

***Town of Southeast
Architectural Review Board
1 Main Street
Brewster, NY 10509***

Minutes – August 26, 2020

THIS MEETING WAS HELD VIA ZOOM VIDEO CONFERENCING

PRESENT: Thomas Frasca, Chairman
Virginia Stephens
Carla Lucchino
Victoria Desidero, Administrative Assistant
Krithika Prabhakaran, Acting Town Planner

ABSENT: Ashley Ley, Town Planner

CALL TO ORDER: 7 p.m.

AGENDA: Pledge of Allegiance

Chairman Frasca: I'd like everybody to do the pledge please.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL (results above)

Chairman Frasca: OK, the first item on the agenda tonight is Lakeview Plaza continued review.

Secretary Desidero: Krithika, I'm sorry, I need you to go back to the... Hold on a second, I can't see the... I need to unmute them, give me one second. We have Brian Vassar and Monica I believe. Are you guys there?

Mr. Vassar and Ms. Roth: Yes.

Ms. Desidero: OK, there they are.

1. LAKEVIEW PLAZA a/k/a UB Brewster, 1505-1515 Route 22, (Tax Map ID 46.-1-1.-1) – Continued Review of an Application for Amendments to Multi-Tenant Sign Program

This was a continued review of an application for changes to a monument sign as referred by the Building Department. The application contained the following documents:

1. Lakeview Plaza, Signage Program, prepared by Archer Signs, dated 6/17/19

Bryan Vassar of Archer Signs and Monica Roth of Urstadt Biddle appeared before the Board.

Chairman Frasca: OK, so it's the continued review for the amendment to the Multi-Tenant Sign Program.

Ms. Prabhakaran: Can everyone see the screen OK?

Chairman Frasca: Yes.

Ms. Desidero: Brian?

Mr. Vassar: Yes.

Chairman Frasca: You're on.

Mr. Vassar: OK, you wanted to see the logos that we had as they were going to appear on the sign or the way we proposed to have them appear on the sign and that's what we've done here. So, everything else about it was OK I understand it, it was just you wanted to see the final mock-up as it will be.

Chairman Frasca: So, as we agreed, the non-logo signs are black letters with white background. The ones with the logos are there as they are; any other comments?

Boardmember Stephens: I have a question: Don't we still need the numerical number like 1336 Route 22 somewhere on this big monument sign?

Chairman Frasca: Yes.

Boardmember Stephens: OK.

Mr. Vassar: This is the first I am hearing that.

Ms. Desidero: We talked about that once before. The address does have to be... I think that's a Code requirement Brian.

Chairman Frasca: It's a 911 requirement.

Mr. Vassar: Well, we can attach a small panel underneath in the center. There's not a lot of space left. We've kind of squeezed this thing as tight as we can.

Chairman Frasca: Victoria, I'm just trying to remember again with the Sign Code, as long as the number is on the sign somewhere.

Ms. Desidero: It's a 911 number so yes, it's required. I seem to recall the last time we discussed it, the agreement was that it was going to be a small plaque or something that came off the bottom of the sign.

Chairman Frasca: It would hang right off the bottom right in the center.

Ms. Desidero: That's the way I understood it.

Mr. Vassar: That can be done.

Chairman Frasca: Carla, any comments?

Boardmember Lucchino: No Tom, no questions. I'm fine.

Chairman Frasca: OK, well, who wants to make a recommendation for approval?

The ARB voted to approve the sign with the following condition:

1. E-911 numbers will be added to bottom of sign.

Motion to Approve: Carla Lucchino

Seconded: Virginia Stephens

Voice Vote: 3 to 0 with 2 vacancies

2. LAS MANANITAS, 1250 Route 22, (Tax Map ID 57.-2-40) – Review of an Application for a Site Plan Amendment

This was a review of an application for a Site Plan Amendment as referred by the Planning Board. The application contained the following documents:

1. ARB Application, prepared by JR Folchetti & Associates, dated 8/11/20
2. Planning Board Report from Zoning Board of Appeals re variances, dated 7/20/20
3. Master Plan Narrative, prepared by Folchetti & Associates, dated November 2019; last revised August 2020
4. ARB Submittal Cover Page, prepared by Folchetti & Associates, dated August 2018, last revised June 2020
5. G Sheet 1 of 5, Preliminary Plan, Drawing Index, Legend, Symbols and General Notes, prepared by Folchetti & Associates, dated July 2020

6. G Sheet 2 of 5, Preliminary Plan, Existing Conditions & Boundary Survey, prepared by Folchetti & Associates, dated July 2020
7. G Sheet 3 of 5, Preliminary Plan, Photographic Map, prepared by Folchetti & Associates, dated July 2020
8. G Sheet 4 of 5, Preliminary Plan, Proposed Conditions, prepared by Folchetti & Associates, dated July 2020
9. G Sheet 5 of 5, Preliminary Plan, Lighting Plan, prepared by Folchetti & Associates, dated March 2020
10. Two (2) Sheets, Renderings, no preparer, undated
11. A-1, Proposed Rear Patio, prepared by J.R. Miller Designs, dated 1/14/19
12. Front Elevation, Rendering, no preparer, undated
13. Side Elevation, Rendering, no preparer, undated
14. A-2, Proposed Storage Building, prepared by J.R. Miller Designs, dated 4/3/18
15. A-1, Proposed Exterior Renovation, Residence, prepared by J.R. Miller Designs, dated 4/2/18
16. Front Elevation, (Residence) Rendering, no preparer, undated
17. G Sheet 8 of 11, Preliminary Plan, Lighting Plan, prepared by Folchetti & Associates, dated March 2020
18. Upper Level Proposed Rear Raised Patio, no preparer, undated
19. Proposed Deck / Patio Wall Mount Lighting, ELC, Spec Sheet
20. Proposed Deck / Patio Wall Mount Lighting, Wall Sconce in Oil Spec Sheet
21. Proposed Deck / Patio Wall Mount Lighting, EXIT Sign, no preparer, undated
22. American Craftsman Series Double Hung White Vinyl Window with Nailing Flange and Colonial Grilles Spec Sheet
23. MP Doors, Fiberglass Smooth White Right-Hand Inswing Hinged Pation Door with 10-Lite GBG Spec Sheet
24. Proposed Storage Barn Wall Mount Lighting, Quoizel Spec Sheet
25. Color Photo Packed Labeled "Comment #9, Materials and Color Samples"

Architect John Miller and Ken Medla represented their client before the Board.

Chairman Frasca: Next on the Agenda is Las Mananitas.

Ms. Desidero: I'm sorry, Krithika, I need you to go back to the people again, I'm sorry. We have to stop the sharing between so I can figure out who I'm...

Ms. Prabhakaran: Yes.

Ms. Desidero: So, I've got: is it J. Miller? Yes, I'm going to unmute you sir. And Ken Medla? Yes, OK, I'm going to unmute you. So, these are the two gentlemen here, I believe, for this application.

Chairman Frasca: Right, OK.

Ms. Desidero: Mr. Miller, I un-muted you but you have to unmute yourself as well.

Mr. Miller: OK?

Ms. Desidero: Yes, thank you.

Chairman Frasca: Welcome. So, this is the application that was referred to the Planning Board to amend an existing structure. There are a number of components to the application including parking lot, lighting, decks, some changes in the architecture and also additions to ancillary structures. So, have at it.

