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It does show the location of buildings. Some extent it shows
the -- whether they're single story or multi-story
buildings, but it doesn't show parking areas. It
doesn't show driveways. It doesn't show landscaping,
lighting, drainage and all those things that are
really best dealt with at the time of the site plan.

Because this is a Master Plan as well,
the Master Plan really isn't intended to dictate a
design option for a property. Merely to
provide an illustrative basis for the plan. And
that's what this is trying to do here. Along the
time that a picture is worth a thousand words, where
there's confusion or misunderstanding in the text
someone could refer to this plan. But, again, the
intent is not of this plan to limit the Hospital to
precisely what is depicted on the plan. It's
tended only to be illustrative.

As to the boundaries of the Hospital
zone, as we said before they're not proposed to
change. As to land uses, they're not proposed to
change substantially, deleted a few land uses from
the current zoning in the plan because, frankly,
they're never going to happen. But, again, that was
the same in the prior draft as what you're seeing
now.
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for setbacks and height and use, and a little bit of
the history. I then move into the background to the
amendment which starts at the bottom of that page.
Much of this you've already seen. I won't belabor
that. But basically provides some history of the
Hospital, the ongoing development of the Hospital and
a recognition of the service that the Hospital
provides and the Planning Board's consensus that the
Hospital is a needed service and needs to upgrade its
facility. While taking some recognition of the
location of the Hospital in the residential area and
the impacts to the residential area. And, again, the
focus is on balancing, meeting the needs of both the
Hospital and the residents, understanding that in no
situation can this be a perfect balance. It's always
going to be the best effort we can make at it, but
it's what it is.

I then made part of the plan goes on to
deal with the future development policies and
standards. And I've included on page 3 of the plan,
which illustrates the option six that I referred to
before.

And I note that that plan is only
schematic in nature, doesn't provide a lot of detail.
It does show the location of buildings. It does
shows the extent of buildings.
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02:31  1 inefficiencies that added areas. And how what we
02:31  2 were calculating and including in those figures,
02:31  3 which is slightly different than what we have in the
02:31  4 last plan. But, essentially, it's the same.
02:31  5 The plan goes on to limit the total
02:31  6 floor area of the Hospital to 1,170,000 square feet
02:32  7 not counting the parking decks or rooftop areas.
02:32  8 In addition we've added a provision
02:32  9 that limits the total parking at the Hospital to
02:32 10 approximately 2,000 parking spaces. There was a
02:32 11 provision therein that says we need to include a
02:32 12 certain level of flexibility. And this is the same
02:32 13 as we have before where if the Hospital were to need
02:32 14 the increase beds we would allow that, however we
02:32 15 would require a compensatory offsetting in intensity
02:32 16 by lowering the site activity in some other component
02:32 17 so that in the end it all balanced out. Similarly if
02:32 18 the floor area of the high activity uses were to
02:32 19 increase such as outpatient area, we'd require some
02:32 20 other compensatory reduction in intensity at the
02:32 21 Hospital, all with the same concept of maintaining
02:32 22 the same intensity of use that exists today.
02:33 23 The second main section in the policies
02:33 24 relates to building mass and coverage. And, again,
02:33 25 this changed because of the reconfiguration of the

