

1 STATE OF NEW YORK : COUNTY OF ULSTER
2 TOWN OF MARLBOROUGH PLANNING BOARD

2 -----X
3 In the Matter of

4 ATKINS NICHOLAS 2 LOT SD

5 Project No. 24-2019
6 Cubbard Drive/33-35 Old Indian Road, Marlboro
7 Section 103.3; Block 1; Lot 14

6 -----X

7 PUBLIC HEARING - SUBDIVISION

8
9 Date: June 2, 2025
10 Time: 7:00 p.m.
11 Place: Town of Marlborough
12 Town Hall
13 21 Milton Turnpike
14 Milton, New York 12547

15 BOARD MEMBERS: CHRIS BRAND, CHAIRPERSON
16 FRED CALLO
17 STEVE JENNISON
18 CINDY LANZETTA
19 JOE LOFARO
20 BOB TRONCILLITO
21 JOHN LaMELA

22 ALSO PRESENT: PAT HINES
23 GERARD COMATOS, ESQ.
24 JEN FLYNN

25 APPLICANT'S REPRESENTATIVE: KARIN REYNOLDS

26

27

28

29

30 -----X
31 Stacie Sullivan, CSR
32 staciesullivan@rocketmail.com

ATKINS NICHOLAS 2 LOT SD - PUBLIC HEARING SD

1 CHAIRMAN BRAND: I'd like to call the meeting
2 to order with the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of
3 our Country.

4 (Pledge of Allegiance.)

5 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Agenda, Town of Marlborough

6 Planning Board. On the agenda this evening we have the

7 approval of the minutes for the May 19, 2025, meeting.

8 Public hearings, we have Atkins Nicholas for a two-lot

9 subdivision, a public hearing of their subdivision at 6

10 Cubbard Drive and 33-35 Old Indian Road in Marlboro.

11 Under Ongoing Application Review, we have Laurell

12 Diorio two-lot subdivision for a final of their

13 subdivision on Hidden Acres Drive in Marlboro. We have

14 Summit Drive Properties with a sketch of their site

15 plan at Summit Drive in Marlboro. We have Dock Road

16 with a sketch of their site plan and lot line at

17 103-137 Dock Road. The next deadline is Friday,

18 June 6th. The next scheduled meeting is Monday,

19 June 21st, 2025.

20 Can I have a motion for the approval of the
21 minutes for May 19th?

22 MR. LOFARO: I'll make that motion.

23 MR. CALLO: I second.

24 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Any discussion?

25 (No response.)

ATKINS NICHOLAS 2 LOT SD - PUBLIC HEARING SD

1 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Any objection?

2 (No response.)

3 CHAIRMAN BRAND: So moved. Any
4 announcements? Anything from the Board before we
5 start?

6 (No response.)

7 CHAIRMAN BRAND: No. All right. First up we
8 have the public hearing for Nicholas Atkins, a two-lot
9 subdivision.

10 Legal Notice, Subdivision Application.

11 Please take notice a public hearing will be held by the
12 Marlborough Planning Board pursuant to the State
13 Environmental Quality Review Act, or SEQRA, and the
14 Town of Marlborough Town Code Section 134-09(C) on
15 Monday, June 2, 2025, for the following application,
16 Atkins minor subdivision, at the Town Hall, 21 Milton
17 Turnpike, Milton, New York, 12547, at 7:00 p.m. or as
18 soon thereafter as may be heard. The applicant is
19 seeking approval of a two-lot subdivision application
20 for lands located at 6 Cubbard Drive and 33-35 Old
21 Indian Road in Marlboro, New York, Section 103.3, Block
22 1, Lot 14. Any interested parties, either for or
23 against this proposal, will have an opportunity to be
24 heard at this time. Chris Brand, Chairman, Town of
25 Marlborough Planning Board.

ATKINS NICHOLAS 2 LOT SD - PUBLIC HEARING SD

1 Did you send out the mailings?

2 MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, I did, and here are the
3 receipts.

4 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Could you give those to the
5 secretary? That would be great.

6 MS. FLYNN: How many did you send out?

7 MS. REYNOLDS: Whatever is there.

8 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Pat, did you want to start
9 us off with your comments this evening?

10 MR. HINES: Sure. Just looking through the
11 subdivision plans to note the variances that were
12 received. This can be incorporated into the zoning
13 bulk table.

14 The status of the Health Department approval
15 I believe remains outstanding for the subsurface
16 sanitary sewer disposal systems.

20 And then any substantive comments received
21 tonight should be addressed.

22 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Thank you. Comments or
23 questions from the Board, if any?

24 (No response.)

25 CHAIRMAN BRAND: If you are here for the

ATKINS NICHOLAS 2 LOT SD - PUBLIC HEARING SD

1 public hearing, I would ask that you just please rise
2 and state your name slowly for the stenographer and ask
3 your comment or question. Is anyone here for Atkins
4 minor subdivision?

5 (No response.)

6 MS. FLYNN: She sent ten out -- 11 out, and
7 there should have been close to 25.

8 MS. REYNOLDS: That was done by Medenbach &
9 Eggers, the engineers, and they did it according to
10 code. Whatever is required.

11 CHAIRMAN BRAND: You counted 25 individuals?

12 MS. FLYNN: I counted 11 that she handed back
13 in, but the number on the agenda says 25. And I know
14 there's a couple of duplicates, but not that many.

15 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Gerry, if the mailings
16 weren't sufficient to cover the public hearing?

17 MR. COMATOS: Then the public hearing is
18 invalid.

19 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Invalid. So we would have
20 to go ahead and schedule another public hearing for
21 that?

22 MR. COMATOS: And the requisite notices need
23 to be sent out.

24 MS. REYNOLDS: I don't think that's
25 necessary. We had a ZBA public hearing, and there was

ATKINS NICHOLAS 2 LOT SD - PUBLIC HEARING SD

1 one or two people there, and they had no objections. I
2 think this is just, you know -- these are the immediate
3 neighbors. And Medenbach & Eggers is --

4 CHAIRMAN BRAND: We're familiar with the
5 engineering firm.

6 MS. REYNOLDS: -- an old -- you know, is 40
7 years in business or something. They know what they're
8 doing.

9 CHAIRMAN BRAND: So --

10 MS. REYNOLDS: We have been doing this here
11 now for a year, just to get a simple minor subdivision.
12 And as I said, it was already -- the neighbors were
13 already invited last time, and there was -- nobody had
14 any objections.