Mr. Miller: All right Tom, thank you. My name is John Miller and I'm with JR Miller Designs Services. I'll be representing the engineering group of John Folchetti Associates and the owner, Luis Sanchez. As you were mentioning Tom, there are multiple phases to this proposal. It's been through Planning and now we're before the ARB (Architectural Review Board) to discuss some of the finer points of the aesthetics of what the proposal is on the table tonight. So, one of the key elements

that was brought is the capacity there in the increased parking. Through the planning cycle they were able to get additional seating for Las Mananitas and on top of that we needed additional parking. So, the parking that is existing in the upper portion of this screen is going to be lined and expanded as well as additional parking that wraps around down to the lower half, yes correct right there and then down the driveway. So, there's additional lighting to support that parking and those additional spots. So, that was one piece of this a little less to the aesthetic. The next one is on the existing restaurant; those of you who've been to Las Mananitas, there are two patios that head towards the reservoir, the proposal is to have an additional patio out from the bar area replacing an existing bay window that's there to a French door that empties onto this new patio to the rear and then the existing exit door will be replaced with a window right to the left. The sweeping stairs will wrap around to the rear and come up to the left side as you drive up the entryway to Las Mananitas. In order to keep with the aesthetic of the existing structure there, the patio is proposed to be of the same color and stonework that is on the two existing tiered patios that are to the right side. If you go to the renderings for a second; the photograph you are on of the existing Las Mananitas might be a good place to start. If you could page up and could you pivot that by any chance?

Ms. Prabhakaran: Yes.

Mr. Miller: Thank you. So, I don't know if everyone here has had an opportunity to dine at the restaurant, but you can see the red roof which is consistent throughout this structure and will be consistent for the new structures that I'll be talking about. The stonework that you see on the front will be consistent to the new proposed rear deck patio and the stucco color will be consistent for all the structures. So, the cohesion between any of the new structures we'll be talking will be in tune and matched to the color schemes that are already existing at Las Mananitas. So, if you go back to the renderings of the rear patio for me, please. So, there are two views that I did of the renderings; one is as you would come from the left side as you drive up the left side of the existing structure and come around, this would be the stairs to the left. You can see where the stairs start to wrap around and wind up on the upper portion. So, that's the view from the yard; if you go off the existing two-tier patio towards the reservoir and were to look back where this is proposed that's what it would look like from the proposed side from the yard. Then the lower rendering is what it would look like as you approached it from the left side and walked up to it and went up those steps that sweep around and wind up on the back of the structure right adjacent to...those windows that you're seeing on the upper tier are the ones to the bar area, that's the restaurant, and then in the lower rendering you see there are to the bar area.

Chairman Frasca: Very ambitious.

Boardmember Stephens: Yeah, you'll need some good masons.

Mr. Miller: Yes, if you've seen the stonework that's done on the existing two tiers, they have some very good quality masons.

Boardmember Stephens: I've seen it a lot for a lot of years.

Mr. Miller: So, we've been in discussion with the same team that did that work.

Boardmember Stephens: Great.

Mr. Miller: The railing, the same wrought iron railing and columns will be in kind with the existing patios. The uniformity between the two will be matched.

Boardmember Stephens: That's key.

Mr. Miller: Yes, absolutely, absolutely.

Chairman Frasca: I know Ashley had raised an issue about the exit door?

Mr. Miller: She just wanted to see some detail on the exit door. Basically it's an exterior French door with crash bars. It's not that complicated of a door. So, it will

exit out to the patio, which is a requirement for this structure with crash bar side. It's actually increasing the exit unit by two-fold because the existing only has a single 3 ft. door that exits out to a very small landing and a set of steps. Those set of steps are 5 ft. wide now going down and you have a double set of doors.

Chairman Frasca: Any questions Carla, so far?

Ms. Prabhakaran: Yes, I actually have a few questions for you. We received the new pdfs that you had sent us based on our comments from before. I work with Ashley so I'll be filling in for her today.

Mr. Miller: OK.

Ms. Prabhakaran: Right here I just wanted to go over your new lighting plan that you had sent us.

Mr. Miller: OK.

Ms. Prabhakaran: I do appreciate that you sent us spec sheets for lighting fixtures 2 and 3. This is what I was wondering about: you have two different lighting fixtures for number one and I was wondering which one you were going with and if you could provide us with a spec sheet for that?

Mr. Miller: Yes, that's an easy one. There was some discussion on which one would be more pleasing. These are the ones that are going to be on the columns for the parking is where these will be. So, if you look... yes correct.

Ms. Prabhakaran: OK, because those should be color-coded as well. I believe you have it in your ledger.

Mr. Miller: Yes, I think they were or I did catch that too that they should be. They should be a green for those as well.

Ms. Prabhakaran: Yes.

Mr. Miller: Understood. That's something that can be sent over very easily.

Ms. Prabhakaran: OK.

Boardmember Stephens: Which of those two fixtures are you going to use, of the two that are side by side?

Mr. Miller: I think we put that we were leaving that up to... as far as the light output, they both are the same. I'm opting for the one on the left. It's a little plainer and it goes a little bit more with the style that we're using versus the one with the point on it on the right.

Boardmember Stephens: Right.

Mr. Miller: In my opinion, but we were going back and forth with which ones made the most sense, but I think the consensus was the one on the left.

Ms. Prabhakaran: If I could get a spec sheet for that, that would be great.

Mr. Miller: OK.

Ms. Prabhakaran: I do know you sent the proposed storage barn wall mount lighting.

Mr. Miller: Yes.

Ms. Prabhakaran: Is that indicated on your lighting plan?

Mr. Miller: It's actually not on the lighting plan. I guess the engineer didn't put it on. Actually up on the barn there are two on the side facing the entry and two where the doors are. When you look at the renderings, I'll point those out. There are actually four proposed.

Chairman Frasca: What I'd like to do is this though... before we get to that, Carla do you have any issues with the proposed deck area revision to the restaurant?

Boardmember Lucchino: No, I don't have any issues. I just have a few questions though, Tom. I mean I'll wait until my turn, if it's my turn now I'd be glad to ask.

Chairman Frasca: Yes, I'd like to hear them, what you have to say.

Boardmember Lucchino: OK, I wanted to ask: the exit door, the picture I think showed it looked white in the picture?

Mr. Miller: Yes, this picture is showing the crash bar. There's another picture that shows the door with dividing lights on it if you keep going up.

Chairman Frasca: It's in the sketch plan I think too.

Mr. Miller: Yes, right. It is white by the way.

Boardmember Lucchino: OK. The light fixtures that we were just talking about.

Ms. Desidero: Carla, excuse me, it's me. You need to turn off your video because you're breaking up; we can't hear your audio.

Boardmember Lucchino: I just did.

Mr. Miller: Could you repeat the question please.

Boardmember Lucchino: Yes, for these lights; they look black in this picture but I thought you said they were green.

Mr. Miller: Oh yeah, I get it. He was referring to the key. The key on here for the legend is green and the lights are indeed black.

Boardmember Lucchino: Got it, got it. And John, is there a landscaping plan that goes with this?

Mr. Miller: One of the things I don't know if you've been up there, but the landscaping is quite lush and manicured and maintained. We really didn't do a landscaping plan, but the idea is; obviously there is plenty of green up there – is to maintain and accent the existing structures and roadways with landscaping but there's no plan that's before the Board tonight. But, you certainly if you've been up there, you know that Mr. Sanchez takes great pride in the aesthetic and the landscaping is going to be paramount to making this the venue that he wants it to be.

Boardmember Lucchino: Will the parking lot be paved?

Mr. Miller: I believe the parking lot is going to be asphalt, correct Ken?

Chairman Frasca: I'm having trouble hearing everyone.

Mr. Miller: You're having a hard time hearing me, Tom?

Boardmember Stephens: You're clear as a bell to me.

Mr. Miller: Yeah, I'm having a hard time hearing Tom actually.

Boardmember Lucchino: I can hear you too John; I can hear everyone pretty well. Can you hear me OK?

Chairman Frasca: Yes, now I can. OK, so the parking lot is a combination of asphalt, gravel and pervious block?

Mr. Miller: Well, the walkways are block. Ken, can you answer that question? Is the proposal to have asphalt or gravel for all the new parking? Oh, the host needs to unmute Ken; he sent me a text.

Ms. Desidero: I unmuted him, he has to unmute himself as well.

Mr. Medla: I believe I'm unmuted now.

Mr. Miller: There you are, yes.

