

July 6, 2009

1

TOWN OF CORNWALL

PLANNING BOARD

JULY 6, 2009

MEMBERS PRESENT: KENNETH BRODMERKEL, ACTING CHAIRMAN
WYNN GOLD
LED KLOSKY
WILLIAM GRABE
HELEN BUNT

ALSO PRESENT: DOMINIC CORDISCO, ESQ.
PLANNING BOARD ATTORNEY

MARK EDSALL, P.E.
PLANNING BOARD ENGINEER

LESLIE DOTSON
PLANNING BOARD CONSULTANT

GARY VINSON
BUILDING INSPECTOR

ABSENT: NEIL NOVESKY, CHAIRMAN
MICHAEL LOBLANCO

REGULAR_MEETING _____

MR. BRODMERKEL: It's 7:32 in the evening, we'll start
our meeting, call the meeting to order.

BROTHERS_BARBEQUE_-_DISCUSSION

MR. BRODMERKEL: Prior to the meeting, the board spoke to a representative from Brothers Barbecue and it was the board's opinion that their pad and piece of equipment they were going to put on it was not necessary to bring before the board, that that could be handled by the Planning Department and Gary Vinson will take care of that.

9W_&_WILLOW_CONVENIENT_STORE

MR. BRODMERKEL: Additionally, we spoke about a luncheonette or convenient store at 9W and Willow which is the Warrex site, they have taken the tanks out or are going to just have convenience food items and they may put a table or two in for people to sit and have a sandwich. Again, it was our opinion, the board's opinion that the changes they were putting in place did not warrant us going through a review that one more time that could be handled by the building department and Mr. Vinson will be overseeing that for us.

COMITO

MR. CORDISCO: Mr. Chairman, we have actually one addition to the agenda, Leslie just brought to it my attention, it was actually submitted in our packets the first round of packets regarding Comito, there was a written request from Pietrzak & Pfau for a six month extension. This board had granted preliminary approval at its July meeting and has extended it once already, they're seeking another six month extension.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Yes, I would ask you has it been our standard procedure to grant this type of thing?

MR. CORDISCO: Yes, it has, it's preliminary approval, it's enabled them to get to outside agency approvals and they're well within their time period.

MR. KLOSKY: Move we grant extension to the Comito Brothers.

MR. GOLD: Second it.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Roll call.

ROLL CALL

MR. KLOSKY	AYE
MR. GRABE	AYE
MS. BUNT	AYE
MR. GOLD	AYE
MR. BRODMERKEL	AYE

MR. CORDISCO: Thank you. I apologize it was an oversight not to include it on the agenda.

APPROVAL_OF_MINUTES _____

MR. BRODMERKEL: We'd like a motion to approve the minutes.

MS. BUNT: So moved.

MR. GOLD: Second it.

ROLL CALL

MR. KLOSKY	AYE
MR. GRABE	AYE
MS. BUNT	AYE
MR. GOLD	AYE
MR. BRODMERKEL	AYE

RESOLUTIONS _____

NELSON_SUBDIVISION _____

MR. NOVESKY: We have three resolutions, first two resolutions are pertaining to something we did last month regarding Nelson minor subdivision which is a two lot subdivision on Mailler. Resolution to adopt negative declaration, so at this point in time a motion to adopt a negative declaration regarding Nelson minor subdivision.

MR. GOLD: So moved.

MS. BUNT: Second it.

ROLL CALL

MR. KLOSKY	AYE
MR. GRABE	AYE
MS. BUNT	AYE
MR. GOLD	AYE
MR. BRODMERKEL	AYE

MR. BRODMERKEL: Second motion we'd ask for is granting of the preliminary and final subdivision approval.

MS. BUNT: For Nelson?

MR. BRODMERKEL: For Nelson.

MR. GOLD: So moved.

MR. GOLD: Second it.

ROLL CALL

MR. KLOSKY	AYE
MR. GRABE	AYE
MS. BUNT	AYE

July 6, 2009

5

MR. GOLD AYE
MR. BRODMERKEL AYE

MR. BRODMERKEL: We have one more resolution but they're on the agenda so we'll do it at that point.

MR. CORDISCO: Mr. Chairman, if you would pass down the Nelson resolutions I'll make sure that Gary gets them.

YOGA_MOUNTAIN,_INC._#2009-09

MR. BRODMERKEL: Our first item folks from Yoga Mountain they're moving to a new location, you folks like to come up and talk to us?

MS. SIRICO: My name is Stephanie Sirico, this is Gail Walsh, she's the founder of Yoga Mountain. I'm the director. We have been in business since 1985 and we have had this location in Cornwall in the Village right now or I guess Cornwall-on-Hudson for about 4 years. We're looking to move our location into Main Street, 282 Main, it's a bigger space, much more open. And we're, we have our basic facility and teachers.

MR. BRODMERKEL: The plans that they submitted don't require any physical change to the facility.