15 CHAIRMAN BRAND: So I'll propose the
16 following. I'm going to say, Jen, we can review those
17 25, and if it looks like the ten is significantly less
18 than it should have been, then we'll go ahead and
19 reschedule it and say that this one was invalid. And
20 then the applicant will be required to do more mailings
21 and have another public hearing.

22 MS. FLYNN: So I'll check in the morning to
23 make sure that there's 15 duplicates.

24 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Right.

25 MR. JENNISON: Did the engineer firm

ATKINS NICHOLAS 2 LOT SD - PUBLIC HEARING SD

1 coordinate with you? They go on the Ulster County
2 site; right? They're supposed to.

3 MS. FLYNN: I don't give them the addresses.
4 They have to go on Ulster County Parcel Finder,
5 500 feet.

6 MR. JENNISON: Did your client do that?

7 MS. REYNOLDS: What?

8 MR. JENNISON: Your engineering firm goes on
9 the Ulster County site within 500 feet. We're saying
10 that there should be 25. You understand that?

11 MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, I understand that. And
12 so the last time when we did the last -- the ZBA public
13 hearing invitations, the secretary also said that there
14 were -- not everybody was invited, and I communicated
15 this to Medenbach & Eggers, the engineer, and they
16 didn't say, you know, that they didn't do anything
17 wrong. I trust that a firm that has been doing that
18 for 40 years, that is also known around here, that they
19 actually know what they are doing.

20 CHAIRMAN BRAND: It wouldn't be the first
21 time that people have erred on this.

22 I'd like to have a motion to close this
23 public hearing.

24 MR. JENNISON: Close the public hearing?

25 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Yes. In the case the

ATKINS NICHOLAS 2 LOT SD - PUBLIC HEARING SD

1 numbers are correct, once we double-check them, then
2 this one could stand as being valid, but I don't know
3 off the top of my head how -- her first estimate was
4 25, but that's every single property. So, obviously,
5 if you own three of them, she's not sending out three
6 individual mailings. She sends one. Oftentimes,
7 there's overlap.

8 MS. LANZETTA: I make a motion to close the
9 public hearing.

10 MR. JENNISON: I'll second it.

11 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Any discussion?

12 MR. JENNISON: With that stipulation.

13 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Yes. So then I'd like to
14 have a second motion that would declare this public
15 hearing invalid should the secretary find that the
16 incorrect number of mailings were sent out and that the
17 applicant would then go ahead and schedule another
18 public hearing.

19 MR. LOFARO: I'll make that motion.

20 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Is there a second?

21 MR. TRONCILLITO: I'll second.

22 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Any discussion?

23 (No response.)

24 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Any objection?

25 (No response.)

ATKINS NICHOLAS 2 LOT SD - PUBLIC HEARING SD

1 CHAIRMAN BRAND: So we will let you know
2 after we research that a little more closely to see
3 what we're going to do moving forward.

4 MS. REYNOLDS: Okay. I appreciate it. Thank
5 you.

6 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Thank you.

7 MS. REYNOLDS: If everything was correct,
8 what would be the next steps?

9 CHAIRMAN BRAND: As there were no substantive
10 comments from the public hearing, we would just have to
11 wait until we get the Health Department approval.

12 MS. REYNOLDS: We do have the Health
13 Department approval.

14 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Pat, do you have it?

15 MR. HINES: I don't think I have it.

16 MS. REYNOLDS: I find the communication
17 between the engineer -- I forgot the name -- Pat Hines
18 and us not existing, so I didn't know anything about
19 the notes. I didn't know that there was -- that he
20 didn't have the information. I didn't even know that
21 he was required to have the information. I have
22 just -- we have the approval of the Department of
23 Health. And let me see if I have the paperwork here.

24 MR. JENNISON: So for the three items that
25 our engineer requested, you have all those answers?

ATKINS NICHOLAS 2 LOT SD - PUBLIC HEARING SD

1 MS. REYNOLDS: Yes. So this is the approved
2 septic plan that was signed by Medenbach & Eggers.

3 MR. HINES: We need to have it signed by the
4 Health Department.

5 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Gerry, did your office
6 receive any easements for access to utilities?

7 MR. COMATOS: No.

8 CHAIRMAN BRAND: So you have a copy of Pat's
9 comments. You have the engineer's comments. When
10 those are completed, then we can move forward.

11 MS. REYNOLDS: So it was signed (indicating).

12 MR. HINES: I don't have this.

13 MS. REYNOLDS: I have an original of this. I
14 didn't bring it. I didn't know that I had to bring it.
15 And can you give me your notes --

16 MR. HINES: You should have them.

17 MS. REYNOLDS: I did not get them.

18 MR. HINES: (Handing).

19 MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Thank you.

21 MS. REYNOLDS: I'm sorry. So I just want to
22 note, so we do have the approved and signed septic
23 design by -- signed and approved by the Health
24 Department. Yes, the water service needs to be --
25 there will be easements for access and utilities, and

ATKINS NICHOLAS 2 LOT SD - PUBLIC HEARING SD

1 as soon as we have the subdivision done, we can go
2 forward with that.

3 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Yes. As soon as everything
4 is done, I don't see any reason why we couldn't
5 schedule the attorney to draw up a Resolution of
6 Approval, but first we have to figure out this matter
7 of the public hearing.

8 MS. REYNOLDS: Okay.

9 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Okay.