Mr. Medla: OK, I'm sorry for my technological failures. So, the parking lot... yes, it's been approved after a lot of testing for stormwater and (Engineer) John Folchetti usually speaks to this but he presented it. The entire parking lot and the roads leading in will be re-blacktopped, the gravel areas will be blacktopped. There is additional drainage that will be put in to allow the water to flow properly and that's all been designed and approved by the Planning committee. The blacktop will be lined so there will now be spaces for people to park in, which has never been the case in the history of this restaurant going back to when it was Capriccio's. So, the parking lot will be brought up to modern specs. It will be lined and drainage will be done appropriately. Valet parking will continue to direct people because it is a complex parking lot so there will still be valet parking to direct people to help fill the spots properly.

Boardmember Lucchino: Thanks Ken. Tom, no more questions for me.

Chairman Frasca: Virginia, do you have any questions?

Boardmember Stephens: No, not at the moment. Thank you.

Chairman Frasca: All right, in moving on with the structure. There are also details for an addition to the... Well, let's get to the residence.

Mr. Miller: Right, on the site plan I don't know if you noticed on the lower portion there, there's a residence that exists there today that needs some aesthetic attention. So, the proposal... next one down, that one... the front elevation, the idea there is to do just facade work on this and to make it, give it the same aesthetic that matches the restaurant. So, the stucco will match the trim, the exposed primed painted areas and beams. The roof shingle type and color will match the existing. In addition to the aesthetic on the front there is no, on the rear today, there was a decaying access via an old deck that has long since been removed for safety reasons and there will be a deck reconstructed on the back of the dwelling for access and that goes towards the reservoir. It's not seen from anywhere other than the reservoir side. If you page down just a little bit you can see the rear elevation and there you see the deck on the back that is not there today. If you would like to look at what the proposed front elevation looks like in color, there's a rendering, again keeping in mind the same aesthetic with the stucco, the white trim, the roof style, and the stone and now go to the rendering of the residence please. There you go. So, you can see, again, kind of forgive the color copy condition. You make color copies of these and you kind of lose a little bit in the translation, but the color of the stone is the same stone that's on the restaurant, the stucco is the same, and like I said the roof style and color is the same as the restaurant for the residence.

Chairman Frasca: So, essentially, you're carrying the theme all the way through.

Mr. Miller: You got it. That really was my direction from the owner and we felt that that made sense for the compound to have that same aesthetic carried through the three structures that will be on the property.

Chairman Frasca: Virginia, you have any comments on this structure?

Boardmember Stephens: No, I like it. I mean I think it is a compound and I think it flows well.

Chairman Frasca: Carla, any comments?

Boardmember Lucchino: No, no comments or questions.

Chairman Frasca: I'm sorry Carla?

Boardmember Lucchino: No comments or questions.

Chairman Frasca: Can anyone catch that? I couldn't hear it.

Mr. Miller: No, I couldn't hear it either Carla. Could you repeat that Carla?

Boardmember Lucchino: I don't have any comments or questions.

Ms. Desidero: She's saying that she doesn't have any comments or questions.

Mr. Miller: OK, thank you Carla.

Chairman Frasca: OK. So I assume the last portion of this would be the storage area.

Mr. Miller: Correct, yes, the detached storage structure. If you go all the way back to the first site plan so we can look at get people oriented to that from the top down, please.

Ms. Prabhakaran: Yes.

Mr. Miller: Keep going down a little bit, oh a bit too far, there we go. There you can see it. So, as you drive up the driveway, which is on the left-hand side and where the main parking lot is there it will sit up on that knoll. If you can see the contours there, there's a high spot right there which isn't adequate for parking or anything other than this storage building. So, that will be where the storage building is located. So, when you drive up it will be in your line of site.

Chairman Frasca: So this is actually, if I'm looking at this correctly, this is actually where he has a pile of cut wood for the fireplace.

Mr. Miller: Exactly Tom, yes. That knoll right up there, there's a plateau right there that is where it's going to go. It makes perfect sense.

Chairman Frasca: Are you going to carry through the theme of the rest of the campus?

Mr. Miller: Yes, go to the renderings. There are really not floor plans to it to discuss anything structurally, just really the aesthetic. So, this top one would be what you would see. Again, we didn't want it to be a squatty little building. We wanted to have some size and aesthetic to match the rest, so therein lies the stone facade at the lower portion, the stucco, and there you can see those lights that we had shown and sent the specs on; the small square black. It will have a small pergola that suspends off the building just for an aesthetic and then the same roof material and structure along with a cupola on the roof; I like the rooster cupola myself. The left side has a second set of doors. These may look like they're hinged doors, they are actually overhead doors to look like hinged doors. This is the side that really faces the parking lot. Again, that's the second use of those lights and the stone stucco. You obviously get the gist of what our goal was there. The rear is pretty generic, but I felt it might be of value to show the rear view in case there were any comments on it. It's really the blind side of the structure.

Chairman Frasca: Virginia, any comments?

Boardmember Stephens: No, it's very impressive. I'm looking forward to seeing it in reality.

Chairman Frasca: Carla?

Boardmember Lucchino: No comments. Looks good.

Chairman Frasca: OK, I know AKRF you had some issues on some of the detail in the lighting plan. You started that before. Is there anything on these other structures that would raise any concerns?

Ms. Desidero: Krithika?

Ms. Prabhakaran: Say that again?

Chairman Frasca: I'm sorry, Krithika, you raised some issues about lighting, but the overall scheme of the planning... and I haven't looked at it in tremendous detail other than the architectural features. Is there anything that creates a concern? I don't see anything.

Ms. Prabhakaran: I don't think so. I think it looks pretty good other than the few comments that I had regarding the additions to the lighting plan. The lighting here on the storage building as was shown on the rendering, and also color coding this proposed lighting plan as well as including this detail onto our lighting plan so it's comprehensive would be great. One more thing would be to give us the correct spec for this lighting fixture one.

Mr. Miller: Yes, I already made that note.

Ms. Prabhakaran: So, those would be my comments, but otherwise it looks good.

Mr. Miller: Any other comments from anyone on the Board?

Ms. Prabhakaran: I think one more comment that I had was in terms of the landscaping, which you addressed as well. If you do have any proposed landscaping, you'll definitely need to submit that to us as well.

Chairman Frasca: My understanding was at this time there were no... other than the stone structures, there was no landscaping.

Ms. Prabhakaran: Yeah, if that's the case then just state that on the plans.

Chairman Frasca: That would have to be another application.

Mr. Prabhakaran: On there, yes, on the application.

Chairman Frasca: OK, would someone like to make a motion to approve this as submitted?

Boardmember Stephens: I'll make a motion to approve it as submitted.

Chairman Frasca: Carla, second?

Boardmember Lucchino: Yes, I'll second, but I think we have to amend the motion to include the lighting requirements, correct?

Chairman Frasca: Yes, that will be in there.

Ms. Desidero: OK, if you want conditions on the approval then the motion needs to be 'to approve with conditions' and then you can trust me to write up what you all just said and Tom will look at it before he signs off on it. But there is a difference between 'with conditions' and 'as submitted.'

Boardmember Stephens: I rescind that then. I will make the motion with conditions as discussed.

Chairman Frasca: I'm sorry, I thought I had articulated that.

Boardmember Stephens: I thought it was a given. I'm sorry. I agree with you Tom.

The ARB voted to **positively recommend** the site plan application to the Planning Board with the following conditions:

1. Specify lighting fixture #1 and provide a Spec Sheet to ARB Ms. Desidero for file;
2. Show storage barn wall mount lights on the lighting plan and include in legend;
3. Color code lighting in the areas proximate to the parking area, northeast of the residence;
4. ARB acknowledges that there is no landscaping plan proposed.