MS. SIRICO: That's correct.

MS. WALSH: That's correct.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Do you folks have anything to add to this? Leslie?

MS. DOTSON: Only thing is that they need to have a public hearing scheduled because they're a special permit use. I have noted that they are fairly near to the Clark building which is on the State National Register of Historic Places. I think that the use is properly still classified as unlisted because there are no changes being made to the building itself. From the front view if you're walking by you wouldn't notice a difference, they're working within the same sign template and everything else so I think that the short form that they have submitted is fine. We have already referred this to Orange County Planning because that's required as well so I just recommend you set a hearing.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Why was it sent to Orange County

Planning?

MS. DOTSON: Because of its proximity to county highways, it's within 500 feet of Willow.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Okay.

MR. CORDISCO: As Leslie's mentioned in her memo, this is a special permitted use which requires a public hearing even though there are no proposed changes to the exterior and as a result the board needs to set a public hearing before it can consider approval.

MR. EDSALL: Inasmuch as there are no exterior improvements proposed, I have nothing to review so I'm fine with it.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Okay, so at this point, we have a mandatory public hearing because of the special use that we'll have to set. Board have any discussion?

MR. KLOSKY: I move we set a public hearing for next month on this application.

MR. GOLD: Second it.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Moved and seconded. Any discussion? If not, roll call.

ROLL CALL

MR. KLOSKY	AYE
MR. GRABE	AYE
MS. BUNT	AYE
MR. GOLD	AYE
MR. BRODMERKEL	AYE

MS. DOTSON: We would also recommend that you authorize us to prepare decisions because we don't anticipate that anything new or significant is going to be raised

July 6, 2009

8

out at the public hearing so this would save them time.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Okay.

MR. KLOSKY: So moved.

MR. GOLD: Second it.

ROLL CALL

MR. KLOSKY AYE

MR. GRABE AYE

MS. BUNT AYE

MR. GOLD AYE

MR. BRODMERKEL AYE

MR. BRODMERKEL: I'll see you folks next month.

HOLLORAN_PROPERTIES_#2004-14) _____

MR. BRODMERKEL: Next is Holloran Properties.

Mr. Patrick Brady appeared before the board for this proposal.

MR. BRADY: Mr. Chairman, members of the board, my name is Pat Brady, engineer for the applicant. We're here tonight requesting final approval. When we received preliminary, there were two conditions, one was receiving Orange County Department of Health which we have received, we received that on--

MR. EDSALL: June 29.

MR. BRADY: --June 29. And also the other condition was that we had received a signoff from New York State Parks Recreation which we have received.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Leslie, anything to add?

MS. DOTSON: The only thing that I mentioned is that there were still some small errors and incorrect labels on the zoning designation for most of the plan sheets, wherever R-3 zoning designation appears on the plans sheets 1, 2, 3 and 4.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Have you received Leslie's comments?

MR. BRADY: I did tonight, that's not, we can, we'll make those changes.

MS. DOTSON: Just in my defense, the comment was outstanding since April of 2006 so it is not a new one but you're focusing on the big issues but this is a picky little one. I still thought it would be better to have that on the plans cause it's a little confusing. That's really it. You have already dealt with SEQRA, I don't think that there are any changes

significant if any to the subdivision plans so I think that you could take action.

MR. CORDISCO: Towards that end, I have prepared a resolution that grants final approval to this subdivision, you granted preliminary approval, they have seemed to comply with the conditions in that resolution that you have before you is actually fairly simple. There are very straightforward conditions, one, they have to pay any fees that are due to the town, two, they have to make their corrections as outlined just by Leslie just now and three, they have to submit a plat for signature. The one thing that I should note however when you get final approval unlike preliminary approval which can be extended every six months with the board's approval, with final approval it's only valid for a maximum period of 360 days. The way we have been approaching this and I just mention this because we haven't had one recently is that this law provides that the final approval is valid for 180 days and then can be extended for two 90 day periods, well, what we have been doing has been to streamline that process and to grant the two 90 day extensions up front and we put right in the resolution the day that it expires. In this case, if you grant it tonight their approval would expire on July 1st of 2010.

MR. BRODMERKEL: So you have, is that built into the resolution?

MR. CORDISCO: It's built right in, they don't have to come back for the two 90 days, they know right up front you can put it in the calendar and you know if you don't get the plats signed by that date, poof, it's gone.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Mark?

MR. EDSALL: All my comments have been addressed back in April of '06, relative to public improvements there

are none since, all the lots front on an existing town road so there's no public improvement estimate nor related inspection fees so this one is quite simple, I believe it's ready for approval.

MR. BRODMERKEL: There you go. Does the board have any discussion or questions?

MR. KLOSKY: This has been thoroughly discussed in the past, it's ready to go forward.

MR. BRODMERKEL: We have given preliminary approval and they have applied with our two, complied with our two requests so they're prepared for final approval as far as--

MR. KLOSKY: I move we adopt the resolution granting final subdivision approval to the Holloran subdivision.