10 MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you.

11 MS. FLYNN: You need to send me a copy of the
12 Health Department approval that you have.

13 MS. REYNOLDS: To send to who?

14 MS. FLYNN: To me.

15 MS. REYNOLDS: Sure. Do you want a copy?

16 MS. FLYNN: Do you have a copy to give to me?

17 MS. REYNOLDS: Of course (handing).

18 Time noted: 7:12 p.m.

19 C E R T I F I C A T I O N

20

21 Certified to be a true and accurate transcript.

22

23

Stacie Sullivan

24

Stacie Sullivan, CSR

25

1 STATE OF NEW YORK : COUNTY OF ULSTER
TOWN OF MARLBOROUGH PLANNING BOARD

In the Matter of

LAURELL DIORIO TWO LOT SD

5 Project No. 24-2020
Hidden Acres Drive, Marlboro
Section 108.2; Block 2; Lot 37

7 FINAL = SUBDIVISION

BOARD MEMBERS: CHRIS BRAND, CHAIRPERSON
FRED CALLO
STEVE JENNISON
CINDY LANZETTA
JOE LOFARO
BOB TRONCILLITO
JOHN LaMETTA

17 ALSO PRESENT: PAT HINES

18 GEBARD COMATOS, ESO.

19 JEN FLYNN

21 APPLICANT'S REPRESENTATIVE: PATTI BROOKS

22

23

24

25

Stacie Sullivan, CSR
staciesullivan@rocketmail.com

LAURELL DIORIO 2 LOT SD - FINAL SUBDIVISION

1 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Next up we have Laurell
2 Diorio for a two-lot subdivision, for a final of their
3 subdivision on Hidden Acres Drive in Marlboro.

4 Pat, did you want to read your comments
5 quickly?

9 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Gerry, anything?

10 MR. COMATOS: Nothing noteworthy. There are
11 a couple of conditions, including my review of the
12 driveway maintenance agreement, which I assume is
13 forthcoming.

14 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Any comments or questions
15 from the Board on this one?

16 MS. LANZETTA: I just want to make sure that
17 everybody understands that the Highway Superintendent
18 was out there and took a look at the drainage and gave
19 us his comments. We received the comments on that, and
20 so it was addressed.

21 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Thank you, Cindy.

LAURELL DIORIO 2 LOT SD - FINAL SUBDIVISION

1 Determination of Non-Significance for this project. I
2 am yes. Member Lanzetta.

3 MS. LANZETTA: Yes.

4 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Lofaro.

5 MR. LOFARO: Yes.

6 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Callo.

7 MR. CALLO: Yes.

8 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Jennison.

9 MR. JENNISON: Yes.

10 CHAIRMAN BRAND: LaMela.

11 MR. LaMELA: Yes.

12 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Troncillito.

13 MR. TRONCILLITO: Yes.

14 CHAIRMAN BRAND: We also have before you the
15 Resolution of Approval for the Town of Marlborough
16 Planning Board. I am yes on that as well. Lanzetta.

17 MS. LANZETTA: Yes.

18 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Lofaro.

19 MR. LOFARO: Yes.

20 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Callo.

21 MR. CALLO: Yes.

22 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Jennison.

23 MR. JENNISON: Yes.

24 CHAIRMAN BRAND: LaMela.

25 MR. LaMELA: Yes.

LAURELL DIORIO 2 LOT SD - FINAL SUBDIVISION

1 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Troncillito.

2 MR. TRONCILLITO: Yes.

3 MS. FLYNN: I forgot to print up a Rec fee.

4 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Yes. So we'll just put in
5 the minutes that I don't have the statement from you,
6 but we will put in -- how many thousand dollars are we
7 approving for the Rec fee?

8 MR. HINES: One new lot.

9 MS. FLYNN: It would be \$2,000.

10 CHAIRMAN BRAND: \$2,000. I'll have a motion
11 to collect \$2,000 for the Recreation fee for the Town
12 of Marlborough for the resulting lot for this
13 subdivision?

14 MS. LANZETTA: In lieu of parkland, I'll make
15 that motion.

16 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Is there a second?

17 MR. LOFARO: Second.

18 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Any discussion?

19 (No response.)

20 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Any objection?

21 (No response.)

22 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Okay. I believe we're all
23 set.

24 MS. BROOKS: Okay. Thank you very much.

25 Time noted: 7:15 p.m.

LAURELL DIORIO 2 LOT SD - FINAL SUBDIVISION

1

2

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

3

4 Certified to be a true and accurate transcript.

5

6

Stacie Sullivan

7

Stacie Sullivan, CSR

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATE OF NEW YORK : COUNTY OF ULSTER
2 TOWN OF MARLBOROUGH PLANNING BOARD

2 -----X
3 In the Matter of

4 SUMMIT DRIVE PROPERTIES

5 Project No. 23-1004
6 Summit Drive, Marlboro
7 Section 108.4; Block 6; Lot 29.311

8 -----X

7 SKETCH - SITE PLAN

8
9 Date: June 2, 2025
10 Time: 7:15 p.m.
11 Place: Town of Marlborough
12 Town Hall
13 21 Milton Turnpike
14 Milton, New York 12547

15
16 BOARD MEMBERS: CHRIS BRAND, CHAIRPERSON
17 FRED CALLO
18 STEVE JENNISON
19 CINDY LANZETTA
20 JOE LOFARO
21 BOB TRONCILLITO
22 JOHN LaMELA

23
24 ALSO PRESENT: PAT HINES

25 GERARD COMATOS, ESQ.

JEN FLYNN

APPlicant's REPRESENTATIVE: MATT TOWNE

-----X
24
25 Stacie Sullivan, CSR
staciesullivan@rocketmail.com

SUMMIT DRIVE PROPERTIES - SKETCH SITE PLAN

1 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Next up, Summit Drive
2 Properties for a sketch of their site plan on Summit
3 Drive in Marlboro.

4 Pat, if we can start with your comments when
5 you're ready.

6 MR. HINES: The project has been redesigned
7 to provide the principal access from Grand Street
8 Extension. The previously proposed access point on
9 Summit Drive will remain as a gated emergency access,
10 gated at both Summit Drive and the property access.

Comments from the Highway Superintendent
should be received regarding the revised access point
to Grand Street Extension.

Comments should be submitted early on to the -- the plan should be submitted early on to the emergency services for their review of the access points.