02:34  1 footprints were changed significantly so the amount
02:34  2 of land area being covered by buildings is
02:34  3 significantly less than in the prior draft.
02:34  4 Building height is the next section in
02:34  5 the Master Plan. To accommodate the increased
02:35  6 setbacks which I'll talk about in a minute, as well
02:35  7 as the reduced building coverage, the new plan goes
02:35  8 up, rather than out. And by that I mean the plan
02:35  9 would allow for taller buildings, increase the
02:35 10 buildings by one story in height, in return for
02:35 11 getting a better setback or bigger setback and a
02:35 12 reduced amount of coverage by buildings that reduced
02:35 13 amount of improvement coverage by buildings and
02:35 14 pavement, more landscaping in other words. This plan
02:35 15 now calls for 70 feet and five stories for the
02:35 16 buildings, plus the rooftop mechanical equipment,
02:35 17 whereas before it was 56 feet and four stories. So
02:35 18 it went up 14 feet in height, which is the one story
02:35 19 level. This applies to the principal buildings. The
02:35 20 parking decks were also reconfigured as part of this
02:36 21 changed concept, so that at this point in time the
02:36 22 permitted height of the parking decks including the
02:36 23 parapet wall, which would need to be 7 feet tall, to
02:36 24 mitigate any visual impact from rooftop parking,
02:36 25 would be the total of 45 feet, including the parapet
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02:33  1 option as well. In addition, we're now including
02:33  2 areas in this regulation that were not included
02:33  3 before. And I note particularly the inclusion of
02:33  4 rooftop areas that are enclosed by a higher screen
02:33  5 wall or a parapet wall by the top level of deck or
02:33  6 rooftop penthouse areas which were not counted in the
02:33  7 calculation in the prior draft.
02:33  8 This area is limited to 1,025,000
02:33  9 square feet located at or above grade. And the
02:33 10 coverage of buildings to a range of 30 to 35 percent
02:33 11 of the lot area. Again, that depends upon what we're
02:33 12 including in that coverage restriction and how we're
02:34 13 calculating that.
02:34 14 An example would be a covered walkway,
02:34 15 if that were to be included in coverage than the
02:34 16 figures would go up. If it's not, then they would go
02:34 17 down. So that's really to -- given as a range so
02:34 18 that when we work out the details in the ordinance we
02:34 19 have some flexibility at that time. And then adding
02:34 20 to that the coverage by parking decks is 8 percent.
02:34 21 I should note the coverages were
02:34 22 significantly greater in the prior draft of this
02:34 23 document. And as part of the change to option six
02:34 24 buildings -- footprint of buildings, if you will, was
02:34 25 reduced significantly, particularly the parking deck
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02:36  1 for the parking area.
02:36  2 The next section relates to yards and
02:36  3 building setbacks. As I mentioned before, these have
02:36  4 been increased in a number of situations,
02:36  5 particularly from Van Dien and Linwood Avenue, the
02:36  6 setbacks have been greatly increased.
02:36  7 And, again, based upon the concept plan
02:36  8 that was presented earlier in the plan, the new
02:36  9 minimum setbacks would be 200 feet from Linwood
02:36 10 Avenue for all buildings. From Van Dien it's
02:36 11 120 feet for the North Building; 100 feet for the
02:36 12 West Building, 85 feet for the Phillips deck and
02:36 13 200 feet for other buildings.
02:36 14 I have not laid out in precise detail
02:37 15 in the Master Plan where these setbacks would apply,
02:37 16 how far the North Building extends. Again, partially
02:37 17 for flexibility and partially because the Master Plan
02:37 18 is really more of a concept document. The ordinance
02:37 19 is where the precision and the details are going to
02:37 20 need to be laid out.
02:37 21 Concerning the setbacks from the
02:37 22 Stielen Avenue properties, the setbacks are 60 feet
02:37 23 for the North Building; 120 for the Cheel Building;
02:37 24 130 for the South Building; and 80 feet from the
02:37 25 Phillips deck. And then abutting Ben Franklin School
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property 40-feet is the setback.

I know in the plan that these setbacks
don't apply to any subsurface parking decks or any
subsurface building areas. Only to areas that are
above grade.

The improvement coverage is buildings
and paved areas essentially. And in the last draft
this was 90 percent of the lot would be either
buildings or pavement which means only 10 percent
landscaping. At this point this time, I recommend
the standard of 60 percent which is a significant
reduction. This was accomplished through, as we have
already discussed, by the buildings going up, having
greater setbacks, having more parking underground or
in decks and less surface parking. As a result of
that 50 percent -- 90 percent is 50 percent more than
60 percent in this plan. So we can see that's a
significant increase in landscaped area. That,
again, doesn't count green roofs on top of decks. In
other words they don't count against that 60 percent,
only buildings and paved areas.

Buffers and site landscaping. This
changed somewhat through the addition of greener
roofs, as well as the increase setbacks of buildings,
as well as some additional treatment in the lower
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areas and along the rear of Steilen Avenue
properties. Much of this is the same, but the buffer
depths on Linwood Avenue would be 20 feet; the buffer
deptths of Van Dien would be 20 feet with additional
buffer depths near the taller buildings; adjacent to
Steilen Avenue properties 20 foot buffer depth along
the sound barrier wall.

