

STATE OF NEW YORK : COUNTY OF ROCKLAND

TOWN OF STONY POINT : PLANNING BOARD

- - - - - X

IN THE MATTER

OF

111 SOUTH LIBERTY DRIVE

- - - - - X

Town of Stony Point
RHO Building
5 Clubhouse Lane
Stony Point, New York
January 26, 2023
7:23 p.m.

BEFORE:

JAMES PURCELL, ACTING CHAIRMAN
KERRI ALESSI, BOARD MEMBER
ROLAND BIEHLE, BOARD MEMBER
MICHAEL FERGUSON, BOARD MEMBER
ERIC JASLOW, BOARD MEMBER
JERRY ROGERS, BOARD MEMBER

ROCKLAND & ORANGE REPORTING
2 Congers Road, Suite 2
New City, New York 10956
(845) 634-4200

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Proceedings

CHAIRMAN PURCELL: Okay. Next is 111 South Liberty. Is somebody here to speak?

MS. MELE: Good evening, everyone. Amy Mele, 4 Laurel Road, New City, New York. I'm here pinch hitting for Mr. Emanuel tonight. He had another engagement. Mr. DeGennaro, who is our engineer, I just spoke to him about five minutes ago, and he was getting off the parkway, so he should be walking in any second. So while I have your attention, maybe I'll just go through a couple of housekeeping matters.

This application has been before you for a while now. And back in, I think it was December, I think I planned a TAC meeting where we presented the plans, and nobody liked them, to put it mildly. Everybody thought it was, the massing was rather large, and they wanted to see some changes to the plans.

At the last TAC meeting, where I happened to be at on another matter, but

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Proceedings

Mr. Emanuel was here, they showed the new renderings where the applicant has made a concerted effort to try and minimize the visual impact as you're coming down 9W. And they step back the top part of the building. And Ken will walk you through, you know, what we did there to try and satisfy you.

So the idea at the last TAC meeting was to come before the full Board, present it to you, see if everybody concurred that this was a better plan and something that they could support. It is an allowable use by special permit. And what it is, is it's a mixed-use complex. And we did lop off a couple of units in the last iteration of this.

So what we're really hoping for tonight is your feedback on the latest plan. And also, I think we can take care of a couple of procedural things. I know that Max did prepare a Part 2 a while ago. We don't have any issues with it. We know we'll have to prepare the Part 3. And I think that some of the changes that we've made will actually go towards perhaps mitigating some of the

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Proceedings

checked yes questions in the Part 2. So I'm thinking tonight you could, if you so desire, adopt the Part 2. Perhaps set a public hearing for next month to start the process.

And also, I believe that you could, I think you could refer us perhaps to most certainly the ARB, because I know that they wouldn't need a SEQR determination. But even the Zoning Board, I think you could refer us so that we could try and get our application materials in. Obviously, they won't be able to hear us or take any action until you make a SEQR determination. But in order to try and condense the timeframe down because the application has been going on for a while, I'm thinking that perhaps that, you know, those things might be accomplished tonight.

But I'm kind of putting the cart before the horse because I was stalling. So I'm going to let Mr. DeGennaro walk you through the changes that we've made to the plans, and you can ask any questions that you have, unless you have anything else of me right now. Okay. Thank you.

1 Proceedings

2 MR. DeGENNARO: I'm going to hand out
3 some updated visual simulations that we did.

4 Hi, my name is Ken DeGennaro from
5 Brooker Engineering, engineer for the
6 applicant. So with the biggest changes that
7 we made for the submission for tonight's
8 meeting are we lowered the building floor
9 elevation by about five feet. And we added
10 a, an off set on the fourth floor roof line.
11 So the facade is now four stories straight
12 up. And that's along the front of the
13 building.

14 So we prepared the updated simulations
15 to demonstrate this in the package that you
16 have. We had time to do two updated sims.
17 And those were really the ones that were most
18 impacted by the revisions for tonight. So if
19 you --

20 BOARD MEMBER ROGERS: The front of the
21 building is on the 9W corridor.

22 MR. DeGENNARO: Yes.

23 CHAIRMAN PURCELL: By any chance, do you
24 have this packet that was given to us at the
25 TAC meeting?

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Proceedings

THE CLERK: I have it.