25 We will need modified site plans, including

SUMMIT DRIVE PROPERTIES - SKETCH SITE PLAN

1 updated grading, landscaping, stormwater, all the
2 typical items, should the Planning Board give a
3 favorable reply to the concept that's been submitted.

4 And a revised EAF should be submitted
5 addressing the changes to the plans.

6 But, basically, the plans have been modified
7 to show the access point through Grand Street
8 Extension, leaving the previous Summit Drive access as
9 emergency access only, gated.

10 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Thank you. Would you like
11 to add anything?

12 MR. TOWNE: I think that pretty much sums it
13 up. Just here to elicit feedback, show the Board the
14 new conceptual layout, and just get it before you guys.

15 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Great. Comments or
16 questions from the Board?

17 MS. LANZETTA: Pat, this is a 12 percent
18 grade for how far?

19 MR. TOWNE: It's 830 -- a little less than
20 830 feet.

21 MR. HINES: A pretty good distance.

22 MS. LANZETTA: Is that allowed for a private
23 road?

24 MR. HINES: Well, it's not a private road.
25 It's a site plan. If it was a private road, it's

SUMMIT DRIVE PROPERTIES - SKETCH SITE PLAN

1 allowed to go to 14 percent for what's called short
2 distances. But this is a site plan versus a
3 subdivision that would be having a private road.

4 MS. LANZETTA: I don't quite understand that.
5 Why are you allowed to have a driveway that has
6 accesses for this many units.

7 MR. HINES: That's one of the reasons why we
8 want to get the jurisdictional emergency services
9 comments. Your Town road specs have a maximum of
10 10 percent, and your private roads allow 14 percent for
11 short distances. And this is depicted at 12. They
12 could probably grade it less, but it's going to be more
13 extensive grading.

14 MS. LANZETTA: Well, I'm still not quite sure
15 why. I thought a driveway was to access one or two
16 homes. Why do we have a driveway that accesses four
17 multifamily units?

18 MR. HINES: Right. This is a site plan, not
19 a subdivision.

20 MS. LANZETTA: All multifamily houses is a
21 site plan.

22 MR. HINES: Right. I agree.

23 MS. LANZETTA: But it's still residential.

24 MR. HINES: It is residential, but this is
25 a -- it's not a private road because it has one owner

SUMMIT DRIVE PROPERTIES - SKETCH SITE PLAN

1 and it's a site plan, where a private road serves those
2 parcels, and each of those parcels own a portion of the
3 private road with an access and maintenance agreement,
4 where this is one lot and is being reviewed as a site
5 plan, not a subdivision.

6 CHAIRMAN BRAND: So, basically, this would
7 fall in the driveway considerations?

8 MR. HINES: Yes. It's a driveway to one lot.
9 It's certainly not a private road under your
10 definitions.

11 CHAIRMAN BRAND: And the driveway is a
12 maximum of 17 percent grade?

13 MR. HINES: Driveways aren't addressed in
14 your Code.

15 CHAIRMAN BRAND: I thought they were.

16 MR. HINES: I could check.

17 MR. JENNISON: I don't think so. Since this
18 is coming back new, I think we should have a
19 preliminary conference on this with all our emergency
20 services and our public works departments before we
21 move on. So I'd like to see that scheduled.

22 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Jen, what would be the next
23 available date that we can do that?

24 MS. FLYNN: Our next meeting is the 16th, or
25 it would have to be July 21st.

SUMMIT DRIVE PROPERTIES - SKETCH SITE PLAN

1 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Are you available on the
2 16th?

3 MR. TOWNE: Probably. I don't have my
4 calendar on me right now.

5 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Okay. So let's tentatively
6 schedule a preliminary conference for June 16th.

7 MS. FLYNN: I'm sorry. The agenda is wrong.
8 It says June 21st. It should be June 16th. It's
9 July 21st.

10 CHAIRMAN BRAND: June 16th?

11 MS. FLYNN: June 16th or July 21st.

12 CHAIRMAN BRAND: So we'll schedule it for the
13 16th, and you'll be in contact with our office before
14 we send out all those emails to everybody.

15 MR. TOWNE: Okay.

16 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Other comments or questions
17 from the Board?

18 MR. TRONCILLITO: Just one question. Did you
19 look -- the last we were here I had some issues with
20 what was being proposed. Did you look into
21 single-family houses, or that wasn't going to work for
22 you, instead of this type of complex?

23 MR. TOWNE: I mean, this is what the owner
24 would prefer to do. This is his preference. So that's
25 what we're going for right now.

SUMMIT DRIVE PROPERTIES - SKETCH SITE PLAN

1 MS. LANZETTA: Can you remind me, under the
2 present zoning and any of the other restrictions, how
3 many single residences you could get in there right
4 now?

5 MR. TOWNE: This plan doesn't have the
6 zoning. I think it was four -- was it four or six?

7 MS. LANZETTA: How many single family would
8 they be able to still fit in that spot?

9 MR. HINES: We don't have that analysis.
10 It's, what, seven acres, I believe?

11 MR. TOWNE: Yes.

12 MR. HINES: You could probably get five out
13 of that probably, once you put driveways, roads.

14 MS. LANZETTA: Being that this is a site
15 plan, certainly as we go forward, we could ask for an
16 alternate development plan?

17 MR. HINES: I think you can always do that
18 under SEQR, sure.

19 MS. LANZETTA: We could ask to see what it
20 would look like if it was only single family or
21 duplexes. Do we want to do that at this point, or do
22 we want to wait and see after our discussion?

23 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Maybe wait until after the
24 preliminary conference, but I think the applicant
25 should be aware that that could be coming down the

SUMMIT DRIVE PROPERTIES - SKETCH SITE PLAN

1 pike.

2 MR. TOWNE: Okay.

3 MR. TRONCILLITO: My own opinion -- I know
4 he's looking at it from a financial aspect. I
5 understand that. But looking at it from fitting into
6 the whole neighborhood, you know, the south side of the
7 village, the west side, it sure would look a lot nicer,
8 that's for darn sure, instead of these things.

9 MR. TOWNE: Yeah. You know, he has mentioned
10 to me possibly doing something like a townhome, so
11 reducing the density somewhat. The buildings would be
12 the same size in orientation, but it would be less
13 units. It's not firm, but that's something he's talked
14 about before.