It also talks about, in the plan about,
the green roof concept and what that's all about.
And about special treatment of the surface areas,
meaning the loading areas, the emergency department,
the receiving areas, as well as mitigation of noise
and other impacts through sound barriers, plantings
and so forth.

Parking and access is the next section
in the Master Plan. In the plan we continue the
original standard of .425 parking spaces per bed.
However, we have added some comments noting that
hospitals are changing, going more towards an
out-patient type operation and that this is something
that may be considered in establishing a parking
standard. Instead of relying solely on number beds,
as beds become less and less, meaning inpatient beds
become less and less of a primary function of the
Hospital and outpatient takes a more prominent role,
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we may need to have a different standard or
additional standard that reflects that more
out-patient type of operation. We have not in the
plan determined what that would be at this time.
Again, the parking limitation of 2,000
parking spaces, which was already mentioned. The
intensity of use section of the plan is repeated here
again at a maximum number, not as a minimum.
We've also added provisions that would
not limit the location of off-site parking for the
Hospital. Currently the code requires that if
parking is off-site it be located within a certain
distance. The problem here is that we have
residential areas surrounding the Hospital and it
would be unreasonable and not a good idea, frankly,
to put parking in those residential areas in order to
meet that distance requirement. So we're basically
suggesting in the plan that that provision in the
existing code not apply to any off-site parking
provided by the Hospital. Again, provided there is a
reasonable plan for the shuttling of off-site parking
users to the Hospital site and back, so that that can
work.

Everything else in the parking section
of the plan is as stated in the original draft.
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Concerning illumination, this is
essentially the same as what was in the prior draft
with one exception, we speak in a little more detail
concerning the lighting at the top level of the deck.
As I mentioned before we had the 7 foot parapet
proposed at the top of the deck, that's partly to
deal with lighting. I've added language here as
well, though, to say that if that is insufficient to
provide protection against excess of illumination at
night then a restriction on the use of the top level
of the deck to have it closed at nighttime hours with
lights off on the top level would need to be
considered.

But, again, that would be if the
parapet and the lighting design were not designed in
a way to mitigate the lighting effects.
The building architecture that is
essentially the same as what was in the prior draft.
Concerning the signs that also is
essentially the same as what was in the prior draft.
Traffic and street improvements, that
has not changed from the prior draft, as -- except
for minor word changes, it is the same as what was in
that draft.

Affordable housing, the only change
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there was noting for the record that there's certain pending changes in the affordable housing policy at the State level. We need the monitor those and see how that would affect the Hospital development, if at all.

Then construction related issues, I did phasing is going to have to stand on its own, that there may need to be temporary circumstances as part of a phasing plan that may deviate from the overall Master Plan policy. If that's the case the plan is saying that they should be limited in extent and in duration.

The subsurface excavation issues have been added that we discussed in prior work sessions related to various issues including: Soil and rock excavation removal; shoring and stabilization of soil and structures; de-watering, both as it relates to the quantity and the quality of the water. The impact upon the subsurface water table and area well and stormwater detention. The plan does not establish detailed guidelines for that. It merely notes that has to be dealt with at the time of the site plan proposal.

First of all that was the most concis The other issues relate to developer's agreement and those are not substantially changed from what was in the prior plan. That, in brief, is what is in this current draft. So I'd like the address any questions or comments you have.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: I have a couple. Tom, you want to start us off? MR. BRANCHEAU: Sure. MR. RICHE: Sure. MR. BRANCHEAU: First of all that was the most concise report you have ever -- I've never -- I have to congratulate you on two things. I'll congratulate you on that and I'll congratulate you, this is a great report I am seeing for the first time. You did a great job.

I have two questions -- I have one question and one comment. With relation to permitted uses, can you tell me what your intent is and what we can or cannot regulate as to rooftop cellular communications.

MR. BRANCHEAU: Well, that's already in the code, rooftop cellular, I believe are permitted here. I have to check to make sure.

MR. RICHE: Well, let me just tell you why I'm asking the question. I think that -- and I have to look back at my notes, I think our intent always has been if the Hospital requires the cellular antennas for the Hospital use, certainly we want to permit that. But we don't want it to become cell farm on the roof of the building.