Motion to Approve: Virginia Stephens

Seconded: Carla Lucchino

Voice Vote: 3 to 0 with 2 vacancies

3. NEW CINGULAR WIRELESS d/b/a AT&T, 3925 Danbury Road, (Tax Map ID 69.13-1-20) – Review of an Application for Site Plan Amendment

This was a review of an application for Site Plan Amendment as referred by the Planning Board. The application contained the following documents:

1. ARB Application, prepared by Cuddy & Feder, dated 7/17/20
2. Memorandum to Chairman Frasca from Cuddy & Feder, dated 8/11/20
3. Exhibit A, Letter of Authorization, prepared by American Tower, dated 4/10/20
4. Exhibit B, Photographs of Site, no preparer, undated
5. Exhibit C, Google Maps Aerial of Site, dated 8/11/20
6. Exhibit D, ANT-001.00 – 9, Plans, prepared by TKK Engineering DPC, dated 6/9/20; last revised 7/15/20

Alec Gladd of Cuddy & Feder represented his client before the Board.

Chairman Frasca: Next, moving right along, New Cingular Wireless dba Verizon Wireless.

Ms. Desidero: We have Alec Gladd joining us.

Chairman Frasca: Alec, good evening. Can you give us just a quick overview of your amended site plan?

Mr. Gladd: Yes, certainly. So, Alec Gladd from Cuddy and Fidler on behalf of AT&T and we are proposing to expand the fence compound at the existing site approximately 468 sq. ft. and this is located at 3925 Danbury Road, which is the location of RRC Automotive. AT&T will match the existing black security fence, which is 6 ft. in height. This is a wooded, kind of remote site. There are not a bunch of uses around, but it is a generally commercial area of the Town. It's between Interstate 84 and Route 6. The nearest point of the proposed expansion is located approximately 154 ft. from the edge of the property line and that edge of the property line is even set back a little farther from the edge of the pavement of Route 6. AT&T needs this location to locate backup equipment for its tower extension and this serves the site presently and for future upgrades. This is a 5G and a First Net site. If you have driven by this site, there is an existing BP to extend the tower right now. They are staging some equipment and the tower extension is scheduled to be completed sometime around mid-September. I'm happy to answer any questions.

Chairman Frasca: Carla, any questions?

Boardmember Lucchino: Yes, Alec, on page 5 of 9; I saw something called a cable bridge. Can you just describe that a little bit to me? Is it aboveground, underground?

Mr. Gladd: It's aboveground. It should be shown, maybe on the elevations, or somewhere in the drawings, but basically it runs the wires from the walk-in equipment cabinet, the backup diesel generator, the RHs up to the tower so it can give power and service the antennae that are up on the tower.

Boardmember Lucchino: Can you describe what it looks like since we don't have a picture? I mean (inaudible)

Mr. Gladd: I'm sorry, you're breaking up a little, but they're grouped inside an enclosure.

Chairman Frasca: It's a conduit.

Mr. Gladd: Yes, it's like a conduit.

Chairman Frasca: I think Carla's concern is that when you say cable bridge you think of an expanse across a plain and that's not what's going to happen here. It's running directly up the tower in a conduit.

Mr. Gladd: Yes, so Ashley if you can go to page 8 of 28 of the pdf you can actually see the existing cable bridge from Verizon Wireless equipment to the tower. You may just have to zoom in a little. So, Verizon has basically just a grouping of wires for a short distance from their equipment into the base of the tower.

Boardmember Lucchino: OK, I'm not so sure I see what you're talking about.

Mr. Gladd: So, on page 8 and then if you zoom in right above the fence you can see the cables running over.

Chairman Frasca: Right there.

Ms. Prabhakaran: In this one?

Mr. Gladd: Yes, in that one.

Boardmember Stephens: It's exhibit C I think in our packet.

Boardmember Lucchino: OK, that gives me a much better idea.

Chairman Frasca: I think you were concerned about line of sight with that, correct?

Boardmember Lucchino: Right, I was. Exactly Tom, you're a mind reader. I don't think it will be visible from the road and I couldn't tell if it was above or below ground.

Mr. Gladd: Yes, it is above ground.

Ms. Prabhakaran: Are you on B or C drawing?

Mr. Gladd: It was on B there was a visual of it. There may be in one of the pictures from C too, there might be a more close up picture.

Boardmember Lucchino: While we're looking for that, Alec, can you hear me OK?

Mr. Gladd: Yes.

Boardmember Lucchino: One more question: there was (inaudible) something called a (inaudible) area; 18 ft. by about 13.5 ft or so. It was on page 5 of 9 of the compound plan. Oh, I see the cables. Can you tell me what that AT&T lease area is?

Mr. Gladd: That is the total lease area from the underlying property owner that AT&T is reserving a space but I believe from the drawings, they're not using all of it, they are only expanding the fence compound 468 sq. ft. So, part of that will be gates, there are a new set of gates that will be put in to open up so they can get to AT&T's equipment.

Boardmember Lucchino: And they'll be the same as the existing gates, right? The fence?

Mr. Gladd: Yes, the existing gates will still be used to access Verizon's equipment.

Boardmember Lucchino: Got it. No more questions.

Chairman Frasca: Virginia?

Boardmember Stephens: No, I'm fine.

Chairman Frasca: OK, if there are no other issues and I believe there aren't, I'd like to make a motion to accept the application as submitted.

The ARB voted to **positively recommend** the application to the Planning Board as submitted.

Motion to Approve: Thomas Frasca

Seconded: Virginia Stephens

Voice Vote: 3 to 0 with 2 vacancies

4. **ALFACOR, 291 Deans Corner Road, (Tax Map ID 78.-2-25) – Review of an Application for Site Plan Amendment**

This was a review of an application for Site Plan Amendment as referred by the Planning Board. The application contained the following documents:

1. ARB Application, prepared by Bibbo Associates, dated 7/17/20
2. Memorandum to Chairman Frasca from Bibbo Associates, dated 8/14/20
3. Three (3) Color Renderings of the Building, no preparer, undated
4. EX-1, Existing Conditions, prepared by Bibbo Associates, dated 10/31/18; last revised 5/12/20
5. SP-1, Preliminary Site Plan, prepared by Bibbo Associates, dated 10/31/18; last revised 5/12/20
6. EP-1, Entrance Plan, prepared by Bibbo Associates, dated 10/31/18; last revised 5/12/20
7. LP-1, Lighting Plan, prepared by Bibbo Associates, dated 10/31/18; last revised 5/12/20
8. LS1, Landscape Plan, prepared by Bibbo Associates, dated 10/31/18; last revised 5/12/20

Chairman Frasca: Next up is ALFACOR.

Ms. Desidero: We have Nick Gaboury from Bibbo.

Mr. Gaboury: I'm Nick Gaboury from Bibbo Associates; we're the site planning engineers for the ALFACOR project located at 291 Deans Corner Road. We've prepared a submission here for you. We've been in front of the Planning Board for close to two years now to work on this project. The site is a 31.5-acre parcel. It is located off Deans Corner Road, but the access for this project is through an existing a common driveway on 14 Fields Lane so the common driveway already serves a

couple of properties and this will be added and extended. Once into the new site we have two warehouse buildings; one larger building, building number 1, is a 450 ft. by 200 ft. warehouse building with a small office component. Building number 2 is a similar use; a combination of warehouse and office, and those dimensions are 100 ft. by 99 ft. Each of the buildings is one story in height. We've had architectural renderings prepared for this meeting. We would have liked to have had more detail available on those renderings. The week before the deadline we were hit with the tropical storm and our architect lost power for about a week and a half: power, email, and phone, so we had a little bit of trouble getting things in but we appreciate your having us on this meeting to discuss everything. I do have a couple of additional elevation views that the architect has provided me since our submission. If we'd like to screenshare those I can add some additional detail to this. What we're looking at here is the front of the building number 1 and we have a row of loading area for large interstate semitrailers and then we have a small office and employee parking area on the right side of the image there. The overall height of this structure here is 36 ft. from the first floor where the employee parking is to the roof; the top of the flat roof there. If we look at the rear of the building, we have provided a couple of alternatives here. There is one rear view here and then there's another that adds a couple of additional darker gray segments to break up the feel of the length of that building so that was an option that we gave to the ARB as something we could discuss and look at which one is preferable. In actuality, the rear of this building should be seen very little by the neighboring properties and neighboring roadways. The rear side faces the 685 corridor. It's set back from the pavement edge approximately 220 ft. from the rear of building number 1 and that directly to the highway. The driver's eye to the building as they drive past it is somewhere in the neighborhood of 600 to 700 ft. as they approach this property.