15 MR. TRONCILLITO: I mean, when I seen the
16 original plans, aesthetically pleasing they weren't.

17 MR. TOWNE: Well, that's not me.

18 MR. TRONCILLITO: I know. I'm just voicing
19 my opinion on that.

20 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Just to clarify, the
21 emergency locked gate at the end of Summit Drive, is
22 there going to be two, one like at the end of the
23 cul-de-sac at Summit Drive and then one going into the
24 complex at the bottom there?

25 MR. TOWNE: Yeah. And that was to prevent

SUMMIT DRIVE PROPERTIES - SKETCH SITE PLAN

1 people from parking on the drive.

2 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Which kind of leads to my
3 next question. I know the last time you guys were
4 here, we did have concerns about no available guest
5 parking. I know the residents on Summit Drive were
6 concerned about that. If somebody has a party, what's
7 preventing them from parking on that sloped driveway or
8 parking on Summit, walking, or even Grand Street?

9 MR. TOWNE: Right. And at that point we did
10 add these parking spaces on the top part of the parking
11 lot. We added eight more parking spaces beyond what
12 the Code requires.

13 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Eight in addition to the 1.5
14 for each unit?

15 MR. TOWNE: Yes. We added more.

16 MR. JENNISON: Can you show me up here where
17 that is?

18 MR. TOWNE: They're up here (indicating),
19 impervious pavement, so we weren't adding to the
20 stormwater calcs.

21 MS. LANZETTA: Are you going to be able to
22 get garbage trucks that would come in and service on
23 that kind of a driveway at 12 percent?

24 MR. TOWNE: I mean, we could try to get a
25 letter from them. I think they're certainly capable of

SUMMIT DRIVE PROPERTIES - SKETCH SITE PLAN

1 driving up it. It's 20 feet wide. It's got
2 significant horizontal radii on the road, and it's got
3 maneuverability up top as well.

4 MR. LaMELA: I know we would probably have to
5 use smaller trucks worst-case scenario, but it sure is
6 doable. It would just be all the residents would have
7 to have their individual cans because we wouldn't be
8 able to get a large front load through there. But we
9 could -- there's other service options that are
10 workable.

11 MR. TOWNE: Okay. I'd be curious to learn
12 more about that.

13 MR. HINES: I would say parts of Bloom Street
14 are more than 12 percent.

15 MR. JENNISON: You're showing dumpsters?

16 MR. TOWNE: Yeah. We have two different
17 locations of them. Right.

18 MR. JENNISON: Mr. LaMela, being a
19 professional in that business, is saying that's
20 probably not going to work.

21 MR. TOWNE: Yes. So I'm curious what would
22 work, then.

23 MR. LaMELA: We would have to do something
24 like a single subscription for the residents, because
25 now you could use a smaller truck, and you would be

SUMMIT DRIVE PROPERTIES - SKETCH SITE PLAN

1 able to do it. But you would need a location to store
2 the containers, if that's the way you want to go.

3 CHAIRMAN BRAND: So like each unit would have
4 to have its own can.

5 MR. LaMELA: But if it's a townhome, they'll
6 be able to store them someplace, like in their own
7 garages or something, so it's not unsightly. But with
8 what's currently being proposed, it would have to be
9 maybe a corral of some sort where all of the cans are
10 located.

11 MR. TOWNE: Okay. Thanks.

12 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Any other comments or
13 questions from the Board on this one?

14 (No response.)

15 CHAIRMAN BRAND: So we'll go ahead and
16 schedule the preliminary conference and get some more
17 opinions from the jurisdictional fire departments and
18 everybody, Highway Superintendent, water people, and
19 then we'll move forward from there.

20 MR. TRONCILLITO: If you can bring back some
21 of those options too, that would be nice.

22 MR. TOWNE: Yes. I'll definitely talk with
23 Nick.

24 MR. TRONCILLITO: Thank you.

25 MR. TOWNE: Thanks a lot.

SUMMIT DRIVE PROPERTIES - SKETCH SITE PLAN

1 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Gerry, so the last time we
2 had this, we adjourned the public hearing indefinitely;
3 right?

4 MR. COMATOS: That's right.

5 CHAIRMAN BRAND: So this is the same project
6 but different access. Basically, it would certainly
7 require mailings, but I believe we said that at the
8 last meeting, but not a whole new starting over kind of
9 thing. Just basically recirculating to all the people
10 within 500 feet that there would be a public hearing
11 for this project?

12 MR. COMATOS: That would be appropriate.

13 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Okay. Thank you.

14 Time noted: 7:28 p.m.

15

16 C E R T I F I C A T E O F N

17

18 Certified to be a true and accurate transcript.

19

20 Stacie Sullivan

21

1 STATE OF NEW YORK : COUNTY OF ULSTER
2 TOWN OF MARLBOROUGH PLANNING BOARD

2 -----X
3 In the Matter of

4 DOCK ROAD

5 Project No. 24-2003
6 103-137 Dock Road, Marlboro
7 Section 109.1; Block 3; Lot 13,
8 14, 14.200, 15 and 29.100

7 -----X
8 SKETCH - SITE PLAN/LOT LINE

9 Date: June 2, 2025
10 Time: 7:28 p.m.
11 Place: Town of Marlborough
12 Town Hall
13 21 Milton Turnpike
14 Milton, New York 12547

15 BOARD MEMBERS: CHRIS BRAND, CHAIRPERSON
16 FRED CALLO
17 STEVE JENNISON
18 CINDY LANZETTA
19 JOE LOFARO
20 BOB TRONCILLITO
21 JOHN LaMELA

22 ALSO PRESENT: PAT HINES
23 GERARD COMATOS, ESQ.
24 JEN FLYNN

25 APPLICANT'S REPRESENTATIVES: SCOTT LEYTON
26 ANGELO LAINO
27 ABIGAIL RUDOW
28 RON CYPERS

29 -----X
30 Stacie Sullivan, CSR
31 staciesullivan@rocketmail.com

DOCK ROAD - SKETCH SITE PLAN/LOT LINE

1 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Finally we have Dock Road,
2 sketch of the site plan and lot line for 103-137 Dock
3 Road in Marlboro.