MR. GOLD: Second it.

ROLL CALL

MR. KLOSKY	AYE
MR. GRABE	AYE
MS. BUNT	AYE
MR. GOLD	AYE
MR. BRODMERKEL	AYE

MR. BRADY: Thank you very much. Have a good evening.

CORNWALL_CANCER_CENTER_#2009-10

MR. BRODMERKEL: Next is Cornwall Cancer Center.

Mr. Timothy J. Moot, Mr. Vincent Cepreano and Mr. Jeff Chaney appeared before the board for this proposal.

MR. MOOT: Good evening, I'm Tim Moot and Jeff Chaney, we're the project architect engineers, we're here before you tonight to review some proposed signage, basically directional signage, we want to add a few, try to get most of the signs uniform on the site. Typically, directional signs are I guess exempt from planning board review, however, we're proposing they have illuminated backlit signs so that it can easily be read.

MR. CHANEY: Visibility creates safety for the site.

MR. MOOT: We prepared a site plan, I don't know if you all have the smaller versions, maybe we can bring this closer so you can see but there's a schedule, there's various signs, some are existing, some are proposed new, some are proposed as replacement but again, the theme being to get them all to be uniform in size and nature.

MR. CHANEY: We're proposing two new signs, one along Elm, another along Laurel.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Can you point to the sign location as you describe it?

MR. KLOSKY: Yeah.

MR. CHANEY: The additional signage is near a new curb cut, an entrance into the parking lot here along Elm and then there's, there was a previously non-existing sign to the emergency entrance that we're proposing for again greater safety.

MR. GOLD: So we understand D2 is one of the new signs. Which is the other new one?

MR. CHANEY: D6, yes.

MR. KLOSKY: Can you point to D2 and D6 on your bigger map?

MR. CHANEY: D2 is, yeah, it's this right here and then D6 is the emergency signage up here to the emergency entrance.

MR. KLOSKY: Those are all double sided?

MR. CHANEY: Yes, they are directional for approaches coming from--

MR. BRODMERKEL: Either direction?

MR. CHANEY: Yes.

MR. KLOSKY: From our earlier discussions I had the impression they were a single sign but I guess not.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Leslie?

MS. DOTSON: My only questions were more procedural, I sort of pointed in the direction of the planning board attorney just because I wasn't sure whether this required referrals to anyone else with respect to SEQRA because of the location of this site next to the Quaker Meeting House. I wasn't sure whether this was ministerial action, it was really under more the building inspector or a modification of the previous one, something we already considered. But given the fact that some of it is new, some of it is replacement, I did have that question. And a subset of that question was also whether it required referral to Orange County Planning under 239.

MR. BRODMERKEL: I think the board has decided to handle this as an amendment to the previous application.

MS. DOTSON: Right, which resolves that.

MR. CORDISCO: Just in furtherance of that discussion, I don't believe any steps need to be taken in regards to SEQRA in terms of starting the SEQRA process over. The original application was deemed a Type I action, all the procedural steps that flow from Type I action were met by this board and when you're dealing with an action under SEQRA, it's just that you're dealing with an action which is construction of a cancer center and all of the pieces that flow from that. It wasn't just the site plan approval for that, it was all of the environmental concerns that are raised by that particular issue had been addressed previously. And the board did so. This will be an amendment to that approval so you wouldn't start over again with the new SEQRA process, you would just revisit your prior approval and see whether or not the construction of the signs that they're proposing create any new environmental concerns. And so when you're ready for approval, you would basically reaffirm your prior SEQRA findings or make a new one as appropriate. So I don't think that the SEQRA process needs to start over again, which is of course good news for everybody, means it's a Type I action, you can rely on previous long form EAF, you don't have to submit that again. However, because it's an amendment to a site plan and there's a formal application before the board and contemplating the board is going to make a formal approval of that, a referral I believe must be made to the County Planning Department because there's no discretion in that regard. When you have an application before the board where the original application triggered referral to the County Planning Department, an amendment of that application would also trigger the referral.

MR. BRODMERKEL: This was triggered because of?

MR. CORDISCO: It's within 500 feet of a county road.

MS. DOTSON: It abuts a state highway.

MR. BRODMERKEL: State highway, yeah, I couldn't think of a county road.

MR. CORDISCO: Quaker in front of that location, that's correct. So procedurally I think it's good news and SEQRA we'll have to wait 30 days on the referral to the County Planning Department.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Mark?

MR. EDSALL: In my comments I broke the review into two sections for the board's assistance in their review. There's two sight signs as they describe code does provide that in this specific case because there are multiple entrances more than a set 300 foot apart, they are allowed to have the second sign, sign S1 exceeds the permissible square footage even with it being assumed as a single sign face but the sign predates the current sign regulations so that becomes pre-existing nonconforming. I'm assuming we could acknowledge for the record that both signs are single sided, I don't believe there's sign text on the back of either one of them.