CHAIRMAN PURCELL: If you add that to that. Be more information. Didn't mean to interrupt you, I apologize. What was given to us at the TAC meeting, I wanted to make sure I had every picture possible.

MR. DeGENNARO: So the revised architectural, you could see on the fourth floor, so here is Route 9W. On the fourth story, the building is set back by about ten feet. In the center, it will still be the fourth floor.

So on the architectural, we set back the fourth story along the front, facing 9W, of the building. And it extends around the corner as well, that setback, as you continue west towards Govan Street, then it remains the full four stories. However, at that location, with the topography, the first story gets buried. So it really appears as three stories from the rear.

As a result of this change, we also reduced the unit count from 88 units to 86 units. The exact determination and breakdown

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Proceedings

of the one and two bedrooms is really, is to be determined. It's, there's some flexibility in there.

And then we revised the grading plan as well. So instead of -- originally, when we did the work, we were trying to minimize the earth work that would be required for the construction. We lowered the building. So the garage floor elevation, the first floor elevation is five feet lower than what was previously submitted.

So on the simulations that we have, we've included the one that's up here is, I believe it is Page 4 of the package that I just handed out. This is the original simulation with the full four stories taken from Route 9W. And this is the revised simulation with the lowered building and the fourth story being recessed along the front. So.

BOARD MEMBER JASLOW: You really think the trees are going to be three times the size of the building?

MR. DeGENNARO: Those are existing trees

1 Proceedings

2 to remain.

3 MR. O'ROURKE: I think he's mentioning
4 the scale of the tree would be, like, versus
5 your four-story building. And the tree is,
6 like, double that height. Are you saying
7 that's an accurate depiction? I think it's a
8 scale issue with that tree.

9 MR. DeGENNARO: With this right here?

10 MR. O'ROURKE: Yeah.

11 BOARD MEMBER FERGUSON: Because the
12 building is 40 feet high. That tree would be
13 90 feet high.

14 MR. STACH: That tree is --

15 MR. DeGENNARO: That's the existing
16 conditions.

17 MR. STACH: Yeah. That tree is only,
18 from where you took the picture, that tree is
19 only, like, ten feet in front of you, versus
20 the building is, like, 50 feet away. That's
21 why there's a difference. In other words,
22 they didn't give you a simulation. They put
23 the building on to the existing photo, and
24 there's a tree right in front of you when you
25 take the photo. Right?

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Proceedings

MR. DeGENNARO: Yes. The second simulation that we updated is taken from the shopping center to the north. So if you continue on, you can see, it's Page 6 has the existing conditions. Page 7 was the original simulation in this direction. So this would be looking south at the building. And Page 8 has the lowered buildings.

So you can kind of tell, if you flip between the last two sheets, if you look at, I guess the cupola on the right, how the building is dropped in elevation. Frankly, I think it's dropped even more than what they have shown.

But we wanted to get some feedback from the Board. We know the visual impact was definitely a concern by the Board. And we want to, before we submit a full set of revised plans, hopefully get some feedback that we're on the right track, that the visual impact has been diminished by these two changes.

BOARD MEMBER FERGUSON: On the southern part of the property, would they be putting

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Proceedings

up a retaining wall close to the property line, similar to Walgreens?

MR. DeGENNARO: The retaining walls have been reduced because we're lower in elevation. But there are still going to be some retaining walls necessary, yes. So the retaining wall on the south would be a retaining wall and cut.

BOARD MEMBER FERGUSON: All the way across.

MR. DeGENNARO: It's closer to 9W. As you travel west on the site, we kind of catch up to grade. And the retaining wall is not going to be as long as it was before, nor as high.

And a similar situation exists along the northern property line, where we also have a retaining wall. That's a retaining wall of fill. And you really, you can't see that in the simulation because the building shields it. But that retaining wall also is lower in elevation and not as long.

We can provide wall profiles as we finish the grading. Really, what we

1 Proceedings

2 submitted was concept plan with some spot
3 grades in the parking lot. It wasn't a full
4 grading plan with contours and, you know,
5 limits of disturbance and all that.