4 Pat, whenever you're ready to start with your
5 comments.

16 Our stormwater comments are still
17 outstanding.

24 To address previous comments from our office,
25 as well as the water and sewer engineers, Brinnier &

DOCK ROAD - SKETCH SITE PLAN/LOT LINE

1 Larios, regarding the proximity of the sewer plant, the
2 applicants and their legal counsel have identified that
3 that will be addressed as a provision of the offering
4 plan documents for the condominium.

5 Again, the lot consolidation/lot line
6 revision map has been provided. Proposed Lot 1, the
7 multifamily project, remains at 24.97 plus or minus
8 acres, while Lot 2, the consolidated parcel, will
9 become a .77-acre individual parcel. It's currently
10 three parcels fronting on Route 9W that will be
11 combined, and a small portion of those, there will be a
12 land swap between those consolidated parcels, and this
13 lot, to keep the parent parcel lot 24.97.

14 It needs submittal to the Ulster County
15 Planning Department.

16 Any comments by the Town's traffic consultant
17 to the Planning Board should be addressed.

18 The applicants are requesting the scheduling
19 of a public hearing, which the Board may want to do to
20 get input from the public. I know there's been
21 numerous letters to date, so the Board may wish to
22 schedule a public hearing at this point. It's
23 certainly up to the Board.

24 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Comments or questions from
25 the Board?

DOCK ROAD - SKETCH SITE PLAN/LOT LINE

1 MS. LANZETTA: Yes. I think the Board should
2 make a determination on the EAF because they can't go
3 to the County until we make a determination. And I
4 just would like to speak to -- you know, we went over
5 the EAF, and we got the responses back from the
6 applicants to our concerns. And I do have something
7 that -- I'm going to read it because I don't want to
8 forget anything.

9 So I apologize for reading off of a paper,
10 but I do want to say that I would like for this Board
11 to find a Positive Declaration for this, and the
12 reasons being that I think there's still an issue of
13 segmentation. The Planning Board should be able to
14 look at the adjacent Route 9W frontage to determine the
15 necessary cross or joint access issues so that the
16 future development of these properties will not have a
17 negative impact on this application or future
18 applications.

19 The New York State DOT and the Town's traffic
20 consultants cannot adequately review this traffic
21 impact without the initial information that would come
22 from including those properties. A Positive
23 Declaration would enable the Planning Board to assess
24 whether alternative layouts or designs for traffic flow
25 are needed, which leads to the positive impacts

DOCK ROAD - SKETCH SITE PLAN/LOT LINE

associated with traffic impacts and design. The Planning Board should not find the current traffic study adequate if it does not include the suggestions made under the Town of Marlborough Safe Routes to School Study or the Route 9W Corridor Study that recommend sidewalks on the eastern side of Route 9W and a crosswalk for Birdsall.

25 Lastly, a Positive Declaration would enable

DOCK ROAD - SKETCH SITE PLAN/LOT LINE

1 the Planning Board to examine how this application can
2 achieve better integration with the Town of Marlborough
3 Comprehensive Plan. There should be ways the Planning
4 Board and the applicant can make this development
5 comply with the requirements to increase walkability
6 and pedestrian safety and reflect a compact settlement
7 pattern where walkability is a key part of design.
8 Community character includes being connected to the
9 hamlet. A Positive Declaration by the Planning Board
10 would enable a deeper and harder look into these
11 impactful issues. This would be the same as the action
12 by the -- that the Town Board took when they examined
13 the Hudson West Bayside project. By declaring a
14 Positive action and working with the stakeholders on an
15 EIS, they would be able to make changes to the
16 development that -- they were able to make changes to
17 the development that benefited the new residents and
18 the community.

19 So I would like to make a motion to make a
20 Positive Declaration on the Environmental Assessment.

21 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Is there a second?
22 (No response.)

23 CHAIRMAN BRAND: There's no second. That
24 motion does not move forward.

25 Pat, I have a question regarding the EAF.

DOCK ROAD - SKETCH SITE PLAN/LOT LINE

1 The last time we were here, there were several items.
2 I know they supplied some supplemental information. I
3 don't know that everyone on the Board had an
4 opportunity to review that. I'd like to have, at the
5 next meeting, where we have the -- the next meeting to
6 go over that. There were three items on the EAF form
7 that we were concerned about whether they were small
8 impacts, large impacts, and we didn't finalize that.

9 MR. HINES: Yeah. We provided that mark-up
10 of the part 2 EAF that we walked through each item, and
11 the applicant's representatives responded to -- they
12 previously identified several items that were moderate
13 to large impacts and had provided you with that
14 information. This Board had changed and/or modified
15 the part 2 as it walked through it, and they did
16 provide responses to those. I don't know if they want
17 to speak to those.

18 CHAIRMAN BRAND: I would like the Board
19 members to review that for the next meeting so we can
20 make a decision on that EAF, whether or not we're going
21 to have them be moderate impacts, large impacts, all of
22 those highlighted items that we went through. Please
23 review the materials submitted by the applicant for our
24 next meeting.

25 MS. LANZETTA: We're still waiting on any

DOCK ROAD - SKETCH SITE PLAN/LOT LINE

1 information from Creighton Manning as well, I believe.

2 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Correct. Is the Board
3 comfortable scheduling a public hearing for this at
4 this time?

5 MR. TRONCILLITO: Sure.

6 MS. LANZETTA: You do understand that they
7 can't go up to County until there is some kind of
8 resolution on the EAF?

9 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Yes. But we can have the
10 public hearing before County; correct?

11 MR. COMATOS: You can.

12 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Did anybody have a chance to
13 review that information?

14 MR. LOFARO: I did not.

15 MS. LANZETTA: I did.

16 CHAIRMAN BRAND: The EAF forms, there were
17 several items last time we were discussing whether or
18 not -- what the impact should be or shouldn't be for
19 those, and then the applicant asked for some additional
20 input, and they provided us with specific -- they
21 addressed each one of ones we highlighted. I would
22 just like, at the next meeting, to just be prepared for
23 that discussion.