MR. CHANEY: Correct.

MR. EDSALL: So they are single sided and as I said, the new sign meets the code, the old sign pre-exists the code.

MR. BRODMERKEL: I'm sorry, I'm looking at the D1 and my question is is it a two sided sign?

MR. EDSALL: It's S1 and S2 are the sight signs.

MR. CHANEY: The D prefixes are the directional.

MR. EDSALL: In addition to the two sight signs, they've got a total of eight directional signs, I believe there's two existing, two new and four being replaced or modified, I believe that's correct. Those directional signs are purposely very discretionary in the code to allow for specific uses for specific traffic conditions for specific site plan arrangements, the flexibility to allow signs so that vehicle movement flows freely and gets to the specific location it's intended. In this case, it's a little more critical because the uses are in fact critical care with an emergency room at two in the morning you darn well if you have an emergency want to be able to find the emergency room rather than pulling into a dead-end parking lot. So this is the case where the code is helpful in allowing you the discretion and the number location and size and so on. I only posed three questions just so that you will have reviewed the application, I believe thoroughly S1 are all the signs necessary or are they in excess, so as long as you all agree that the eight are needed and that the locations are legitimate you can move on to the issue of the sizing of the signs and in many cases that's a function of how much information is on the sign and the size of the text so that it's legible and they have given you elevations of each sign so that you can make that determination. And last but not least, special condition of illumination whereas normally directional signs on retail establishments and office establishments are not preferred to be illuminated in this particular case the emergency nature of the facility may in fact cause the need for some or all of the directional signs to be illuminated. Counsel has advised that the sign code does allow you flexibility to make that determination so it's just a matter of looking at the signs and speaking to the applicant so

that you can verify that you're convinced that in fact that is the case. Last comment I made cautioned them that the way Cornwall sign ordinance is written it doesn't provide for a mandatory setback from property lines. The reason it's like that is because property lines in many cases vary quite a bit depending on the right-of-way width, it's a functional code basically says you can put the sign on your property but it can't obstruct pedestrian traffic and cannot obstruct sight distance, so even if the board okays your placement from a layout standpoint from their review which doesn't include sight lines if in fact you place the sign and it causes an obstruction of sight distance and it violates the code in its physical installation you'd have to move it. So just make sure when you put these in place you don't create a problem with sight distance which would be for your own people in fact so I don't believe any of them will obstruct pedestrian traffic, just obstruct sight distance from the entrance or exits so that's all I have to bring to your attention.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Question for you, Mark, regarding this sight distance there was a letter or a reference by one of the folks who live in the community regarding sight distance in a truck and it is my understanding that our Highway Department Supervisor checked it out, is that correct?

MR. EDSALL: That was, we did receive a letter, I have not been out there as of yet, my intention was to see how they make out tonight and then deal with it as part of the reconstruction re-establishment of all the signs, so I know Mr. Conley was out there, apparently his initial review was that his belief is that there is not a problem but we will doublecheck it and if there's a need to shift things we'll work with them on the installation.

MR. BRODMERKEL: But the initial review by the Highway Department was it's okay?

MR. EDSALL: Correct.

MR. MOOT: Can you tell us which sign that was?

MR. EDSALL: Not sure I know which one.

MR. BRODMERKEL: D3 is my understanding.

MR. EDSALL: Might have been D3 so it may have in fact if D3 is being modified and they want to enhance--

MR. VINSON: The complaint wasn't in an automobile, the complaint was in a higher vehicle that when you're up higher that the sign obstructs your view.

MR. CHANEY: That's the intersection of Elm and Laurel, I believe.

MR. VINSON: So it's vehicles that are higher up in versus an automobile.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Further review will occur?

MR. EDSALL: We'll look at that, there is room for D3 to shift if it's needed but that's it. I would suggest that you just so you do due diligence you consider those three issues and see how you make out.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Thank you. Board have any questions?

MS. BUNT: I don't have any.

MR. GOLD: Yeah, these are now we were led to believe these are single sided signs, now we're being told they're double sided signs?

MR. MOOT: S2 is a new single sided sign.

MR. GOLD: Right now, I'm looking at it only because

it's laid out, I'm looking at the directional signs you've got all these signs spec'd out 4 x 6 feet but if I look at your diagram, D2 only has two lines Cancer Center Parking and Hospital Parking, D3 has four different directions.

MR. CHANEY: It's a standard sign size that we will not exceed.

MR. GOLD: So what you're telling me is the biggest one will be 4 x 6 but some of them will be smaller than that?

MR. CHANEY: Yes.

MR. GOLD: You haven't told us, that was the clarification I was looking for, now it makes sense. Sign D1, which is an existing sign which according to this you're replacing the existing sign is 6 x 8 feet, maybe I'm missing something here, but there's an empty box under illumination and under size, what size is the one going, D1 going to be and will it be illuminated?