6 BOARD MEMBER ALESSI: Can I ask you a
7 question? Where did you lose the two units?
8 Was it just --

9 MR. DeGENNARO: On the fourth floor.

10 BOARD MEMBER ALESSI: -- by virtue of
11 the reduction of the setback on the top
12 floor?

13 MR. DeGENNARO: Yes. So the units in
14 the front became wider and narrower since we
15 lost the ten feet from the building face.
16 And we lost some units at that location.

17 BOARD MEMBER ALESSI: And now that
18 setback will become terrace area for these
19 units?

20 MR. DeGENNARO: I believe so. Yeah, so
21 along the front on the fourth floor, there's
22 now six units that are 807 square feet to 908
23 square feet. So those can be either really
24 one or two bedroom units, depending what the
25 market preference is.

1 Proceedings

2 BOARD MEMBER BIEHLE: Are they planning
3 on keeping that whole area open and not
4 separating it so you walk out, you walk in
5 front of somebody else's window?

6 MR. DeGENNARO: The area on the fourth
7 floor?

8 BOARD MEMBER BIEHLE: Yeah.

9 MR. DeGENNARO: It would be private
10 balconies.

11 BOARD MEMBER BIEHLE: It doesn't show
12 that. So it shows as one open terrace for
13 all, all of them.

14 MR. DeGENNARO: On the site plan? Okay.

15 BOARD MEMBER BIEHLE: You know what I
16 mean.

17 MR. DeGENNARO: Yeah, I do now.

18 BOARD MEMBER BIEHLE: I mean, I'm
19 assuming you're going to have doors going out
20 to the terrace.

21 MR. DeGENNARO: Yes.

22 BOARD MEMBER BIEHLE: So you can walk 20
23 feet down and be in somebody else's window.

24 MR. DeGENNARO: No. There would be
25 privacy screening in between the units.

1 Proceedings

2 It's, the discussions that we have, the
3 intention was that would be patios for those
4 units.

5 BOARD MEMBER ALESSI: The building and
6 mechanical equipment, that's going to be on
7 the rooftop?

8 MR. DeGENNARO: Yes.

9 BOARD MEMBER ALESSI: Is that visual
10 from 9W? I mean, I see it looks like it's
11 set back towards the back of the building.

12 MR. DeGENNARO: It is going to be set
13 back towards the back of the building. We
14 want to take advantage of the views on the
15 roof. So the open space recreation would be
16 in the front. Yeah. So the rooftop
17 mechanicals and elevator bulkheads are shown
18 on the architectural rendering, and they
19 would be towards the back.

20 BOARD MEMBER FERGUSON: Three sets of
21 elevators, right?

22 MR. DeGENNARO: Yes. I'm sorry.
23 There's one set of elevators, and there's two
24 additional staircases.

25 BOARD MEMBER FERGUSON: The elevator

1 Proceedings

2 shaft is in the center?

3 MR. DeGENNARO: Yes.

4 BOARD MEMBER BIEHLE: Any reason the
5 recreation area -- I guess you just wanted
6 the minimum. It's, on the one side, it takes
7 the full front. But on the other side, it's
8 partial, two thirds of it.

9 MR. DeGENNARO: On the roof?

10 BOARD MEMBER BIEHLE: Yeah.

11 MR. DeGENNARO: I believe we exceed the
12 required amount. And honestly, we haven't
13 done a full design of the recreation on the
14 roof. We wanted more to demonstrate that
15 there would be something, you know. And then
16 as the project advanced, you know, we could
17 lay it out precisely.

18 BOARD MEMBER BIEHLE: I'd think you want
19 to match both sides. Get as much space as
20 possible.

21 MR. DeGENNARO: There is the roof plan,
22 which has it extending across the front. But
23 not into -- if it's a U-shaped building, not
24 the legs on the U.

25 BOARD MEMBER BIEHLE: Yeah, but one

1 Proceedings

2 side, one side of the front is full and one
3 side is not.

