

Town of Stony Point

Department of Planning

74 EAST MAIN STREET
STONY POINT, NEW YORK 10980

Tel: (845) 786-2716 x 113

planning@townofstonypoint.org

Fax: (845) 786-5138

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

May 28, 2014

RHO BUILDING at 7:00 P.M.

Present:

Eric Jaslow, Member

Peter Muller, Member

Michael Puccio, Member

Gene Kraese, Member

Gerry Rogers, Member

Michael Ferguson, Member

Thomas Gubitosa, Chairman

Michael K Stanton, Esq.

Special Counsel

Max Stach

Town Planner

PLANNING BOARD AGENDA

May 28, 2015

RHO BUILDING at 7:00 P.M

APPLICATIONS:

3. Verizon Wireless Proposed Public Utility Wireless Telecommunications Facility (NY Mott Farm) at 560 Liberty Drive, Tomkins Cove, New York SBL 10.02-3-10 BU Zone Site Plan/ Conditional Use, located on the East side of North Liberty Drive, Tomkins Cove

- Site Plan
- Special Use Permit recommendation

Other Business:

Town Fire Inspector, Thomas Larkin would like to address the Board.

Minutes of April 23, 2015 Meeting

Chairman: First on the agenda is Verizon Wireless Proposed Public Utility Wireless Telecommunications Facility.

Verizon Wireless Proposed Public Utility Wireless Telecommunications Facility (NY Mott Farm) at 560 Liberty Drive, Tomkins Cove, New York SBL 10.02-3-10 BU Zone Site Plan/ Conditional Use, located on the East side of North Liberty Drive, Tomkins Cove

Mr. Sheridan: Verizon is looking to locate a wireless communication facility at 560 North Liberty Drive we were previously before this Board and were sent to the TAC which we had some discussions with they recommended an alternate location for the tower which we revised the location the tower is now to be located towards the back side of the building on the side in the parking lot and the equipment is now to be located in the back of the property as well down the hill on a flat area and access to that equipment is to be gained. By an existing road coming up from behind the property. The tower and equipment now meets all the setbacks so no variances are required at the TAC meeting they requested that they look into two items moving forward one is to see if the pole could be changed to a tree pole since it is no longer need to be a flag pole because it is not in front of the building any more Verizon is looking into that and it looks like that is a strong possibility and Verizon is looking to make it a tree pole. The other issue was if the cable coming up from the equipment area to the tower which are now currently on a cable bridge which is going up above the ground could be located could either be located below the ground or could be covered or wrapped in a material that would not be reflective of the light. Verizon engineers are looking into that the possibility of covering those cables or burying it behind shrubbery and we could have that answer shortly. At this point what I would like to get out of this meeting if I may is to confirm the locations of the balloon test on June 18th with a rain wind date for the 19th I would like to confirm the location of the photos and make sure you are satisfied with were the pictures will be taken from and also since hopefully we will be back with the proposed tree pole for the next meeting assuming that works out and the cables covered and we will have visuals of both those items for the next meeting at this point I would also like to request that A. refer us to the ARB which I think is necessary for this Board and B. if the Public Hearing could be scheduled so we can move on this project.

Mr. Muller: I have two questions (inaudible) the tower is now back and down - correct.

Mr. Sheridan: The tower is not down the hillside the tower is in the back of the parking lot it is still in the parking lot the hill starts in back of the parking lot. So the tower itself is going to be in the back corner. If you are familiar with the site when you pull into the parking lot the tower is going to be in the back left corner.

Mr. Jaslow: I have a question for you at the TAC Meeting you were talking about correct me I am wrong you were asking for two different options one the flag pole one with no flag on it painted brown or some other color or the tree pole option not just to do the tree pole.

Mr. Sheridan: We can take a picture and we can have Verizon give simulations of both I think if going forward with discussions with Verizon I think the tree pole is

something that they are more interested in the hopes that would allow them to have more capacities.

Mr. Jaslow: We were talking about a flag pole without a flag because it is less obtrusive than the tree pole possibility.

Mr. Sheridan: I think both were mentioned and that is why we are exploring the issue of the tree pole the other pole is just a flag pole it is just a flag pole without the flag. So we will have a simulation of that also.

Mr. Kraese: Let me ask you a question overiously you are going to have intentions of putting more carriers on that pole.

Mr. Sheridan: That is required by your code is to have at least two co locators on the tower.

Mr. Kraese: So basically you are leaning towards a tree of some sort.

Mr. Sheridan: It provides more capabilities.

Mr. Kraese: I understand that.

Mr. Jaslow: We were leaning towards less obtrusive for residents than what was more beneficial for Verizon.

Mr. Sheridan: Hopefully this will qualify as both.

Mr. Muller: Do you know which direction the antennas are facing are they mostly facing towards Westchester?

Mr. Sheridan: I would have to confirm that but I think they are mostly facing South and West.

Chairman: Just so everyone knows for tonight because I see the public here tonight is not the Public Hearing.

Mr. Sheridan: There will be two antennas facing North two antennas facing South which are stacked and two facing west so it is a three antenna design stacked for a total of six antennas.

