

**Town of Austerlitz
Columbia County
New York**

Richard Madonia, Deborah Lans, Perry Samowitz, Lee Tilden, Eric Spiegel

**Planning Board Meeting
May 2, 2019
7:00 p.m.**

*******AGENDA*******

- 1) Call Regular Meeting to Order**
- 2) Approval of April minutes**
- 3) Unfinished Business**
Airosmith Development – New Tower on West Hill Rd
- 4) New Business**
No New Business
- 5) Public Comments**
- 6) Adjournment**

*******Next Regular Planning Board Meeting June 6, 2019*******

Town of Austerlitz
Meeting of the Planning Board
April 4th, 2019

In attendance: Town Attorney, Joseph Catalano, Deborah Lans, Richard Madonia, Lee Tilden, Perry Samowitz, Eric Sieber

Meeting Called to Order: 7 pm

Approval of Minutes:

Motion to approve minutes, D. Lans, Second, P. Samowitz Approved 5-0

Unfinished Business

Aerosmith Development - New Tower on West Hill Road

A review of the proposed Aerosmith Development had been sent to both William Johnson, RF Engineering Consultant and Ray Jurkowski, Austerlitz Town Engineer. Wm Johnson's and R. Jurkowski's written comments were sent to each Bd. member and Ray Jurkowski was also in attendance at this meeting. The Cell Tower provisions contained in the Town Zoning law figured in his observations.

With respect to the visual assessment through photographic simulations, Ray Jurkowski suggested and identified 7 locations to be used for public presentation since the map presented earlier was not based on visual verification. With Bd. member agreement that photographic verification was best suited in this assessment, a motion to waive the requirement for a balloon test was made by D. Lans , seconded by P. Samowitz, approved 5-0 .

Further discussions included beacon lights. Aerosmithb rep. Schweigard noted FAA regulations on beacon lighting are being consulted. Questions arose and discussion ensued about use of the backup generator, and noise, fuel storage, mufflers, arrangements with the fire department, cumulative radiation effect from all the towers, night and day time simulation plus FAA regs. Safety issues also need consideration. i.e, ice damage, falling parts. Base photos were also requested. AT&T representatives stated their intention to obtain the requested in good faith and noted they will be reach out to the Fire Dep't and will seek and provide radiation data.

The capacities of the existing towers are not exactly known nor is there a final termination date for the present towers. Co-location needs to be discussed as to feasibility and whether some carriers on present towers can be moved to the proposed tower. A letter is being requested by the applicant from Goosetown owner on this matter. **RFA** has no oppositions to number of towers; does requires that zoning code be followed.

Responses from William Johnson and Ray Jakowski were discussed and considered. Wm. Johnson recommended that data on heights of carriers on colocations be brought to a certainty and additional propagation maps were requested.

No additional tower is being considered for future use by AT&T. The meeting covered the scope of the information needed for approval by the Bd. members. Requested material will be mailed to the Board, for discussion in at the next meeting.

An invoice received for the services of the RF Engineer's report were submitted to Aerosmith representatives after which the meeting was concluded.

New Business: None

Public Comment:

Maureen Wilson , Rte. 203 resident made observations and comments on the proposal. She was encouraged to return again when the public hearing has been arranged.

In accord with an agreement to use meeting time, when possible, for further training of the Planning Board, Joseph Catalano addressed the area of **Special Use Permit**.

This type permit is unique under basic Administrative rules and decisions are based on the record of the application and the review process on that application. The PB has original jurisdiction over site plans, special permits and subdivisions. Uses that require site plans are considered appropriate for a district depending on the site plan's indication of type, scale, intensity, location, and how it affects neighboring properties. Uses that require special permits are less certain as to whether the proposed use fits into the area and is compatible with the neighborhood. The Board's decisions are based on details and meeting the criteria in the zoning law.

In the AT&T plan before the Board there is further criteria... Need versus Impact as well as the FCC regulations.

Ray Jurkoski noted that in considering Special Use Permits it is wise to use the Code Enforcement's experience and expertise when appropriate.

Meeting adjourned at 8:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Constance Mondel