4 MR. DeGENNARO: Yes.

5 CHAIRMAN PURCELL: Do you have any more
6 of what we had from the TAC meetings?
7 Because there's a little bit more visual. So
8 the Board can -- like this particular, like I
9 have this packet from the TAC meeting. I
10 think this has got a better look to the shape
11 of the building, 9W, what's on the rooftop.
12 You know. There's another packet here of
13 other renderings of the property. I think
14 this is an important packet, actually, for
15 the Board members to have.

16 THE CLERK: Was it in that packet that I
17 gave you?

18 MR. DeGENNARO: It should have been,
19 yeah.

20 CHAIRMAN PURCELL: I mean, I figured
21 you'd bring it with you tonight. That's all.

22 MR. DeGENNARO: I have an extra copy,
23 but I didn't have copies to hand out.

24 CHAIRMAN PURCELL: You guys can share
25 that. You guys can share, run through it.

1 Proceedings

2 And then just to look at it, give more of a
3 crisp look of the rooftop with the, you know,
4 the exits are on top. The mechanicals are
5 going to be. The elevator, the emergency
6 doors. Flip through it, you'll see different
7 colors, the setbacks a little bit more, so
8 you can visually see those different
9 sections. That was presented to us at the
10 TAC meeting.

11 THE CLERK: I gave you the latest
12 submission.

13 CHAIRMAN PURCELL: I'm sorry, Mary?

14 THE CLERK: I gave you the packet with
15 the latest submission before this one.

16 CHAIRMAN PURCELL: Lot of pictures to
17 look at.

18 BOARD MEMBER ALESSI: And the rooftop,
19 what's intended to be up there, just tables
20 and chairs?

21 MR. DeGENNARO: Yes.

22 CHAIRMAN PURCELL: So I think at this
23 point, if members want to digest a lot of
24 paperwork, going home and review it. You
25 know, it's good stuff. Visual is critical.

1 Proceedings

2 Mary, what's the next move that we need to
3 do?

4 THE CLERK: I don't know. You're going
5 to have to ask Max.

6 CHAIRMAN PURCELL: Max? At this point,
7 I mean, the Board does have to review this,
8 look it over. There's a lot to be digested
9 here.

10 MR. STACH: Yeah. I mean, I think we
11 were discussing a lot of the details of the
12 application. And the Board had issue with
13 the big global issues here. I think the
14 applicant heard what you were not liking on
15 the previous submission. They've submitted a
16 revised version.

17 I think -- and the intent of this
18 meeting would be to give them some guidance
19 if you're equipped to do that. You know, you
20 got some of the visuals earlier this month.
21 You have additional visual simulations, which
22 this is really for the purpose of SEQOR,
23 because this is what we're looking at in
24 SEQOR, in the Part 3.

25 So if you're comfortable giving some

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Proceedings

feedback on the revised plan, I'm sure the applicant would appreciate that. If you need to reserve it, I think you should also give that information to them so they know. But I'm sure that part of the intent here is to know whether we're moving forward with this design, in which case Amy -- Councilwoman, I don't know what you call it -- Amy has said, you know, she'd like to see the Part 2 adopted if you agree with it so that they can get to addressing that.

CHAIRMAN PURCELL: What's the height at now? I'm looking at the back side of the building.

MR. DeGENNARO: The back side?

CHAIRMAN PURCELL: Yeah, back side.

BOARD MEMBER BIEHLE: So the back side of the building looks like a two-story building from Govan. Is that what you're saying?

BOARD MEMBER ALESSI: Three.

MR. DeGENNARO: Three.

BOARD MEMBER BIEHLE: No, from Govan, you said two.

1 Proceedings

2 MR. DeGENNARO: Yeah, it's about
3 30 feet.

4 CHAIRMAN PURCELL: So what's the
5 elevation in the back, the back and the rear
6 and the front, what's the elevations at?

7 MR. DeGENNARO: So the roof elevation is
8 at 148. And the finished floor elevation,
9 the adjacent grade in the rear is 119. So
10 about 30 feet.