Chairman Frasca: I looked at it again today and the back end of this building, it looks like it would be substantially seen from 684 and that is part of a gateway entrance. I didn't see details as far as any proposal for berming or plantings that would be substantial.

Mr. Gaboury: We provided a planting plan as part of the submission.

Chairman Frasca: And that's good, yes.

Mr. Gaboury: To get into that a little bit: at the Planning Board Public Hearing there was a comment from a couple of the Planning Board members to add additional plantings in the rear along with the row of Norway Spruces that we've already provided at the corners of the building we were going to provide some additional maples and cherry trees, deciduous trees and plant that slope a little more naturally and try to hide that building as best as possible. Our idea on that was to gather any additional comments from this Board and then incorporate them into a final version of the landscape plan for the Planning Board. But there is also a very thick, mature wooded area between the highway and the rear of the site currently, so in our opinion this building will be tucked into the hill and be far enough away from the highway that you would barely see it in the winter maybe partially when leaves are off.

Chairman Frasca: This is our first stab at this, correct?

Mr. Gaboury: Correct, we received a referral at the last Planning Board Meeting to the ARB.

Chairman Frasca: Virginia, do you have any comments on this so far?

Boardmember Stephens: It's a massive building so I think the more screening you can give the better. The plantings component will be important and I think of the two rear facades, the one where you are breaking up those white squares on either end

is a better fit. I am not an expert when it comes to the plants and vegetations so I will defer but I would like to see more put in here.

Chairman Frasca: If I could just jump back in for a second. We had a person on our Board who was excellent at this, but as far as the caliper of the trees; a 6 to 8 ft. tree is like a few inch caliper and then the Norway Spruces, this building is 36 ft. tall and the Norway Spruces I think that I read on the plan are 8 ft.? Is that correct?

Mr. Gaboury: No, I believe the installed height of the Norway Spruces was more in the way of 16 to 18 ft. and maybe you want... Maybe Rob Alfredo who is on the call here can add some input to this. I believe he had some trees that were a fairly decent size that were kind of being reserved for this building specifically. He owns the property just to the south, which is the current contractor's yard.

Mr. Alfredo: Hi everyone. I don't know if you can hear me.

Chairman Frasca: We can hear you Rob.

Mr. Alfredo: I'm Rob Alfredo, I'm the owner. We have out on North Salem Road I have a tree farm. We have many trees. The size of these trees, because it's a local transplant, we can actually do 16 to 18 ft. trees. Anything larger than that is a high risk to move. These are very healthy, very wide and deep trees that will provide enormous cover and as Nick had stated, there is well over 100 ft. of hardwood woods between 684 and the building and the way that the building parallels 684, you won't be looking at the full width of it unless you were literally stopped on 684 or possibly in the southbound lane, which is much much further away and sits at a different elevation. It is actually, I believe, lower. So, we're very much onboard with the screening and the intent and the concern about having so much of the building exposed regardless of whether it's wintertime or whatever the condition or whatever the angle. I had spoken to Nick about... We anticipate coming back with additional trees within that graded area that you can see where the Norways are and adding some deciduous so we've got a little bit more texture going on there and not just all evergreen. But, the evergreens on the southern side, rear of the building will cover from the angle of 684 probably a minimum of 50% of the building with exception to what's higher than that 16 to 18 ft. initial planted height. We tried to put a lot of... because of the size of the building, we tried to keep the colors from being too bold, add some interest. The outside is an ash gray, it's a very light gray; it's even slightly lighter than this rendering. The corners...

Chairman Frasca: What I'd like to do is just... I was asking about the planting. I'd like to get Carla's impression of the planting: what her thoughts are on the planting and then I'd like to move on to a few more questions I need to raise.

Boardmember Lucchino: Thanks Tom. Rob and Nick, I agree with the comments on the landscaping. I think the more the better. When I looked, I'm not an expert either, but I have some extensive landscaping at my home and the deer are very hungry so anything you can do I think to have deer resistance would serve you well in the long run so that you're not replacing after they decide to make a meal out of your expensive landscaping. So that's all I would recommend to you. The building is kind of plain, both buildings, so if you can fix it up with some landscaping, I think that would be great.

Mr. Alfredo: Absolutely and I have a couple of other buildings on Fields Lane so I share your concern with the trees. We're constantly spraying and just keeping an eye out for damage, especially throughout the winters.

Chairman Frasca: As far as, again just general comments, as you said it's a pretty massive building. As far as HVAC installed, is anything going to be installed on the roof that will be visible from 684?

Mr. Alfredo: Right now that's in design Tom, in all honesty. We typically would try to keep that toward the center of the building and I think if we create a projection, we'll

see that because of the elevation in relation to 684. If there were rooftop units they would be masked by the height of the eave of the building. If not, we could offer a fence or something that may blend in on the roof. You know with this size it's hard to just do perimeter...

Chairman Frasca: I know, that's why I asked the question.

Mr. Alfredo: Yeah, yeah. I know, it's a very good question.

Boardmember Stephens: What I am hearing in a nutshell is that you're not exactly sure how the mechanicals are going to be screened as it were at the moment, but they will be on top of the building?

Mr. Alfredo: Yes, there will be RTUs on top of the building. Right now we're thinking maybe four units.

Boardmember Stephens: OK.

Mr. Gaboury: And really, I believe that should only be visible from your property, Rob, which is uphill of this site. You wouldn't be able to see those from the highway side because they are at a lower elevation.

Chairman Frasca: I guess that's your HVAC mechanicals that would be... We've used parapets and things like that in the past to block those units from visually seeing them. So, one of the concerns I would have with both the buildings would be the external mechanicals would then be, excuse the word, but littering the top of the building. Again, keeping in mind that I think we can all agree, it's going to be seen from somewhere one way or another. We've always tried to minimize that when we can. Virginia, did I cover that?

Boardmember Stephens: Yes, I think yes. So, it's a work in progress is what I'm hearing.

Mr. Alfredo: It is.

Chairman Frasca: Any comments on that?

Boardmember Lucchino: I have a couple other questions, if I can ask them Tom?

Chairman Frasca: OK, anything on the mechanicals at all?

Boardmember Lucchino: No, I agree with the points that you and Ginny made.

Chairman Frasca: OK, all right. Please feel free.

Boardmember Lucchino: OK, I saw that there were two outdoor storage areas adjacent to building number 2. What are you going... what will they look like? What are you going to store there? Will they be fenced?

Mr. Gaboury: As of right now we don't have an end-user for this site so the storage areas are just generally going to be unstriped, paved areas for outdoor storage of potentially tractor trailer containers or onsite storage for whatever the final end-user would be. We don't have fencing shown on the outdoor storage areas, however, the only neighboring property to the south there is the contractor's yard, which also has a lot of outdoor storage on that site so I think it's grouping storage in an area that's already clearly outdoor storage so it's kind of grouping it with that. That's our thoughts as of right now. Once we have an end-user maybe the storage areas are not needed or altered in some way. The storage area behind the building, all the way to the east, does have a guardrail and I know one of the comments was regarding some of the site features such as guardrails and walls; if you want to get into that right now, we can discuss those. I had a couple details printed up that I could screenshare myself, but that's going to be a timber guardrail holding back the storage area from the small stormwater retention pond below it.

Ms. Desidero: I'm afraid you're going to have to send those in for the next time. We don't allow screensharing by the applicants at this point, but if you could include it for the next meeting so the Board can see it.