Mr. Muller: None are facing Westchester it is to our East.

Mr. Sheridan: Right Westchester is to our East.

Mr. Muller: So there are no antennas at this time.

Mr. Sheridan: No not in the current design.

Mr. Kraese: Getting back to what you are saying now with these two antennas in my opinion we would be better off with a tree compare to a pole because it would look less intrusive.

Mr. Sheridan: That is a possibility and that is why we are going to present the simulation of the tree poles.

Mr. Stach: I think what he said is very important they are going to provide simulations of both and the Board will determine which one is less impactful.

Chairman: Basically once we have the balloon test we will have the two designs of what will go there.

Chairman: Right now I need a motion to refer them to the ARB.

MOTION: REFERR APPLICANT TO THE ARB.

Made by Gene Kraese and seconded by Michael Ferguson

Mr. Kraese: The applicant made a request to have Public Hearing next month.

Mr. Sheridan: Looks like it will probably be July for the Public Hearing if you could schedule that now so when come back in July it will be the Public Hearing.

Mr. Kraese: You know what is going to happen you will have enough time now to let us know if you will go above ground or below ground and if it is above ground we would like to see some visuals to take away from the galvanized look something more pleasing to the eye. I know you would like to get it done but these two issues of the pole and the bridge is basically the whole job.

Mr. Stach: I think there is two other things one is there was a question as to the locations of pictures.

Mr. Sheridan: 1. Is right in front of the tower 2. Is down (inaudible) 3. Is at the bottom of Scandell Court 4. West Shore Drive and Liberty 5. And 6. Are on West Shore Drive 7. Is at the corner of Rt. 9 8. Is up near Kelly Court 9. And 10 are at Katavolus Drive 11. Is the corner of Scandell and Herbert Ct. and across the river additional are going to be taken.

Mr. Muller: Can I request one more photo at the corner of Scandell and Herbert.

Mr. Stach: Do you have a trail map in that area?

Mr. Sheridan: I do not have a trail map are there any additional ones you would like.

Mr. Stach: I can look at the trail maps and just make sure because DEC even though we know that a major concern of the Board is how it is going to look in the Town and DEC does require assessing for recreational recourses so I think if there are any trails in the park and the Battlefield which is the closest Historical resource it will be visible but you are probably talking about 2 to 3 miles at that point.

Chairman: I know it is not a Public Hearing is there anyone in the audience is there any other viewpoints you may think you may need a picture from.

Mr. Muller: I got your house.

I live on the corner of Scandell and Herbert you are doing the balloon test but it is the wrong time of the year you should have done it two months ago before the leaves came out. With no leaves on the trees I can see Mancuso Construction with leaves on the trees I can't I am sure a lot in the area are pretty much the same. My other question is why erect a whole new tower and not use the existing power lines.

Mr. Stach: Just to clarify this is not a Public Hearing all those questions are for the Public Hearing I think what the Chairman is just asking you if there are any additional views.

Chairman: We will bring that up at the TAC Meeting.
I need a motion to schedule the balloon test June 18th with a rain date of June 19th from 8:00 AM to 6:00 PM a six foot red or orange balloon.

MOTION: SCHEDULE THE BALLOON TEST FOR JUNE 18TH AND 19TH 2015 FROM 8:00AM TO 6:00 PM A SIX FOOT RED OR ORANGE BALLOON
Made by Eric Jaslow and seconded by Peter Muller

Mr. Puccio: I just want to make sure that you have everything and all the answers we requested at the next TAC Meeting.

Mr. Sheridan: At this point at the last TAC Meeting they requested that we do a tree pole and we are looking into doing the tree pole right now.

Mr. Jaslow: We requested that you give us the option so we can see what looks better we never requested we ask if you could give us a flag pole brown without a flag and what a tree looks like.

Mr. Sheridan: We are doing that and we will have simulations after the balloon tests.

Mr. Kraese: So we probably won't see you in June.

Chairman: I need a motion to set a Public Hearing for the July meeting.

MOTION: SET PUBLIC HEARING FOR THE JULY 23, 2015 MEETING.
Made by Gene Kraese and seconded by Michael Ferguson
All in favor

Chairman: We will see you them. Next on the agenda is Mr. Larkin.

Thomas Larkin, Stony Point Fire Inspector

Mr. Larkin: Tonight I want to talk to you about the Planning process in February I went to the Zoning Board of Appeals on a single home construction on 2735 Blanchard Road. It was a single home on an existing site and it happens to be now there will be four homes and this home will be 1,500 feet off the road. As in the past the emergency vehicle access is put on the table as the last thing. We need to reverse this process and have the emergence vehicle access done at the beginning of the process for the applicant. What took place this particular day was

the conditions were very bad and it became very dangerous trying to access a property one of our vehicles did not fit on the driveway. After speaking to John O'Rourke he advised me of a radius of turn test which is a computer generated program that would overlay on these plans to see if the vehicles would fit. We have run into this problem several times before in 2005 we had the Heatly/Sullivan issue on Buckberg where that crossed easement and they decided that they were going to build a driveway on a weekend without telling anybody then it came down and the fire trucks could not fit in the driveway and in the 2010 Fire Code this came out. (handout)

FIRE Code of New York State – Driveway/Private Roads

SECTION 511 EMERGENCY VEHICLE ACCESS FOR DETACHED ONE- AND TWO-FAMILY DWELLINGS

511.1 Emergency vehicle access for one or two Group R-3 buildings and detached one- and two-family dwellings constructed by the *Residential Code of New York State* hereafter constructed or moved into the jurisdiction shall be provided in accordance with this section.