MR. CHANEY: It was left blank because we're not changing that sign so--

MR. MOOT: That was the pre-existing sign.

MR. GOLD: So--

MR. CHANEY: We'd only be replacing the sign plates, the identification.

MR. GOLD: Is that the same with the D8 then as well?

MR. CHANEY: We will not modify that sign at all, D8.

MR. GOLD: On the site sign, S1 existing is 6 x 8 feet, apparently you're not changing the size of that?

MR. CHANEY: That's correct, we're not modifying the sign at all.

MR. GOLD: All right, now, all the directional signs are going to be two sided signs?

MR. CHANEY: They are.

MR. GOLD: What material are they made out of?

MR. CHANEY: Aluminum, they're going to make match the signage that's currently there.

MR. GOLD: These are back lit illuminated?

MR. CHANEY: Yes.

MR. GOLD: Is it a plastic?

MR. CHANEY: The name plates are plastic, yes.

MR. GOLD: All right, thank you.

MR. GRABE: I was listening to Wynn, are you replacing all the replacement signs are going to be 4 x 6?

MR. CHANEY: Maximum size would be 4 x 6.

MR. GRABE: So you don't know really what size the signs are going to be but they are not going to exceed 4 foot by 6 foot?

MR. CHANEY: Correct, the signs that have required the most directional information will be 4 x 6 but none will exceed that.

MR. GRABE: All right.

MR. EDSALL: Am I correct just so the record is clear that the top section which identifies St. Lukes

Cornwall Hospital is the same size from all the directional signs?

MR. CHANEY: Correct.

MR. EDSALL: And you add panels under it based on the amount of direction you're giving?

MR. CHANEY: That's correct.

MR. KLOSKY: My ongoing concern is with the sort of look and feel of the entrance to the town and the adjacent historical structure which is there, I think that three brightly illuminated relatively tall signs along Elm Street are probably unnecessary. I like the idea of lighting the emergency entrance of course as Mark mentions public safety has to come first but I think the fact that you've got bright lights over in the emergency area and you've got the illuminated signs over there that's quite visible from if I'm not mistaken, somebody correct me if I'm wrong, I think you can see pretty well back in there from Laurel and it just it doesn't really seem consistent with me to those three signs along I think it's Laurel right there in the front or Elm?

MR. CHANEY: Elm.

MR. KLOSKY: Along Elm in front is not I'm not really in favor of seeing those illuminated.

MR. CHANEY: The current D3 is illuminated though.

MR. KLOSKY: Yeah, I guess I'm just, these look a little bit like a retail sort of, they're similar to a retail type of signing and that's not something that we have ever had along that section of our town. It is adjacent to a historic structure, when we put the people across the street at the, what's the name of the project across the street, Leslie?

MS. DOTSON: Canterbury Green.

MR. KLOSKY: --we had fairly significant light pollution and concerns about lighting that went into their SEQRA review. And we also considered it as part of this application, I think lighting back in the area of the emergency room makes sense but three signs along elm number one, I'm not sure why three are required along that short stretch of road and additionally if you light all of those it's going to considerably change the look and feel of that stretch there next to the historic structure.

MR. CHANEY: The height is a function of again visibility and we anticipated snow and that would be at a certain height greater visibility to vehicular traffic, I think we have perhaps flexibility in at least some discretion in making it more, well, you know, within the landscaping.

MR. KLOSKY: For me, the issue is more the illumination, we don't really want to encourage a brighter, a brighter glitzier Cornwall, especially adjacent to a historic structure. So that's not something I'm in sort of a, I don't see the great gain that goes along with illuminating signs that lead to a parking lot for a daytime use facility which is the cancer facility. Lighting the emergency room signs absolutely support that, think it's a great idea, there's plenty of light back there already, you know, there's going to be the big white "H" signs that people are looking for already, so those signs along Elm there are just I'm not in support of illuminating those signs.

MR. GOLD: I have a question specifically about D3, unfortunately, the picture you provided doesn't show the sign, it barely shows anything. According to you, the current D3 sign is illuminated at what appears to

be at corner of Elm and Laurel?

MR. CHANEY: No, it's not, it looks, it's a regular street sign.

MR. GOLD: I can't see it so I have no idea.

MR. CHANEY: Unfortunately, with the reproduction better reproduction is on the board.

MR. GOLD: You're proposing that that sign will be an illuminated sign?

MR. CHANEY: Yes.

MS. DOTSON: Instead of being in the area between the sidewalk and the street it would be next to the sidewalk.

MR. MOOT: Opposite side of the sidewalk.

MS. DOTSON: So it would be set further back.

K[]e[]p

*MR. GOLD: I guess the other concern I have with that specific sign and I'm not as bothered about the illumination as Led is, I'm concerned that that be placed so that when you're trying to make a left turn from Laurel onto Elm which many of us do when we're coming off 9W that you be able to clearly see down Elm Street.