Mr. Gaboury: Sure, and I'll just describe quickly: we're doing a typical timber guardrail with 8x8 in. posts put on center rail and the small retaining wall that's

running along the property line between Topspin and building number 1. That retaining wall will be a boulder freestanding wall down on the southern property line between the existing building offsite there's a small retaining wall holding that site higher than the parking area of building number 1 in the front. That's where the boulder retaining wall will be and will only be seen from this building number 1 site really. I believe the final was the trash enclosure. We have detail for that, which is very much the same trash enclosure that was approved for the other Mr. Alfredo site of BRAVCOR on Fields Lane, just to the south of the property. We would be using the typical trash enclosure that was approved there.

Boardmember Lucchino: So Nick I would, in addition, when you provide everything it's good to see if you have actual photos or at least if you have colors that helps since we're all about the way it looks so that would be really helpful. Another question I had is: is there a lighting plan or are there light fixtures?

Mr. Gaboury: We do have a light plan that was provided with our submission here.

Boardmember Lucchino: OK, somehow... I didn't see the detail.

Mr. Gaboury: I believe it's page number 3 or 4 in our submission. There are several wall-mounted lights on each of the buildings. Those are wall packs that are full cutoff, fully shielded to reduce any type of glare or issues like we talked about seeing it from 684. The lights on building number 1 will be on timers also, to turn off when the building is not in use. We have several light poles around the perimeter of the parking area and the storage areas to provide site lighting for loading and unloading and parking.

Boardmember Lucchino: Do you have pictures of those light fixtures?

Mr. Gaboury: I do have pictures here, but like Victoria said, I can't share them right now but I can provide those to the Board certainly.

Chairman Frasca: One of the things I'd like to do is I think the whole idea of tonight was to get some initial thoughts on some of the concerns we might have on the building. I think we don't have enough detail to really continue this any further unless I'm missing something.

Boardmember Lucchino: I agree with you Tom.

Chairman Frasca: I think the applicant has some work to do. I think basically the largest concern is going to be I think visibility and how it's viewed and the landscape. The building is the building. We can talk a little bit more in detail on that with further submissions. OK? Nick, are you good with this?

Mr. Gaboury: That sounds good. Are there any comments tonight that we can work on incorporating into the next submission?

Chairman Frasca: Well, I think, as I said, I mean I'll let everyone speak but my concerns... I have articulated them I think. Ginny?

Boardmember Stephens: Yes, I would agree. We want to talk about the landscaping. We want to talk about the mechanicals and their screening. I want to see cut sheets of the various light fixtures that you're going to have throughout. Those would be my top three at the moment.

Chairman Frasca: Carla?

Boardmember Lucchino: I agree, Ginny summed it up very well.

Chairman Frasca: All right gentlemen, thank you very much.

Mr. Alfredo and Mr. Gaboury: Thank you.

5. **EUROTECH, 19 Sutton Place, (Tax Map ID 78.-2-16.16) – Review of an Application for a Sign**

This was a review of an application for a Sign as referred by the Building Department. The application contained the following documents:

1. ARB Application, prepared by PW Scott Engineering, dated 6/29/20

2. "Eurotech" Colors, no preparer, undated
3. ARB1, Location Plan, prepared by PW Scott Engineering, dated 7/20/20
4. ARB2, Freestanding Sign, prepared by PW Scott Engineering, dated 7/20/20
5. ARB3, Planting Plan, prepared by PW Scott Engineering, dated 7/20/20

Chairman Frasca: OK, next on the agenda is Eurotech.

Ms. Desidero: So, we have Peder Scott joining us for the next two applications.

Chairman Frasca: Yes, he's with Eurotech and Hardscrabble, correct?

Ms. Desidero: Correct.

Chairman Frasca: OK.

Ms. Prabhakaran: Victoria, can you hear me?

Ms. Desidero: Yes, I can hear you. I have asked Peder to unmute himself but I don't hear him yet.

Engineer, Peder Scott: I did. Can you hear me?

Ms. Desidero: Yes, now we can hear you, Peder, yes.

Mr. Scott: I don't see anything on the screen yet.

Ms. Desidero: Krithika?

Ms. Prabhakaran: Yes do you see it now?

Mr. Scott: I'm on the, kind of.

Ms. Prabhakaran: Can you see it now?

Ms. Desidero: We're seeing the project application. Now we're seeing the lighting. There you go.

Ms. Prabhakaran: Yes. Too many pdfs today.

Mr. Scott: That's Hardscrabble. That's Eurotech, OK.

Ms. Prabhakaran: We're on Eurotech right now, sorry.

Mr. Scott: Yes.

Chairman Frasca: OK Peder.

Mr. Scott: So, you've seen it before in regards to plantings and enhancements to the building and at this point in time we're here before you for a sign. What we are doing is... My client has two separate companies: one called Eurotech Construction which will be occupying the building and also platform, which is the same company but they just provide the materials – that is these platforms for working on buildings in New York City while Eurotech Construction actually does the work. You have two different departments on the same sign. The sign before you is 20 sq. ft. It's located about 16 ft. back from the property line on the site and it's a one-sided sign which faces the Sutton Place roadway. Sutton Place roadway is a private roadway ending in a cul-de-sac off of Fields Lane. We have an area with a big box around it saying enlarged area below is where the sign is located. If you go from that overall site plan to what we're proposing in the box you'll see the location of the sign itself. The Ordinance requires you to put in plantings equal to two times the area of the sign and so we have a separate planting plan for this project as well as the sign itself. The sign is pretty straightforward. We've given you colors of the red in the Eurotech Construction; it's a Pantone red and the orange in the platform is Pantone orange and everything else is black and white. So, it has two colored elements in it; that is the box in platform is orange and the box in Eurotech Construction, the box to the left that's in red and that's the extent of it. These were in color so I'm not sure why they're coming up black and white. So, what we have at this juncture is that the sign is fully conforming and it will be HD foam-based body of white. The columns are 4x4 of wood with a white cladding around it. It's a premanufactured white cladding by a company called Fairway, which makes sign enclosures of vinyl, white vinyl and that slips over the 4x4 and it's assembled in that form as shown on the picture in front of you. That's the description of the signage and I could go to the plantings if you like.

So, the plantings – we have two types of plantings. We have one version which is all native and one which is decorative planting species. The client wanted a decorative planting species, but we have had some discussions in the past with your Board about going with native plants. In this particular site we could provide either version, but the synopsis of the plan is there is a bush on either side of the sign toward the rear and then in the front we have ground cover and then we have different ground covers in the corner. Behind the sign in each version we have cone flowers. So, the client, on the decorative planting, was enamored with tiger lilies. For some reason he wanted to put tiger lilies in and he wanted the color to come through in a year-round environment under the decorative species alternative. The only difference between that and the native plants is we took out the tiger lilies and put in Wildberry Heuchera, which are white colored flowers and the bushes would be St. John's Wort. I guess after our conversation with him, everything we just specified – either version is deer resistant as we qualified through our sources. Nothing is deer resistant I might add, but in regards to these two options, again the client would like a decorative planting species. He provided the plants he wanted, but we provided a native option as well. He would be happy with either version we hand him and that's my synopsis.

Chairman Frasca: Virginia, any questions?

Boardmember Stephens: No, no I would like to have been able to see the red and the orange, but as long as it's the Pantone we know exactly what it is so.

Chairman Frasca: I think that was previously submitted, wasn't it?

Boardmember Stephens: Was it?

Ms. Desidero: No.

Chairman Frasca: No? We never saw that?

Mr. Scott: We even emailed them today to make sure we had it for tonight.

Ms. Desidero: No, actually everything you emailed today was sent to Krithika. There was no color.

Ms. Prabhakaran: There was no color rendering.

Ms. Desidero: (Inaudible) rendering of the sign sent by digital format at all.

Mr. Scott: The pictures of the lettering of the signage and colors were not provided?

Ms. Prabhakaran: No.

Ms. Desidero: Not digitally.

Mr. Scott: Oh, they were dropped off. Oh, OK, they were dropped off. OK, well, the colors are orange and red and we have the numbers of them.

Ms. Desidero: Can you hold it up? Do you have it there?

Mr. Scott: Oh yeah, I have it right here. I don't know if you can focus in on it

Ms. Desidero: At least they can see it a little bit. Krithika, can you go back to the people. Hold it up... push it up Peder.