11 CHAIRMAN PURCELL: So it's reduced a
12 little more.

13 MR. DeGENNARO: Yes.

14 CHAIRMAN PURCELL: Okay. Because we
15 were at I think 38 8, and then it was down to
16 35, and now it's lower a little more with the
17 revised --

18 MR. DeGENNARO: Well, the overall height
19 calculation is based on average grades.

20 CHAIRMAN PURCELL: Yup.

21 MR. DeGENNARO: So it's less in the back
22 and more in the front.

23 CHAIRMAN PURCELL: So what do we got for
24 an average?

25 MR. DeGENNARO: It's still 38. We

1 Proceedings

2 lowered the building.

3 CHAIRMAN PURCELL: Yeah, I know. That's
4 why I asked.

5 MR. DeGENNARO: But that -- everything
6 got lower accordingly, so the overall height
7 didn't change.

8 CHAIRMAN PURCELL: Okay.

9 BOARD MEMBER BIEHLE: You don't have a
10 simulation from Govan that we're looking at,
11 right?

12 MR. DeGENNARO: We do. That was
13 previously submitted, but it has not been
14 updated.

15 BOARD MEMBER BIEHLE: Not updated with
16 the new height. Because you're saying
17 essentially, it's going to maintain the
18 two-story appearance from Govan, so --

19 MR. DeGENNARO: Three stories.

20 BOARD MEMBER BIEHLE: Oh. It says the
21 appearance would be two stories. On your
22 letter, right? First paragraph, last line.

23 MR. DeGENNARO: Based on with the line
24 of sight and with the grade change, because
25 we're sloping downhill. The building

1 Proceedings

2 height --

3 BOARD MEMBER BIEHLE: You said the
4 building is lower.

5 MR. DeGENNARO: Yes.

6 BOARD MEMBER BIEHLE: So it's going
7 to -- it's not going to feel -- it's going to
8 feel like we see three stories.

9 MR. DeGENNARO: Yes.

10 BOARD MEMBER BIEHLE: It's going to be a
11 story lower.

12 MR. DeGENNARO: Yeah. And the building
13 is actually lower than the barn that's in the
14 back there, that's pretty close to Govan. So
15 from that perspective, you know, and it's set
16 further back, of course, from the street.

17 MR. STACH: So at the TAC meeting, they
18 had provided the submission that was in your
19 packet. And we asked them before this
20 meeting to provide these two views because we
21 figured they were the most public views. And
22 we knew they had limited time to get them
23 done.

24 BOARD MEMBER BIEHLE: That's fine.
25 We're going to need it for the public.

1 Proceedings

2 MR. STACH: You're going to need it for
3 the EAF.

4 BOARD MEMBER BIEHLE: Yeah.

5 MR. DeGENNARO: Yes.

6 MR. STACH: Do you recall when you sent
7 that EAF or those original visual
8 simulations? The balloon test was in
9 September, I want to say, right?

10 THE CLERK: Max.

11 MR. DeGENNARO: Yes, it was.

12 THE CLERK: Max, sorry. One was in
13 December. I think it was December 6th.

14 MR. STACH: December 6th for this most
15 recent --

16 THE CLERK: December something. It was
17 one packet, and then one packet was in
18 January.

19 MR. STACH: Okay.

20 THE CLERK: I only brought the January
21 packet with me.

22 MR. STACH: So the balloon test was in
23 June, I think.

24 MR. DeGENNARO: Okay.

25 MR. STACH: Maybe we did it in April and

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Proceedings

May, and then the results were submitted in June.

CHAIRMAN PURCELL: Just, John, on the common space area, the balconies, is that considered part of the common space area that we're looking for, the calculation needed?

MR. HAGER: I think I had offered an interpretation earlier on in the project.

CHAIRMAN PURCELL: Okay.

MR. HAGER: That question had come up. And from my memory, I believe that I agreed with the applicant that that could qualify for open space based on how the interpretation went through the ZBA.

CHAIRMAN PURCELL: So that's including rooftop and the balconies as a common space.

MR. HAGER: Yeah. There had been an appeal to the ZBA for an interpretation about whether the open space required for this special exception use had to be on the ground, or if it could be included on a rooftop area. And the ZBA studied that, and they had their public hearing. They came back with a decision that it could be

1 Proceedings

2 included on a rooftop.

3 And then I believe it was the applicant
4 that had asked me if I would interpret that
5 some of that rooftop area could be on these
6 individual balconies that are not accessed by
7 the whole population of the building. They'd
8 be privately accessed.