MR. CHANEY: That was what was being brought up.

MR. GOLD: I wanted to amplify that point that concerns me.

MR. MOOT: We can move that one back.

MR. GOLD: So by moving it back?

MR. MOOT: You can so you're not--

MR. GOLD: Does it then become superfluous because it's not readily visible from Elm and can it be illuminated? I'm not suggesting that you need to but I'd like to consider that.

MR. MOOT: I guess the intent is that somebody on Elm could see the turn here for emergency, it doesn't say emergency.

MR. KLOSKY: I guess I'm seeing eight signs in a relatively short stretch of road, all of which are going to be illuminated and I think that's going to look hideous, I want to be straight with you, I want to share my opinion with you directly, that's my feeling.

MR. CHANEY: Currently, the signage isn't uniform and we're trying to approach something that's consistent.

MR. BRODMERKEL: What's the wattage of the bulbs inside?

MR. CHANEY: I don't know voltage.

MR. BRODMERKEL: I'm sure they're fluorescent.

MR. CHANEY: We're using the same design as what's currently there.

MR. BRODMERKEL: That would go into answering Led's concern if they're 400 watts inside one of these things then we're pretty bright but if it's two 20 watt bulbs--

MR. CHANEY: Well, intention of the signage is not to produce light, it's to light the sign.

MR. BRODMERKEL: I agree with the intention however--

MR. GOLD: Is it possible to consolidate D2 and D3 and eliminate a sign, I mean, you may be able to do that graphically the signs look like they're maybe 30 feet apart?

MS. DOTSON: Or if you could eliminate D1 even because if you put D2 on the other side of the driveway would that not--

MR. EDSALL: D1 is the landmark to get you in off Laurel or Quaker Avenue if anything D2 becomes excessive.

MR. GOLD: Well, one of the two.

MR. EDSALL: D3 is critical to get you to turn off Elm, off Laurel.

MR. MOOT: Yes, it says emergency on it.

MR. EDSALL: So D2 if you had to kill one on Elm that's probably the one you can eliminate and as far as illumination D4, D5 and D6 really don't serve nighttime emergency, they serve daytime functions.

MR. KLOSKY: I agree.

MR. EDSALL: So I'll just put that on the table that 7 I think is critical, 8 is critical.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Is there street lighting on both?

MR. MOOT: Both streets.

MR. EDSALL: Yes, I'm not sure that they're concurrent with the sign location but there's street lighting on both roads.

MR. BRODMERKEL: D1 location is as far as I can see strictly advertisements.

MR. CHANEY: There's directional information.

MS. DOTSON: They are proposing to put it there, yes, and it will actually be much subtler in a way because there's more directional information than they are proposing to put on it.

MR. BRODMERKEL: And that would be seen coming off of?

MR. CHANEY: Quaker.

MR. KLOSKY: If perhaps working with our planning consultant to try to lower the visual impact of the signs along Elm.

MR. MOOT: Yes.

MR. GOLD: As you're considering our suggestions, I have the same comment about D6 and D7 as I do about D2 and D3, seems like an awful lot of sign in a short span of road, perhaps there's a way to eliminate one.

MR. CHANEY: I think here the intent was at each entrance into the facility that some direction be given as to what--

MR. GOLD: But all D6 is telling me go another 20 feet and there's the emergency entrance. I realize it says something about proceeding, I'm not all that terribly concerned about it but being fairly familiar with the layout here I'd be happier if there was a way to consolidate those two signs as well and I think Led and I are pretty much on the same page, we'd like to see if your signs, we don't want to defeat your purpose but if you can accomplish it with fewer signs.

MR. BRODMERKEL: If I can interject, one of the purposes of those two signs is to say ambulances only here and everybody else here and that's what they're

trying to do because that's what's going on.

MR. CHANEY: I agree, thank you.

MR. KLOSKY: Maybe you can take a look at the existing illumination and work with that and try to if there's a streetlight right there.

MR. CHANEY: I think with the street lights we didn't think that the signs were contributing anymore than the light level that's currently there.

MR. KLOSKY: It's a visual, they really will pop out, I think that's what you want, I mean, that's good for an ambulance driver trying to get to the emergency room but perhaps now at all the locations that you have specified.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Board have consolidated thoughts?

MS. BUNT: Can we say which ones, do we have the power to say this one can be lit, that D1 can't be lit or this one has to be removed?

MR. CORDISCO: Yes, you have that discretion.

MS. BUNT: Because I do agree those three lit signs right in a row there.

MR. GOLD: Do we have the discretion to say come back with a modified plan?

MS. DOTSON: Yes.

MR. KLOSKY: Based on the input from this month's meeting that's what I suggest.

MR. EDSALL: I would suggest that you try to reach a consensus so what you send to the county or did it go to the county?

MS. DOTSON: It hasn't yet.

MR. EDSALL: Why don't you try to come up with a plan that when you send it to the county it reflects your direction.