At least that's my position. MR. BRANCHEAU: Well, I can only tell you that's a whole other issue. And this was -- the Village came under a legal challenge some years ago for Cellular Antenna Ordinance. And this ordinance withstood that challenge. One of the fundamental things with cellular is to provide reasonable accommodation for cellular telephone transmission. Currently, the Village has tried to do that by avoiding as much as possible on pole, towers, with antennas on top instead has chosen a policy of putting antennas on the roofs of buildings. Not low buildings, mind you, taller buildings. Given the Hospital's location, its taller building heights that are allowed, the decision was made and is made and currently, and I just checked and it is already permitted in the H-Zone to have them on the building.

In and effort to meet the requirements of the law to provide reasonable accommodation and at the same time to discourage towers it was decided that the H-Zone would be an appropriate location. So I continued that in the plan. MR. RICHE: Okay. MR. BRANCHEAU: Whether we can take it out or not is obviously debatable. MR. RICHE: But I think it also the Hospital's position, again, we've heard so much testimony, but I would just caution that we don't want the Hospital to look like, and I don't think they do either North Broad Street -- this look like South Broad Street --

MR. HURLEY: North Broad.

MR. RICHE: North -- 44 North Broad Street. So I'll just throw that out. And just one more suggestion on the last section with relation to the developer's agreement.

MR. BRANCHEAU: Yes.

MR. RICHE: The one thing that I think you left out here that we might want to add is
21 02:48 1 escrows.
02:48 2 CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Escrows for?
02:48 3 MR. RICHE: Escrows that might, you
02:48 4 know, escrow accounts that need to be established up
02:48 5 front for traffic control, those kinds of things. I
02:48 6 highly recommend that we negotiate those things up
02:48 7 front in a developer's agreement.
02:48 8 MR. BRANCHEAU: There is language in
02:48 9 here, I think it's in --
02:48 10 MR. RICHE: The reason I say that is
02:48 11 with the constraints that municipal governments are
02:48 12 going to be under there have been some projects in
02:48 13 the Village in the past where the Village waited and
02:48 14 awful long time the collect traffic control dollars
02:48 15 back, long after the projects were finished and
02:48 16 needed to lay out that money so the police officer
02:48 17 can do that sidewalk.
02:48 18 So what I would suggest is that we make
02:48 19 provisions in the developer's agreement for escrow to
02:48 20 be deposited up front for projects to cover those
02:48 21 costs.
02:48 22 MR. BRANCHEAU: If you Board wants to
02:48 23 include that.
02:48 24 CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: It makes a lot of
02:48 25 sense, particularly in light of the conversations
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22 02:50 1 there's a number of ways we can handle that. We
02:50 2 could measure the setback, for example, not from the
02:50 3 easement line, but measure it from the center line of
02:50 4 the road, something like that instead of from the
02:50 5 easement line. But even if we measure from the
02:50 6 easement line, what I'm really saying here is is that
02:50 7 we're measuring this -- these setbacks at this point
02:50 8 in time from the existing easement.
02:50 9 If the easement were -- if we know at
02:50 10 the time of the drafting of the ordinance that it's
02:50 11 going to be a larger easement we're saying -- let's
02:50 12 say it's 200 feet from Linwood Avenue is the setback
02:50 13 and we know that the County wants a 10 foot wide
02:50 14 easement when comes to writing the ordinance. We
02:50 15 could write the ordinance to say 190 feet and it
02:50 16 would still be consistent with this plan. That's
02:50 17 really where I was going with that because you know
02:50 18 there'll be some time between adoption of this plan,
02:50 19 assuming it is adopted or any plan that's adopted,
02:50 20 and the actual drafting and adoption of an ordinance.
02:50 21 We may know more at that time. I didn't want to
02:50 22 limit or constrain or prevent flexibility by trying
02:50 23 to tie down what the precise boundaries of the
02:50 24 easement would be at this time. We know more then,
02:50 25 then we can deal with it then.
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23 02:48 1 that we've had that would increase the intensity of
02:48 2 the supervision by either the Village or its fire
02:48 3 inspectors in some of the activities. It makes a lot
02:48 4 of sense. I would agree with Tom on that.
02:48 5 Anything else, Tom?
02:48 6 MR. RICHE: That was it.
02:48 7 Thank you.
02:48 8 CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Charles? Anne?
02:50 9 Morgan?
02:50 10 MR. HURLEY: No question.
02:50 11 CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Nancy?
02:50 12 MS. BIGOS: No.
02:50 13 CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Blais, on page 4
02:50 14 in lot area it said the future additional roadway
02:50 15 easements or dedications should be permitted without
02:50 16 the need for variance relief, which is as I recall
02:50 17 our code correctly, contrary to what our current code
02:50 18 says for all the other zones in the Village that as
02:50 19 easement lines move your setbacks move.
02:50 20 MR. BRANCHEAU: That's true. That's
02:50 21 true.
02:50 22 So basically an easement is not counted
02:50 23 as part of the lot for purposes of zoning compliance.
02:50 24 This being a Master Plan, however, we
02:50 25 can deviate. When we get to the actual ordinance,
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that high. That's almost two stories, because each
corner, you know, I'm familiar enough with equipment
and involved to know that they really do have to be
that high. That's almost two stories, because each
was would it be better to have a parapet right up to the facade that matches the facade versus a screening wall that didn't match the facade, but which was set back. I don't know that -- obviously, I can't really say it could be better as a parapet with no setback, depending upon how it's designed. It's really one of those things that's sort of a detail item. But if the Board wants something, we can put something in. I just lack an understanding of the precise details of it to --

CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Well, then let's table it for now and move on.

Anybody else? Questions?

MAYOR PFUND: I agree. I think in my mind figuring out what would be better or worse visual effect.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: It could depend on -- it would all depend on the actual.

MAYOR PFUND: Yes. I'm not sure we should be determining --

MR. RICHE: Yes. The Master Plan is silent.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Anybody else have comments?

MR. NALBANTIAN: Yes, I just want to know, I don't know if it's appropriate or not, but on the buffers on the site landscaping on page 7, the larger concerns that I have relate to the Stielen Avenue properties that will be abutting, that will have a view of the taller buildings. I mean you talked about landscaping between the buffer from the property line to the wall that would be required.

Is it appropriate to put in more specific language about the maturity of that buffer at the time of the planting or the size or quantities? So it doesn't -- it's not perceived by neighbors as being another wall yet in front of a wall of a tall building. It's just a question. I don't know if it's appropriate or not.

MR. BRANCHEAU: Well, I do have the language in the introduction paragraph before the bullets. I do say that: "The visual impact of any fence or wall as viewed from the street or adjacent property should be mitigated by placing such fences or walls toward the Hospital side of the buffer with the landscaping between the fence or wall"
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And property line".

So that the landscaping would be what either a parapery or adjacent property owner would see first, not the wall.

MR. NALBANTIAN: My comment --

MR. BRANCHEAU: But as for the details of the landscaping and how tall it is and how it the spacing would be and --

MS. PRICE: Blais, I think maybe what Charles I saying is in that same paragraph there could be a comment added about ensuring that the height at planting --

MR. NALBANTIAN: Precisely.

MS. PRICE: -- would --

MR. NALBANTIAN: I don't want any flowers towards the landscaping but something that would help reduce the perception of the wall.

MS. PRICE: And it's not a specific height or planning width, but just in terms of making a general statement concerning the overall --

MR. NALBANTIAN: Precisely.

MS. PRICE: -- needs which we need.

MR. BRANCHEAU: I don't have a problem with adding that. I think it's, in essence, sort of spoken of in the code but this would strike it there.
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So you're saying it's not appropriate to put in --

MR. NALBANTIAN: No, I'm saying it's --

too much and not enough detail. Too much detail, there may be an idea you didn't think of but now you're restricted yourself to not be allowed to do that, even if it's a good idea because you tied it down so detailed that you prevented yourself. Too loose and there could be abuse and misinterpretation of what you meant.

So it's a fine line. And what I'm saying is if you feel that a general statement saying that any landscaping or buffers should be substantial enough to mitigate the visual impact of any walls, so forth, yes, that still gives you some flexibility --

MR. NALBANTIAN: That would be great.