9 CHAIRMAN PURCELL: Right.

10 MR. HAGER: But I gave the opinion that
11 I thought they could still qualify as part of
12 the open space.

13 BOARD MEMBER JASLOW: Okay.

14 CHAIRMAN PURCELL: Thank you, John.

15 MR. HAGER: You're welcome.

16 CHAIRMAN PURCELL: All right. So if we
17 were to take action, what would be our next
18 step? Max, what would be our next step?

19 MR. STACH: I think if you want to
20 provide them with feedback individually as a
21 Board. And then I think you might want to
22 adopt the Part 2. I think they'd be looking
23 to know should they proceed with this plan,
24 or do you want something else to look at?
25 So. Has this gotten most of it? I mean, it

1 Proceedings

2 can continue to evolve.

3 CHAIRMAN PURCELL: Correct.

4 MR. STACH: But if you want major
5 changes, you better tell them now, right?

6 CHAIRMAN PURCELL: Well, yeah, because
7 they have to put the time and effort.

8 MR. STACH: Exactly.

9 CHAIRMAN PURCELL: And want to minimize
10 the consultants' cost to the applicant.

11 MR. STACH: All right.

12 CHAIRMAN PURCELL: So I understand that.
13 So I guess -- I'm sorry, Mike?

14 BOARD MEMBER FERGUSON: The structure
15 would be the same. Just making changes to
16 the site.

17 CHAIRMAN PURCELL: Yeah. I don't see
18 the structure changing, right, to the Board
19 Members? We did ask and request at the last
20 meeting about setbacks softening the blow,
21 the gulag-looking building, it was just one
22 giant block, it was kindergarten. I guess we
23 kind of do have to make a move. Or if the
24 Board wants each, wants to give each
25 individual response to the applicant, if you

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Proceedings

feel more comfortable, you might have questions for the Building Department and Max, and on your own, one on one. That would be the decision for us all to make tonight so we can not keep the applicant in limbo.

MR. DeGENNARO: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PURCELL: So, Mike, what would you like to do?

BOARD MEMBER FERGUSON: I think the way the structure is set up now would be adequate. All the changes to that site got mentioned early on, about dumpster enclosures and stuff, that can all be addressed.

CHAIRMAN PURCELL: As the project progresses.

BOARD MEMBER ROGERS: Yeah. I mean, I think they've -- it's definitely a smoother look. So I think this is more on track from my standpoint than what was -- certainly as far as last time. So, you know. Then I think we could probably refer them to the ARB, too. I mean, that's --

CHAIRMAN PURCELL: Okay. Kerri?

BOARD MEMBER ALESSI: Agreed.

1 Proceedings

2 CHAIRMAN PURCELL: Eric?

3 BOARD MEMBER JASLOW: I agree with both
4 of them, too.

5 BOARD MEMBER BIEHLE: Yeah.

6 CHAIRMAN PURCELL: All right.

7 MS. MELE: May I just make one comment?

8 CHAIRMAN PURCELL: Yes.

9 MS. MELE: I'm just wondering what's the
10 harm in maybe setting a public hearing for
11 next month. You could still review it all
12 month, and then you'd have an opportunity to
13 hear what the public has to say about it.
14 And it might influence, you know, your
15 decision, and it could get the SEQR process
16 rolling again.

17 MR. O'ROURKE: Chairman, if I may. Not
18 to be the bad guy, but we had talked.

19 CHAIRMAN PURCELL: Yeah.

20 MR. O'ROURKE: That's a nice thought,
21 but the public is going to ask about
22 retaining walls, storm water, utilities that
23 we haven't seen yet, right. You haven't
24 made, you haven't taken that and made a real
25 submission of plans. So I personally don't

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Proceedings

like having a public hearing when we don't have plans to answer the public, because then they're just going to come back next month and the following month.

I think the Board is going to have the same comments as the public is going to have. It's going to be the same thing. So again, that's my two cents. But I think you have to have a full set of plans before you have a public hearing.

CHAIRMAN PURCELL: I agree. I agree with John. I won't speak on behalf of the Board, but I do agree with John. The consultants.