Mr. Scott: Right there?

Ms. Desidero: No, you're showing the top of the page, not the sign.

Mr. Scott: OK.

Ms. Desidero: It's a basic orange and a basic red.

Mr. Scott: Yes.

Boardmember Lucchino: (inaudible) paper copies we were sent.

Chairman Frasca: Are the colors specified?

Mr. Scott: Yes.

Chairman Frasca: Notwithstanding that they are specified and as far as the planting plan, is that an option we can leave to the owner?

Mr. Scott: Yes, he presented the decorative plans as his preferred alternative, but we prepared, on our own behalf, the native plantings. He reviewed it and he would be acceptable of either version.

Ms. Desidero: So, Tom, I think the ARB needs to make a choice and it needs to be on the approval so that when someone goes out to inspect it later, they will know which one they were supposed to put in. He wants you to choose one.

Ms. Prabhakaran: I have a question for the applicant as well: are there any sign illumination details that you're proposing?

Mr. Scott: It's not illuminated and we didn't indicate it was. The sign is not illuminated.

Ms. Prabhakaran: OK, yes, if you could state in the plan as well it would help.

Chairman Frasca: Virginia, as far as the plantings, do you have any comments?

Boardmember Stephens: No, if either of the two of you have a preference to the decorative versus native, I will happily go along.

Chairman Frasca: Well, I always prefer the native.

Boardmember Stephens: OK, good.

Chairman Frasca: That's my opinion.

Boardmember Lucchino: I would just suggest, Peder, that you take the one that is the most deer resistant. I see some boxwoods in the decorative planting plan.

When those deer, like you said, nothing is really deer resistant so I'm happy either way. I mean it's OK with me, but so you don't have to keep replacing things I'd say go with the stuff the deer don't eat if you have a choice.

Mr. Scott: Yes.

Chairman Frasca: I'll be the tiebreaker: I think we should go with the native plantings.

Boardmember Lucchino: Fine.

Boardmember Stephens: Fine with me.

Chairman Frasca: All right, so Peder, we're going to approve the sign. It's not being backlit in any fashion.

Mr. Scott: No.

Chairman Frasca: We're going to go with the native plantings.

Mr. Scott: Yes.

Ms. Desidero: So, Mr. Chair, I'm going to make those the two conditions of the approval should you vote to approve.

Chairman Frasca: Yes. I would need to; will someone make a motion?

Boardmember Lucchino: May I ask another question, Tom, before we go there?

Chairman Frasca: No problem.

Boardmember Lucchino: I thought I recently read in the sign provisions of the Town Code that dark backgrounds are preferred. Someone can correct me if I am wrong, but this is a lot of white. I think Peder, you said even the wood was covered with a white foam?

Mr. Scott: It's a white vinyl. We wanted to go with white because basically it's set so far back from the road, it's on a private cul-de-sac. Our problem is, it is so isolated and far from the roadway that we wanted it to pop out a little bit because it's not really at the elevation of the road itself, it's down below the road per the contours and so we wanted a little bit of pop there versus making it black because I think it would disappear in the background of the building etc.

Chairman Frasca: I could be incorrect but I don't think there's any provision in the Sign Code for dark-colored signs.

Boardmember Lucchino: It says dark background preferred. I just read it the other day.

Mr. Scott: You are correct.

Boardmember Lucchino: It isn't mandatory, it just says preferred. And Peder, when you sent the paper copies to us, the colors came through on the paper because I'm looking right at them.

Mr. Scott: OK, very good.

Boardmember Lucchino: And I guess considering the area and the way you described the setting and all that, I can understand why you would want a white sign. I live not too far from there so I took a look over the weekend and I can understand completely.

Mr. Scott: OK, thank you.

Chairman Frasca: OK, so getting back to the application and the approval. Do we have a motion to accept this?

Ms. Desidero: It's an approval with conditions.

Chairman Frasca: Ginny?

The ARB voted to **approve** the sign with the following conditions:

1. Sign is not illuminated;
2. Native planting plan will be followed.

Motion to Approve: Virginia Stephens

Seconded: Thomas Frasca

Voice Vote: 3 to 0 with 2 vacancies

6. HARDSCRABBLE CLUB, 22 Sutton Place, (Tax Map ID 78.-2-16.3) – Review of an Application for Site Plan Amendment

This was a review of an application for Site Plan Amendment as referred by the Planning Board. The application contained the following documents:

1. ARB Application, prepared by PW Scott Engineering, dated 8/13/20
2. Memorandum to Chairman Frasca from PW Scott Engineering, dated 8/12/20
3. S1, Pool Site Plan, prepared by PW Scott Engineering, dated 8/12/20
4. SY-2, Site Details & Landscaping, prepared by PW Scott Engineering, dated 8/12/20
5. PH, Photo Sheet, prepared by PW Scott Engineering, dated 8/12/20
6. L1, Lighting Photo-Metric Site Plan, prepared by PW Scott Engineering, dated 8/12/20

Peder Scott of PW Scott Engineering represented his client before the Board.

Chairman Frasca: So, we are on to the Hardscrabble Club.

Mr. Scott: OK, so we're going back memory lane here. This thing was approved as one of the projects on the Sutton Place project and it's a tennis club. What took place just recently is the State of New York has allowed schools to have competitions as long as they're outside. No one is willing to go inside the sports club so accordingly we are expediting an amendment to the existing site plan. We currently have two existing clay courts on the site located to the south of the project, again on Sutton Place. The intent is to add two more courts. What we did was, we spent a lot of time trying to come up with a solution to the problem we had because we had setback issues as well as some aesthetics. Setback-wise we couldn't go in the front yard setback, which is 50 ft. because of zoning restrictions so we had to push the entire project toward the rear property line. So, what we're proposing is: what exists now is a 120 x 120 ft. two court fence system of 10 ft. in height. So, we had to put something in 120 x 204, which is a collegiate size of a court to meet school athletic requirements. So, what we decided to do is put the court in, but we put something called California corners in the edges of the court to reduce the abrupt

nature of a fence arrangement. By putting all the courts into one big fence, we're able to squeeze it down to fit four courts in a smaller area. Instead of being 240 ft. long, we were able to get it to work with 204 ft. by just compressing the courts together in the smallest size possible. So, with the court in mind, we are moving toward the rear of the site and to the rear of us is Mr. Alfredo's contractor's yard, which is shown on an arial photo that we have in our submission. Mr. Alfredo's rear yard, which is right across from where our fencing and new enhancement is proposed there is a road there. So, what we have is a current lawn area to a heavy maple buffer and beyond that we have the entrance to a contractor's yard and a roadway that passes right along the property line within the side yard. So, our neighbor really isn't... We don't have a great visual impact to the neighbor because it's a heavy industrial site filled with outdoor loading bins and equipment. Now, but we do have plantings proposed to shield the fence. In collegiate sports with fencing, in the east and west direction you have to keep them open for natural light to go onto the court itself, but on a southern direction, towards Fields Lane which is about 800 ft. to the south on Sutton Place, we are proposing a heavy buffer of 10 ft. high plants. We have two options: either American holly or Skip Laurel. Both are deer resistant and both make excellent buffers. It will be a manicured planting forming a wall with limited spaces between where the courts are just to allow some light. The entrance to these new courts is toward the building side. So, you don't have anyone walking through the fencing to the south. It's just going to be a solid fence wall with this large buffering in place along the south side. We've also put another grouping on the north side where it would buffer the fencing from the existing parking of the project itself. Now, in our submission we provided you pictures of what the site is and maybe if I could digress to the PH, there we are. So, not only the court fencing is pretty much in the middle and we showed two pictures of how the fencing looks right now. The fencing will be the same fencing but in this case the corners were cut out. Also, that new stone wall you see... Well that's the courts, you see the courts how they look right now. And then, if you look to the right of that, there is a new stone wall we've built along the edge of the Alfredo property, which is the industrial park and want to extend that along our property line beyond where the courts are. So, we're going to have a brand-new wall line extending along behind the courts. But the maple trees that are there... it says proposed decorative wall on the piece of paper, the site plan. So, that decorative wall is cleaning up a wall in disrepair and basically the big maples will stay in place. So, we're pretty much pretty well buffered to the east and again to the west we have the lawn area of the property with a very similar looking fencing facade. So, we have lighting as well and the lighting basically is lighting prepared by Cree Industries and what I did is we gave you a lighting plan. If you go to the right side there's a map of the fencing, on this map, you can use this one too, it's good. OK, that's fine. So, this is a picture of the foot-candles of our proposed lighting and the fences are integrated with the lighting; that is the light poles are nested on the east and west side right in the fencing itself and on the south and north side the fences are nested in these V-shape we have in each of the courts, which are required for collegiate play so the ball doesn't bounce into someone else's court during play. So, all those little V-shapes you see there, the lighting is at the apex of the notches on the baselines of the court itself. In between the courts we also have light poles as well and the light poles are 15 ft. tall and we provided you pictures of them. They meet all the night sky criteria. The pictures are on SY-2, if I may. Yes, to the right is the lighting. And so, what we have is we're using the upper lights for the perimeter poles... there we go... the AA mount is what's going on the perimeter. Again, they are night sky compliant. The TNP mount ones are in the middle of the courts and they give you a wider based illumination and the ends, the