MR. BRANCHEAU: -- as to a detailed design and I don't mind adding that.

MR. NALBANTIAN: That would be good.

MR. RICHE: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Anybody else?

MR. RICHE: Nope.

MAYOR PFUND: Not at this time.

MR. BRANCHEAU: I do want to add one
Mr. Riché: Well, that also -- and also in the permitted uses section I
omission on my part. In the permitted uses section I
3 would like to, with the Board's consent, add a
prohibition of heliport.

Mr. Riché: A what?

Mr. Riché: Right.

Mr. Nalbantian: My question is if there's an emergency situation such as that wouldn't
it be an advantage for them to land on the top of the
5 Hospital as opposed to vets field. If they're going
to be landing anywhere does it make --

Mr. Brancheau: Well, there's a
difference between an emergency situation and
9 something that's designed to receive regular

Mr. Riché: A what?

Mr. Brancheau: Heliport.

Mr. Brancheau: Yes, helicopter landing

Mr. Brancheau: There's no specific neighborhood.

Chairman Nicholson: Does our current
ordinance say anything about heliports.

Mr. Brancheau: I don't believe so.

Chairman Nicholson: It's silent.

Mr. Brancheau: Well, I can check but, I

Mr. Brancheau: I don't think it does.

Mr. Nalbantian: The noise that they
project is going to be huge.

Chairman Nicholson: Yes. On the other
hand, the guy in the helicopter needs the use of the
hospital.

Mr. Riché: What's he say?

Mr. Hurley: The guy in the helicopter
needs the hospital.

Mr. Brancheau: There's no specific
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Chairman Nicholson: Mr. Collins is
noding his head so...

Mr. Riché: Okay.

Chairman Nicholson: Well, in that case
then let's add it.

Mayor Pfund: For, I guess, we can
still consider if it can be silent as to it.

Chairman Nicholson: Well, it's another
dimension of intensity of use that I think we need in
the draft.

Mr. Riché: On that issue I realize --

I remember that issue being raised by some of the
neighbors, certainly what we've work towards here is
a balance to protecting the neighborhood. And I
think that goes a long way of sending a message also.

Mr. Brancheau: That's my cue.


Thank you.

Board Members, what I'd like to
instruct Blais to do is, and the rest of
professional staff to do, is to prepare, based on our
review of this document tonight and the comments, and
an edition of the Master Plan Amendment for
publication in time or in need for a public hearing
session on May 3rd.

How does that sound to everybody?

Mayor Pfund: Good.

Chairman Nicholson: Yes.

Gail, what do we need to do that?

Mr. Collins: In agreement with Mr.

Brancheau.

There's no specific neighborhood.

Chairman Nicholson: Mr. Collins is
noding his head so...

Mr. Riché: Okay.

Chairman Nicholson: Well, in that case
then let's add it.

Mayor Pfund: For, I guess, we can
still consider if it can be silent as to it.

Chairman Nicholson: Well, it's another
dimension of intensity of use that I think we need in
the draft.

Mr. Riché: On that issue I realize --

I remember that issue being raised by some of the
neighbors, certainly what we've work towards here is
a balance to protecting the neighborhood. And I
think that goes a long way of sending a message also.

Mr. Brancheau: That's my cue.


Thank you.

Board Members, what I'd like to
instruct Blais to do is, and the rest of
professional staff to do, is to prepare, based on our
review of this document tonight and the comments, and
an edition of the Master Plan Amendment for
publication in time or in need for a public hearing
session on May 3rd.