So we'll make a motion -- I'm sorry? So we're going to make a motion to have the, go to the ARB, and accept Part 2, and also accept any questions from the Board Members to be responded to.

MS. MELE: Sure. And if we could be adjourned, perhaps, to the next meeting, not as a public hearing, but to -- we could make a submission, Mr. DeGennaro tells me, by next week for next month's meeting. And then you

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Proceedings

would have a more fully developed set of site plans so that perhaps you'd feel comfortable setting a public meeting in February for March.

CHAIRMAN PURCELL: John?

MR. O'ROURKE: Well, I think that's the standard practice. If he can submit it by the deadline review, he'd show up at the TAC meeting. We'd review at the TAC. And then depending on the results of the TAC meeting, we can put him on the agenda.

CHAIRMAN PURCELL: Is the Board comfortable with that? Okay. So I need a motion to accept the --

THE CLERK: Refer to the ARB.

CHAIRMAN PURCELL: For the ARB. Sorry. I apologize. That's my daughter's snack. What else?

MR. HAGER: I have a question related to the ARB. Is there any building signage plan for the office spaces below?

MS. MELE: I'm sure there is. I don't know that that's been fleshed out yet.

MR. DeGENNARO: We haven't discussed it,

1 Proceedings

2 but there will be something. So we will
3 incorporate a proposal for that in our next
4 submission.

5 MR. HAGER: Yeah. I think the ARB wants
6 to be involved in the signage.

7 MS. MELE: Sure, yeah. And I anticipate
8 maybe on a building of this size, it might be
9 a couple of visits to the ARB. So maybe the
10 first is building facades and rooftop, and
11 then we can turn to signage and lighting and
12 things like that.

13 CHAIRMAN PURCELL: Okay. So motion to
14 refer to ARB. And we have to do one or two,
15 two separate motions?

16 THE CLERK: One. First, ARB. Who made
17 the motion?

18 BOARD MEMBER ROGERS: I'll make the
19 motion.

20 CHAIRMAN PURCELL: Second?

21 BOARD MEMBER FERGUSON: I'll second it.

22 THE CLERK: Who made the motion?

23 BOARD MEMBER FERGUSON: Jerry.

24 THE CLERK: Oh, Jerry.

25 CHAIRMAN PURCELL: Roll call, please,

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Proceedings

Mary.

THE CLERK: Okay. Mr. Biehle?

BOARD MEMBER BIEHLE: Yes.

THE CLERK: Mr. Jaslow?

BOARD MEMBER JASLOW: Yes.

THE CLERK: Mrs. Alessi?

BOARD MEMBER ALESSI: Yes.

THE CLERK: Mr. Ferguson?

BOARD MEMBER FERGUSON: Yes.

THE CLERK: Mr. Rogers?

BOARD MEMBER ROGERS: Yes.

THE CLERK: Chairman Purcell?

CHAIRMAN PURCELL: Yes. I need a motion to, for Part 2.

BOARD MEMBER ALESSI: I'll make the motion.

BOARD MEMBER JASLOW: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN PURCELL: Roll call?

THE CLERK: Okay, one second. You're going too fast for me. Okay. Mr. Biehle?

BOARD MEMBER BIEHLE: Yes.

THE CLERK: Mr. Jaslow?

BOARD MEMBER JASLOW: Yes.

THE CLERK: Mrs. Alessi?

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Proceedings

BOARD MEMBER ALESSI: Yes.

THE CLERK: Mr. Ferguson?

BOARD MEMBER FERGUSON: Yes.

THE CLERK: Mr. Rogers?

BOARD MEMBER ROGERS: Yes.

THE CLERK: Chairman Purcell?

CHAIRMAN PURCELL: Yes.

THE CLERK: Okay.

CHAIRMAN PURCELL: Thank you, guys, for
your time. Appreciate it.

MR. DeGENNARO: Thank you very much.

MS. MELE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PURCELL: We'll see you at the
next meeting.

(Time noted: 8:02 p.m.)

oOo

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Proceedings

THE FOREGOING IS CERTIFIED to be a true
and correct transcription of the original
stenographic minutes to the best of my ability.

Jennifer L. Johnson