the board -- has been mentioned to the board.

CHAIRMAN FORBES-WATKINS: Any questions, comments? I am back to our quandary. Does this that go back to the planning board?

MS. STECICH: I have a telephone call to the chairperson.

CHAIRMAN FORBES-WATKINS: Is this -- and I'm asking my board colleagues, is the question of the 6-inch versus the 16-inch, is this an issue that significantly changes the

view preservation? Does the view-preservation issue, where we would be approving a 10-inch antenna or 10.8-inch, or whatever it is, antenna to replace -- to add three of those and replace three 16-inch antennas. Do we wish to consider that separately from any issues that may come from the full question of the specification of what it was that was approved in 2002.

MR. LEAF: From my perspective, I think it's a single issue for this board. It would be nice to have the application amended so that it referred to the approval of the construction of six 10.8 antennas.

Since the record now shows that only six-inch antennas have been approved, therefore, we would need to approve all six, not simply the three additional antennas. But I believe that, at least, from my perspective, the analysis is the same. Whether they had originally approved 16-inch antennas, or they approved six-inch antennas, I don't necessarily feel the need to go back and determine exactly where things went wrong. It's enough, I think, for us to review it now as if it were an application for six --

CHAIRMAN FORBES-WATKINS: The view

preservation issue?

MR. LEAF: The view preservation, with respect to six antennas, six 10.8-inch antennas. And there are six antennas approved by the lease, but there are six six-inch antennas approved by the lease. So you will have to have --

MS. STECICH: No. Six permitted by the lease and approved -- and the special permit approval was for six, six-and-a-half-inch antennas.

MR. LEAF: So do we need a new permit under the wireless code?

MS. STECICH: I don't know. I have to think about that.

CHAIRMAN FORBES-WATKINS: I appreciate what Marc Leaf suggests as far as the application being really for six 10.8-inch antennas. The question is: Is that amendable here before us today or must that go back to paperwork?

MS. STECICH: You know, I -- let me look at the notice. It's probably covered by the notice. Is this what was in the notice, Deven? For the construction addition of three panel antennas. I think it is because that would be noticed. There's three up there, and

the notice didn't define the size. And if anybody wanted to see it, they would have come to see the plans. I would say that the notice is accurate, to make the determination that Marc said.

MR. LAUB: We did submit in writing and, I believe, a copy should been brought to the zoning board, of our original submission to the planning board. We did submit in writing that we were intending on replacing -- making all of the antennas 10.8-inches. We did submit that in writing, for the record.

MR. LEAF: I will make a motion that we approve the application of New Cingular Wireless PC for view preservation approval for the construction, slash, addition of six panel antennas and associated equipment on the roof of the municipal building. That such panel antennas to be not in excess of 10.8 inches in width. And we have other dimensions on the plans. We can refer, simply, in accordance with these plans. Is there a second?

MR. DOVELL: I think that what's happened is this is something that's happened over time. That it's been an accretion of one antenna and then two, and we are at this critical point were the building is now

cluttered, and it's quite an eyesore. To my mind, it's become an eyesore. It's not necessarily what you are proposing individually here. It's the collection of stuff on the roof. That, at some point, either the termination of the lease or a renewal period that a study be made somehow to begin to, over time, to rethink the position of all of this stuff on the roof. That the study might examine the possibility of centralizing it and screening it in a way that we don't have a building that is festooned with antennas. And it's not just your antennas, it's the cabinets, it's the whip antennas, and all of these other things. That somehow we look at a master plan to begin to strip the building and, in fact, can somehow be worded into whatever resolution we make.

MR. LEAF: Can we consult with our attorney?

CHAIRMAN FORBES-WATKINS: I think that could be a memo to the trustees or something, rather than part of the --

MS. STECICH: That's what I was going to suggest. That I prepare a memo similar to the one that I prepared for the planning board from the zoning board

suggesting, that, upon renewal, whatever renewal comes up next, that a master plan be created for the roof. And in the future, antennas have to comply with that.

CHAIRMAN FORBES-WATKINS: We have before us a motion. All those in favor?

(All In Favor.)

MR. LAUB: Thank you. I would like to thank the board for its patience in this matter. And I will certainly -- I will personally work to make sure that AT&T's installation abides by what's been approved. I thank you for your time and consideration.

CHAIRMAN FORBES-WATKINS: That leads us to the minutes of the April 23rd meeting. Are there any corrections? May I start by correcting a cover: Marc Leaf is a member, not an alternate. Any corrections or additions?

MR. LEAF: I didn't have any.

CHAIRMAN FORBES-WATKINS: Can I have a motion to approve the minutes as amended. All in favor?

(ALL IN FAVOR)

CHAIRMAN FORBES-WATKINS: The next meeting is scheduled for June -- does anyone have a calender?

MS. STECICH: June 25th.

CHAIRMAN FORBES-WATKINS: The next meeting is scheduled for June 25th, if there is business before us. Motion to adjourn.

MR. LEAF: So moved. Thank you.

(Whereupon, at 8:55 P.M. this meeting was adjourned.)

ZONING BOARD MEETING OF MAY 28, 2009

ZONING BOARD MEETING OF MAY 28, 2009