How does that sound to everybody?
03:06 1 hearing tonight based upon the presentation that you
03:06 2 heard from Blais and authorizing Barbara to go ahead
03:06 3 and proceed with public notice.
03:06 4 I believe that public notice needs to
03:06 5 be in the paper, Barbara, by tomorrow, right, for
03:06 6 Fridays paper?
03:06 7 MS. CARLTON: Yes.
03:06 8 CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Okay. So I’d like
03:06 9 to make the motion then to move the matter back to
03:07 10 public hearing on May 3rd. And instruct Blais to
03:07 11 prepare the necessary documents for publication. And
03:07 12 for the staff to arrange for notice and meet places
03:07 13 to conduct a series of hearings in May to further the
03:07 14 deliberation of the H-Zone matter.
03:07 15 MR. RICHE: Where are you going to have
03:07 16 those meetings?
03:07 17 CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Well, do I have a
03:07 18 second on the motion?
03:07 19 MR. RICHE: Second.
03:07 20 CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Barbara, has
03:07 21 already made arrangements with the Board of Education
03:07 22 for space at BF for some of the dates.
03:07 23 MR. RICHE: So that’s where the
03:07 24 meetings will be.
03:07 25 MS. CARLTON: Yes. The Fourth of May
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03:09 1 so that we can have confirmation or additional
03:09 2 comments based on the record from his vantage point.
03:09 3 So that those presentations will take
03:09 4 up a good chunk of the third.
03:09 5 CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: So depending on
03:09 6 how we progress through that the next would be the
03:09 7 Hospital representatives, Mr. Collins and company.
03:09 8 And then we have the Concerned Residents of Ridgewood
03:09 9 group. And then we would open it back up to our list
03:09 10 of public Barbara has carefully preserved that list
03:09 11 in a mayonnaise jar. And we’ll go from there.
03:09 12 Any other questions on the motion?
03:09 13 MS. PRICE: Mr. Chairman, just to that
03:09 14 end, we’re not sure how long that everything is going
03:10 15 to take on the third so I think that it would be
03:10 16 helpful if the Hospital and CRR were just ready to
03:10 17 proceed whenever we finish, so that we don’t have a
03:10 18 gap. So whether it’s on the third or the fourth that
03:10 19 everybody is just ready to go.
03:10 20 CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Yes.
03:10 21 Barbara, would you take the roll on the
03:10 22 motion?
03:10 23 MS. CARLTON: Mayor Pfund?
03:10 24 MAYOR PFUND: Yes.
03:10 25 MS. CARLTON: Ms. Bigos.
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03:07 1 will have to be here.
03:07 2 But the 3rd, the 17th, the 18th and the
03:07 3 24th will be at BF.
03:07 4 CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: So any other
03:07 5 questions on the motion?
03:07 6 MR. RICHE: No, other than if it’s
03:07 7 going to be here on the 4th then we’ll just have to
03:07 8 make arrangement, obviously, for overflow in the
03:08 9 garden room downstairs.
03:08 10 CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Yes.
03:08 11 Unfortunately, we can’t -- we want to press forward
03:08 12 with the matter, we can’t get BF or even GW every
03:08 13 night that we prefer. So we will make a case for
03:08 14 overflow crowds.
03:08 15 And, of course, the first hearing will
03:08 16 probably be limited to presentations by Blais and our
03:08 17 other experts, correct?
03:08 18 MS. PRICE: Right. Blais would have to
03:08 19 go through the Master Plan Amendment. And then I
03:08 20 would anticipate that we’ll need to have the official
03:08 21 final reports presented in summary fashion and
03:08 22 authenticated by Mr. Skorupa and by Mr. Keller so
03:08 23 that those are entered into the record. And I also
03:08 24 feel that it’s prudent to have Mr. Staigar take a
03:09 25 look at this new amendment before the first hearing
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03:10 1 MS. BIGOS: Yes.
03:10 2 MS. CARLTON: Mr. Hurley?
03:10 3 MS. HURLEY: Yes.
03:10 4 MS. CARLTON: Chairman Nicholson?
03:10 5 CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Yes.
03:10 6 MS. CARLTON: Mr. Nalbantian?
03:10 7 MR. NALBANTIAN: Yes.
03:10 8 MS. CARLTON: Ms. Ward?
03:10 9 MR. WARD: Yes.
03:10 10 MS. CARLTON: Mr. Riche?
03:10 11 MR. RICHE: Yes.
03:10 12 CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Motion to adjourn?
03:10 13 MR. RICHE: So moved.
03:10 14 MR. WARD: Second.
03:10 15 CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: All in favor?
03:10 16 (Whereupon, the motion is passed by a
03:10 17 unanimous vote in favor.)
03:10 18 CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Thank you,
03:10 19 everybody.
03:10 20 (Whereupon this matter will be
03:10 21 continuing at a future ate. Time noted 11
03:10 22 p.m.)
03:10 23
03:10 24
03:10 25
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