24 I guess, Jen, when would we be able to have
25 the next public hearing for this project?

DOCK ROAD - SKETCH SITE PLAN/LOT LINE

1 MS. FLYNN: July 21st.

2 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Does that work for you,
3 July 21st?

4 MR. LEYTON: If that's the earliest that we
5 can do it, yes, we'll be here.

6 CHAIRMAN BRAND: I believe it is, because
7 we'll have Summit Drive at the next one, correct, the
8 16th?

9 MS. FLYNN: You have the preliminary on the
10 16th.

11 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Right. Is there anything
12 else scheduled? Could we do it on the 16th?

13 MS. FLYNN: There is something, but I think
14 it's a B&B.

15 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Could you have that ready
16 for that date, June 16th?

17 MR. LAINO: I apologize. What needs to be
18 ready?

19 CHAIRMAN BRAND: I'm sorry?

20 MR. LAINO: What would need to be ready?

21 CHAIRMAN BRAND: The mailings out for the
22 public hearing. Any type of --

23 MR. HINES: It can't happen with the
24 newspaper.

25 MS. FLYNN: That's too soon.

DOCK ROAD - SKETCH SITE PLAN/LOT LINE

1 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Too soon. So July 21st.

2 MR. LAINO: Just to clarify, there's no early
3 July hearing?

4 MS. FLYNN: No, there's not.

5 CHAIRMAN BRAND: I'd like to have a motion to
6 schedule the public hearing for July 21st.

7 MR. TRONCILLITO: I'll make that motion.

8 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Second?

9 MR. CALLO: I'll second it.

10 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Any discussion?

11 (No response.)

12 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Any objection?

13 (No response.)

14 CHAIRMAN BRAND: So we'll do that on July
15 21st.

16 MR. HINES: I know Ms. Rudow is here tonight.
17 I don't know if you want to take the opportunity to
18 review some of that or if you want to have them review
19 some of their responses.

20 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Sure. If there's something
21 you want to add -- for the EAF you're talking about,
22 Pat?

23 MR. HINES: Yes. They had prepared responses
24 to that. I don't know if they're in a position to
25 discuss that.

DOCK ROAD - SKETCH SITE PLAN/LOT LINE

1 MS. RUDOW: I think we want to clarify.
2 There were a number of items in the mark-up that we
3 received where the Board wanted to deliberate. We went
4 ahead and prepared kind of a draft attachment to the
5 part 3. It's sort of in the format of what you would
6 see in a part 3, assuming that all of the items that
7 were identified for deliberation were checked moderate
8 to large impacts. So we tried to account for -- even
9 in the case that a potential for a moderate to large
10 impact was identified, we responded to that here in
11 narrative format. We are finding no significant
12 adverse impacts. So we can certainly walk through any
13 of the items that you had questions on.

14 MR. LEYTON: Right. We're here to, if there
15 are any questions, to just, you know, answer them as
16 best we can. So if there's something you want to bring
17 up now, we're available. If you want to do that off
18 line or any other way, we're here to get you whatever
19 information you need.

20 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Does anyone want to ask any
21 specific questions?

22 MR. JENNISON: I have a specific question
23 about the map. I'm concerned about -- it was brought
24 to my attention that the parcel Josephine, they have
25 two access points. One on Dock Road, and they have a

DOCK ROAD - SKETCH SITE PLAN/LOT LINE

1 right-of-way through the property out onto 9W. Is that
2 the depicted on this map? Because I'm not seeing it.

3 MR. LEYTON: No. Again, we've -- I know
4 Josephine has access to her house through Dock Road.
5 On 9W, which there is a road to get to our basic
6 property that Josephine has been using, and she
7 contends that she has it in her deed, but there's never
8 been a -- it might be in her deed. I've never looked
9 at it. But it doesn't lay with our land. There's no
10 covenant or restriction or permanent easement that was
11 on our property. So I believe -- again, I believe her,
12 that there's something in her deed that says that, but
13 I've spoken to our attorneys, who are pretty
14 sophisticated, and there is no rights on that portion.
15 So that's why that's our access point to the
16 property -- to our property.

17 MR. JENNISON: Correct. Okay.

18 MS. LANZETTA: I have a question regarding
19 going over some of the traffic analysis. And you guys
20 have 103 units, and for your weekday --

21 MR. HINES: It's 106 now, Cindy.

22 MS. LANZETTA: It's 106, that's right. I'm
23 looking at the original traffic analysis.

24 So 106. And you're saying your weekday a.m.
25 peak hour for the trip generations would be 48

DOCK ROAD - SKETCH SITE PLAN/LOT LINE

1 vehicles, and then weekday p.m. peak hour, again would
2 be 58. Now, the Bayside project had 104 units, and
3 they generated -- they said that -- they predicted they
4 would generate 105 vehicle trips in the a.m. and 177 in
5 the peak hours of the p.m. I'm wondering why there's
6 such a big discrepancy between your figures and a
7 similar project right up the road.

8 MR. LAINO: I mean, we've never reviewed that
9 traffic study, so I don't know what they were using to
10 come up with that trip gen. We can certainly try to
11 get ahold of it and compare.

12 MS. LANZETTA: Did you read the Route 9W
13 Corridor Management Plan that the Town and the County
14 produced together?

15 MR. LAINO: Not totally, no.

16 MS. LANZETTA: That might be a good thing to
17 read too, because it has a lot to do with what the
18 projections were for the traffic and what kind of
19 improvements that they were looking to make in that
20 area. And there's certainly very different --

21 MR. LAINO: And I can bring that to my
22 traffic engineer for sure.

23 MS. LANZETTA: -- certainly very different
24 numbers. And I'm just wondering if the DOT is aware
25 that you also own the property -- the other properties

DOCK ROAD - SKETCH SITE PLAN/LOT LINE

1 that are up front on 9W.

2 MR. LAINO: So I believe that was discussed
3 with the DOT, but there's no plan for development on
4 those properties at this time, so the DOT can't analyze
5 something that's not being proposed.