MR. GOLD: Is that our responsibility or theirs?

MR. EDSALL: I think if you can come to a consensus they'll understand what you tell them.

MR. GOLD: Okay.

MR. EDSALL: We have talked about D2 maybe being unneeded, we talked about D3 being shifted although all signs will be field verified, D4, D5 and D6 clearly we said may not have critical need for lighting and they might even be, D6 might not be needed, I think the rest of them we haven't really picked on.

MR. MOOT: What if we were to say the, not saying, well, if we did the lighting out at D4, 5 and 6 then would we really need more review on that?

MR. EDSALL: You're here anyway so--

MR. KLOSKY: The lighting at D4, 5 and 6 is not a concern, it's the lighting at D1, D2 and D3 which is the concern to me.

MR. EDSALL: D1's lit now, I believe.

MR. MOOT: And D3 we want to have lit because it tells somebody emergency.

MR. CORDISCO: It's to turn at that corner.

MR. EDSALL: Eliminating D2 is good progress on your issue, Led, and D1's already lit and it's pretty much I

don't think you're changing the size.

MR. MOOT: All we're doing is words.

MR. EDSALL: That's been that way for quite a while.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Eliminating D2 is defeating a purpose of putting an entrance there which was to get people to enter from Elm rather than going around the turn.

MR. EDSALL: Possibly it could stay but not be illuminated.

MR. BRODMERKEL: That may be but they need a sign there.

MR. EDSALL: Makes sense.

MR. BRODMERKEL: That was the concept of trying to eliminate that.

MR. GOLD: Does anyone know what the real distance is between the corner and that entrance?

MR. MOOT: Not really.

MR. EDSALL: Couple hundred feet at the most, 150.

MR. BRODMERKEL: We specified it.

MR. GOLD: I still think we can consolidate those signs.

MR. KLOSKY: There is no reason to eliminate D2, 4 and 5.

MR. EDSALL: What I don't want to have happen someone misinterprets the arrow to turn left turning into the new entrance as being the emergency room.

MR. BRODMERKEL: I would disagree, I think that they need D2 and 3.

MR. EDSALL: D2 should be on the other side of the driveway and not illuminated.

MS. DOTSON: Yes, right.

MR. KLOSKY: If it's not illuminated, I don't care that much.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Yeah, D2 would serve better purpose on the other side of the driveway, he's absolutely correct there.

MR. MOOT: And no light because--

MR. EDSALL: Yes.

MR. CORDISCO: It's a daytime parking lot.

MR. KLOSKY: If S2 is lit during the day, that kind of draws people towards that and I don't know that S2 actually in the middle of the night if it was lit up until 10 o'clock in the evening, that's one thing but lighting S2 late into the night at two in the morning you're just going to draw people to S2 and I don't know what they're going to do when they get there.

MR. ESDALL: S2 can be on a timer.

MR. KLOSKY: Right. S2 will fool somebody into going up into the turnaround because it looks pretty official.

MR. EDSALL: It could be on a timer.

MR. EDSALL: So we're moving D2 and not illuminating it, we're shifting D3 in the field as needed for sight distance.

MR. MOOT: That stays lit.

MR. EDSALL: S2 is going to be on a timer. What about D4, 5 and 6?

MR. KLOSKY: Four and 5 didn't need to be lit, I don't think again it's daytime use mostly.

MR. MOOT: Five designates handicapped parking.

MR. BRODMERKEL: D5 would pertain to parking for visitors in the winter, sun goes down at 4, 4:30, visitors parking is on till 8 o'clock at night.

MR. KLOSKY: Maybe putting it on a timer as well then.

MR. BRODMERKEL: That would be fine.

MR. MOOT: Like how long after hours would you want to see the timer set?

MR. BRODMERKEL: An hour would be fine.

MR. MOOT: Close of business?

MR. BRODMERKEL: Close of business would be visiting hours.

MR. CORDISCO: Like an hour afterwards.

MR. KLOSKY: Shut off at 10 o'clock.

MR. BRODMERKEL: When does visiting hours end?

MR. MOOT: Nine.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Then 10.

MR. MOOT: So S2 and D5 on timers off at 10, D4 was no

light.

MR. CORDISCO: Correct.

MR. MOOT: Now we're at D6.

MR. BRODMERKEL: The purpose of that and I'm not sure you gentlemen are completely aware of what the answer should be I understand it as ambulances only in this entrance?

MR. CHANEY: Correct.

MR. EDSALL: D6 is just the receiving and pushing you along for emergency and make a left turn at, D7 will get you in the emergency that one's going to be illuminated, keep in mind the sign face is changing.

MR. BRODMERKEL: D6 just tells you emergency, go to the next entrance.

MR. CHANEY: Right.

MR. MOOT: D7 is the ambulance emergency.

MR. GOLD: Emergency and ambulance both going to D7, can we at least make D6 not illuminated because you shouldn't be receiving after dark.