Exceptions:

1. Construction of dwellings on premises which have had local site plan approval prior to the adoption of this code.
2. Accessory storage buildings.
3. Dwellings without electrical service and permitted to not have electrical service by the *Residential Code of New York State*.

511.2 Driveways. Driveways shall be provided when an exit door required by *Residential Code of New York State* Section R311.4 is located more than 300 feet (91 440 mm) from a fire apparatus access road or public street.

Exception: The measurement is permitted to be increased beyond 300 feet (91 440 mm) if driveways cannot be installed because of location on property, topography, waterways, nonnegotiable grades or other similar conditions and the building is protected by an automatic sprinkler system in accordance with 903.3.1.1, 903.3.1.2, or 903.3.1.3.

511.2.1 Dimensions. Driveways shall provide a minimum unobstructed width of 12 feet (3658 mm) and a minimum unobstructed height of 13 feet, 6 inches (4115 mm).

511.2.2 Turnaround. When driveways are in excess of 500 feet (152 400 mm) in length and does not exit to another fire apparatus access road or public street, a turnaround shall be provided suitable for use by fire apparatus.

511.2.3 Turnouts. Driveways in excess of 500 feet (152 400 mm) in length and less than 20 feet (6096 mm) in width shall be provided with turnouts along the driveway that are a minimum 20 feet in width for a length of 50 feet (15 240 mm) in length. The turnouts shall be placed at intervals not to exceed 500 feet (152 400 mm) along the driveway.

511.2.4 Stability. Driveways, including bridges and other supporting structure of driveways, shall be constructed to support fire apparatus in all weather conditions.

511.2.5 Design. The design of driveways, including turning radius and grade, shall facilitate passage of fire apparatus and be approved.

511.2.6 Driveways, and portions thereof, that serve more than four buildings shall meet the design requirements of fire apparatus access roads in Section 503.

Mr. O'Rourke: Typically it is part of the subdivision or site plan you would just basically run that computer analysis and it basically shows the truck and how it would access.

Mr. Jaslow: As of right now no one goes to the private house and signs off?

Mr. O'Rourke: What happens is this is the very last thing that is done they get all there approvals and the Fire Company is the bad guy saying hey you can't do this. It should be done in front of the Planning Board.

Mr. Larkin: OSHA standards today fire trucks are running around 34 feet per pumper at 15,000 pounds they were 28 feet before.

Mr. Puccio: What you are saying is the fire trucks should be reviewed at the same time rather than 6 months later.

Mr. O'Rourke: The point is if you use the computer model they would not have to take their fire trucks there we just do the computer models.

Mr. Muller: What happens if it fails the computer model?

Mr. O'Rourke: Then we redesign the driveway.

Mr. Rogers: Shouldn't it be on the applicant presenting the plans.

Mr. Larkin: I personally would think so it has to be done.

Mr. O'Rourke: We would have to create the model.

Mr. Puccio: So we would just set the program up and see if it happens. Can we make a rule for the Planning Board to say that the fire truck test has to be done first?

Mr. O'Rourke: Typically it is reviewed under SEQRA at the Planning Board I have never seen the Town Code say you have to do the turn radius.

Mr. Kraese: When we get these applications like we always get and we send them to the Fire Commissioners honestly they never respond we all have to work together.

Mr. Larkin: I think they realize that and there has been a turnover there and I think they will be willing to do that but in the past we were using the vehicles.

Mr. Muller: Tommy if we do this the new applicants coming to us will be required to run that computer generated model on their program will that give you everything that you ask? You will know up front and your concern was they were finding out at the very end and the Fire Department is becoming the bad guys. Now we will require them to run the computed generated program first so I think that gives you just what you were asking for.

Mr. Larkin: But I still think the Fire Department will be on board with other things hydrant placements or easements. Ok gentleman, thank you.

Mr. Honan: You mentioned that the criteria now is that there are larger vehicles and heavy fire vehicles does the Town have those or is that something that the Town will acquire?

Mr. Larkin: The Town already has them.

Mr. Honan: So basically we can model from those vehicles.

Mr. O'Rourke: We based the program on the actual vehicles the Town owns.

Mr. Larkin: Thank you again.

Chairman: I need a motion to accept the minutes.

MOTION: ACCEPT MINUTES OF APRIL 23, 2015
Made by Eric Jaslow and seconded by Michael Puccio

MOTION: CLOSE PLANNING BOARD MEETING
Made by Eric Jaslow and seconded by Michael Puccio

Respectfully submitted,

Clerk to the Planning Board