AA or the TMs, which are inclined; they give you one-way directional lighting. The synopsis of all the lighting is that we've kept the lighting so that everything is faced downward and in addition we don't have any spillage over the property lines more than 0.5-foot candles while we meet the collegiate level of play, which is a minimum of 60-foot candles. So, basically the court surface will glow but the perimeter will be devoid of spillage and that is the intent of the project for lighting. The lighting is all silver and the poles are 4x4 and they are 15 ft. tall with these lights mounted on top. So, if one will look at the project in the end, you're going to see big plantings on the south side about as tall as the fencing and you'll have these light poles sticking about 5 ft. higher than that facing inward toward the court and that will be the overall synopsis of the visuals on the fencing and the light poles. Again, we already have a fence there; in fact the center court of the fence of our new plan is the old fencing that remains. We're only adding fencing on to the east side, a majority is added to the east side toward the neighbor, that is the construction yard and we have less of an addition toward the west, which is where there is a lawn right now. That's the total project. I can answer any questions.

Chairman Frasca: Krithika, do you have comments about the lighting?

Ms. Prabhakaran: Right now I think you've provided court lighting, the legend, and is this your final photometric plan?

Mr. Scott: Yes, the one from Cree is the final, yes.

Ms. Prabhakaran: The one from Cree so that was the one...

Mr. Scott: That's it... right there. Yes, that's it.

Ms. Prabhakaran: No comments, I think it looks good.

Chairman Frasca: Virginia, any comments about this?

Boardmember Stephens: No, I think it's kind of a nice addition actually and looks like it's been well thought out and it's going to be a little tight when those balls roll, I can tell you that much but have at it.

Chairman Frasca: Carla, any questions?

Boardmember Lucchino: I just have one question: There is to, I think it's maybe the east side of the tennis courts, the new tennis courts Peder, there was something called phase 1 SSTS area?

Mr. Scott: Yes.

Boardmember Lucchino: What's that?

Mr. Scott: That's a septic area. That's a grass area where the septic system is existing underneath it and the reserve dedicated to the right of that. We're just protecting that with construction fence so no one will drive over it and wreck it.

Boardmember Lucchino: OK. Oh construction fence. I don't know what that is; can you explain it?

Mr. Scott: Construction fence is that orange material which is temporarily put in place to prevent a contractor from driving across a septic field with a truck. When the job is done, we just remove this orange banding around the septic area and it basically stays as lawn surface.

Boardmember Lucchino: Got it, got it. Perfect. Makes good sense. That was the only question I had. You answered everything else.

Chairman Frasca: Victoria, this is a final approval?

Ms. Desidero: So, this is a recommendation back to the Planning Board and yes, it would be final from the ARB. I do have one question, Tom, was there some sort of a choice on one of the plantings because I didn't catch that.

Mr. Scott: Yes, if I could, we showed two plans: American Holly or Skip Laurel. American Holly is more native, but Skip Laurel is a better-looking buffer. It's more... Well holly you know is dark green and they get the little red berries periodically and the Skip Laurel looks like evergreen but unfortunately it is not native. Again, we're

back to what do we go with. Skip Laurel is easier to prune. Again, it's extremely deer resistant, but is not native. American Holly, of course you know, you see it at Christmastime hanging from bows. The downside to with that is you can't prune it as well because it has those eight-pointed leaves and it has red berries growing periodically. That's the only thing that I could find that was anything close that would work native. Again, the client would rather go with the Skip Laurel but I had to show you the... the only thing I could pick from your inventory was a holly.

Chairman Frasca: Well the Skip Laurel certainly makes a lot more sense for grooming.

Boardmember Stephens: It's a maintenance issue.

Ms. Desidero: So, I would just like to ask Krithika if she could tell us which one Ashley was looking at when she looked at this and made her recommendations.

Ms. Prabhakaran: She actually didn't make a recommendation on either one. If you want, I can reach out to her.

Ms. Desidero: No, no they can decide. I just don't remember there being a choice before so I just wanted to make sure this is what she saw.

Chairman Frasca: I'm certainly partial to the Skip Laurel for grooming purposes.

Boardmember Stephens: I would agree with that.

Boardmember Lucchino: Me too. I agree.

Chairman Frasca: OK, so what we're going to do is we're going to need a motion to approve this project and we're going to indicate Skip Laurel as the preference for planting.

The ARB voted to **positively recommend** the application to the Planning Board with the following condition:

1. Skip Laurel is the ARB choice for screening.

Motion to Approve: Carla Lucchino

Seconded: Virginia Stephens

Voice Vote: 3 to 0 with 2 vacancies

Ms. Desidero: Mr. Chairman, we have an unusual situation: we have two sets of minutes, neither of them will ever have a quorum to approve so... We have had to do this previously. I have to ask the Board members to vote even though they were not at the meeting because otherwise they will never be approved. You are allowed to do that. We don't generally ask people to do it for obvious reasons, but Katherine has resigned and Mary is gone and I'll never have three.

Chairman Frasca: Well, Katherine hasn't resigned officially has she?

Ms. Desidero: Yes, she has. She said she would make herself available for tonight but after that she is officially resigned.

Chairman Frasca: OK. Is everyone OK with voting for the next minutes?

Boardmember Stephens: I didn't read them because I didn't think I would be voting on them.

Ms. Desidero: I don't know if it makes you guys feel any better but since we started the Zoom meetings, these minutes are verbatim so they are literally what everyone said. It's not like when I used to write the Minutes and sort of summarize and then you might take exception to my summary, but these are literally every word that came out of every person's mouth.

Chairman Frasca: Is there any way to abbreviate that?

Ms. Desidero: No, it's part of the Governor's Order.

Chairman Frasca: Jesus, OK.

Ms. Desidero: As long as we have Zoom meetings, the Meeting Minutes have to be verbatim. That's part of the Governor's Order.

7. APPROVE MEETING MINUTES OF MAY 27, 2020

Motion to Approve: Carla Lucchino

Seconded: Virginia Stephens

Voice Vote: 3 to 0 with 2 vacancies

8. APPROVE MEETING MINUTES OF JUNE 24, 2020

Motion to Approve: Virginia Stephens

Seconded: Carla Lucchino

Voice Vote: 3 to 0 with 2 vacancies

9. ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

Motion to Approve: Thomas Frasca

Seconded: Carla Lucchino

Voice Vote: 3 to 0 with 2 vacancies

Signed By:


Thomas Frasca, Chairman

Date:

9/23/2020

THE FULL AUDIO RECORDING OF THIS MEETING IS AVAILABLE AT:

<https://www.southeast-ny.gov/337/Planning-Board-Audio-Files>