MR. MOOT: Can we just eliminate one?

MR. CHANEY: No, it's a whole back panel.

MR. MOOT: So they make the corner and they just look for the next emergency.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Mark, is that supposed to be a one way through there, the emergency room entrance?

MR. EDSALL: No, when they're in a rush, they come any

way they want and to be honest with you, even though it's the intent of that parking area next to D6 and D7 is for doctors and ambulances, a lot of times people discharge emergency patients from their personal vehicles and then move their car so D6 to me for lack of confusion should probably just have receiving on it cause you're going to go another 50 feet and see D7.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Then we wouldn't need it illuminated.

MR. EDSALL: Right.

MR. KLOSKY: They're going to go to the illuminated sign for the ER visits.

MR. EDSALL: D7 is going to get you in.

MR. KLOSKY: By not having too many lights you're actually helping out.

MR. EDSALL: I think so, there's more confusion if you have too many choices so D6 could just say receiving and not be illuminated.

MR. MOOT: Right and D7 would be?

MR. EDSALL: D7 gets you where you gotta be.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Does that sit well with the board?

MR. MOOT: And D8 stays lit.

MR. EDSALL: D8 is fine.

MS. BUNT: I'm good.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Changes all right with you?

MR. KLOSKY: Yes.

MR. GRABE: Yes.

MR. KLOSKY: Thank you.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Board goes along with the modifications that were mentioned.

MR. EDSALL: I've got all the notes I'll make sure that when they resubmit it in my e-mail we'll doublecheck it before it goes to the county and comes back to you for final next month.

MR. BRODMERKEL: We'll approve it and it will be part of the original as an amendment. Okay, gentlemen, do you have any further questions for us?

MR. MOOT: No.

MR. KLOSKY: Thanks for working with us.

MR. CORDISCO: Site plan amendment you need to determine whether or not you're going to require a public hearing, public hearing is discretionary, you could waive it, you already had a public hearing of course on the cancer center itself, it would be only related to the signage that we just discussed.

MR. GOLD: When we held the public hearing, I don't remember was this issue, was the issue of signage raised?

MR. CORDISCO: Not that I recall.

MR. KLOSKY: I'm always in favor of a public hearing when the timing makes it possible, especially given the sensitivity of the hospital issues for the last few years.

MR. GRABE: Public hearing.

MR. GOLD: I'm in favor of a public hearing.

MS. BUNT: Public hearing.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Okay, I would say I'm not but the board has made a decision.

MR. VINSON: We're going to have a public hearing in August.

MR. CORDISCO: You should have a motion then to require a public hearing and that could be authorized for your August meeting.

MR. KLOSKY: Assuming that the changes are made.

MR. EDSALL: It's not as if they're being held up because we have to wait for the county anyway.

MR. KLOSKY: Move we authorize a public hearing for next month.

MR. CEPREANO: Can we make a request there's one building sign the S2?

MR. GOLD: Second it.

ROLL CALL

MR. KLOSKY	AYE
MR. GRABE	AYE
MS. BUNT	AYE
MR. GOLD	AYE
MR. BRODMERKEL	AYE

MR. CEPREANO: Is it possible for S2 if we can do a separate submission because that's a building sign for the cancer center and we're just about ready to complete that and go for our C.O. so I don't know if this process may take a little bit longer?

MR. BRODMERKEL: You think the cancer center will be reaching C.O. status before next month?

MR. CEPREANO: Yes.

MR. KLOSKY: It's not a separable action.

MR. CEPREANO: We submit the building sign separate and get a permit for it, an amendment for it, we'll still submit, resubmit all the other signs.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Gary, what's your knowledge of their status?

MR. VINSON: With the hospital, the applicant is free to file for a permit for the sign that he's referring to.

MR. EDSALL: The only reason they're here is because of the number of directional signs the code allows, Gary has the option of referring it to the board, relative to S2, if that was the only issue on the table, Gary could have processed it administratively as a sign permit.

MR. VINSON: But I warned them about all the directional signs.

MR. EDSALL: So I think that the positive thing is that the board really has no concern about S2 and you have resolved the issue of a timer then Gary could just proceed with the permit based on some input.

MR. BRODMERKEL: I would advise you to put it on a timer.

MR. CEPREANO: Will do.

MR. BRODMERKEL: Otherwise, it will be back. We have a

July 6, 2009

37

motion and a second. Is there further discussion?
Roll call.

ROLL CALL

MR. KLOSKY	AYE
MR. GRABE	AYE
MS. BUNT	AYE
MR. GOLD	AYE
MR. BRODMERKEL	AYE

MR. KLOSKY: I move to adjourn.

MR. GOLD: Second it.

ROLL CALL

MR. KLOSKY	AYE
MR. GRABE	AYE
MS. BUNT	AYE
MR. GOLD	AYE
MR. BRODMERKEL	AYE

Respectfully Submitted By:

Frances Roth
Stenographer