6 MS. LANZETTA: And the school is aware of
7 that as well, that you own the properties up front as
8 well too?

9 MS. RUDOW: I don't believe that was
10 discussed with the school district. We had several
11 coordination calls with the school district regarding
12 access to the site. So they're very well aware of this
13 plan. We've provided them the updated site plan. We
14 have a letter from them just confirming what our
15 discussion -- what it was about. And they agreed with
16 the bus access to the site. They agreed they can't
17 access the site because it's a private road. So from
18 everything that we've coordinated with the school
19 district, they haven't flagged anything that they're
20 concerned about.

21 MR. LAINO: Again, there's no project on the
22 piece that fronts 9W at this time.

23 MS. LANZETTA: Other than the sidewalk, you
24 wouldn't be able to have anyplace for the pick-up for
25 the kids at bus stops?

DOCK ROAD - SKETCH SITE PLAN/LOT LINE

1 MR. LAINO: Correct. It would be at the
2 entrance of the proposed development on the sidewalk.

3 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Any other comments or
4 questions?

5 (No response.)

6 CHAIRMAN BRAND: All right. So we will do
7 our homework for the July 21st meeting, and we will
8 have the public hearing for the public. You can speak
9 with Jen, and she'll give you the specific information
10 regarding the mailings.

11 MR. LEYTON: Thank you. Again, just to
12 reiterate, we're here to answer questions. It doesn't
13 have to be -- we don't have to wait to July 21st. If
14 there's something that anybody wants to know, pick up a
15 phone or email, and we'll have the correspondence with
16 you.

17 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Sure. Thank you.

18 MR. LEYTON: Thank you.

19 Time noted: 7:46 p.m.

C E R T I F I C A T E O F N O T A R Y P R O C E S S I N G

21

22 Certified to be a true and accurate transcript.

23

24 *Strain S.*

25

Stacie Sullivan

Stacie Sullivan, CSR

1 STATE OF NEW YORK : COUNTY OF ULSTER
TOWN OF MARLBOROUGH PLANNING BOARD

2 In the Matter of

BOARD BUSINESS

BOARD BUSINESS

17 GERARD COMATOS, ESO.

18 JEN FLYNN

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

-----X-----

Stacie Sullivan, CSR
staciesullivan@rocketmail.com

-BOARD BUSINESS-

1 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Anything else from the
2 Board?

3 MS. LANZETTA: Oh, yes. I think -- something
4 that has been on my mind, and I just wanted to discuss
5 it with the rest of the Planning Board, is looking at
6 how we handle multifamily housing in the Town of
7 Marlborough. And I'm thinking we only allow for maybe
8 six houses on a private road, and part of that is for
9 safety reasons, but now we're reviewing multifamily
10 projects that even can be put on a driveway. And you
11 might have 32 units or a private road with 106 units,
12 and I don't know if that's in the best interests of the
13 people who are living in those places. I don't know if
14 that's something -- you know, Pat, maybe you would know
15 more. Are there any communities that require public
16 roads that service multifamily housing?

17 MR. HINES: I don't. By the nature of them,
18 they're one lot usually. They're not subdivisions. So
19 there's not -- you would be putting a public road into
20 basically one lot. I think you may want to speak to
21 your Highway Superintendent. Those are very different
22 animals when you're maintaining and plowing snow and
23 such. It's not a one pass deal. You'll have people
24 parking -- there's a lot of different access points and
25 people parking in various locations. It's often

-BOARD BUSINESS-

1 difficult to define where the site plan would end and
2 the Town road would begin. You're going to have a line
3 of snow through there. It would be a unique situation.
4 I don't know of any others. You have some
5 multifamilies here. You have Jenny's Gardens that
6 comes in off of Birdsall. You have the one right down
7 the road here I think next to Bob's house. That has a
8 fairly long roadway next to it. I don't know how long
9 -- Bob may be able to say better. But the senior
10 complex there, Horizons. That has a roadway into the
11 site, but that is -- it's a driveway. It's not a
12 private road.

13 MR. TRONCILLITO: And they're well
14 maintained. Every one of them.

15 MR. HINES: Marlboro on Hudson comes to mind,
16 up on Highland Avenue, I think. That has that
17 loop-through, but that's their roadway, owned and
18 maintained. It has the parking off of it, kind of
19 coming into it. I don't know of any other towns that
20 have multifamily with a Town road going into it. It's
21 always a site plan special use kind of thing.

22 MS. LANZETTA: But it makes it -- it just
23 seems like it makes it difficult to -- you know, we
24 don't -- like it's harder for us to be able to get the
25 improvements for pedestrian access, you know, for

-BOARD BUSINESS-

1 bicycles. Now we're introducing possible private, you
2 know -- very private, you know, roads where we're going
3 to have situations where people are going to, because
4 of inadequate parking -- additional parking for guests
5 and things, people are gonna park on roadways or they
6 leave their garbage cans out in the roadways, and then
7 the next thing you know people are reporting their
8 neighbors because, you know, they're not following the
9 rules.

10 MR. HINES: I own a condominium.

11 MS. LANZETTA: I just see a certain benefit
12 in a public road that everybody kind of -- you know,
13 there's something about being a public road besides the
14 adequate safety and the fact that you're not getting in
15 a sense double-taxed, because you are able to have the
16 Town maintain the road, that it just makes for a better
17 community where people can come and go and not be on
18 top of their neighbors. And then also it would fall
19 in, the police, to enforce HOA, you know, regulations
20 is kind of crazy too. Then you have to -- what? You
21 have to get a private agreement with the police
22 department to come in and enforce your own regulations?

23 MR. HINES: I doubt they'll do that.

24 MR. CALLO: And I actually love HOAs because
25 it keeps everybody's standards in the neighborhood up

-BOARD BUSINESS-

1 to where they are, unlike some places in Marlboro where
2 you have great roads and you have that one neighbor
3 that doesn't take care of their property. It looks
4 like hell, unfortunately. So I think HOAs -- I lived
5 in Las Vegas. We had private, gated communities where
6 would you go in and everyone -- if you didn't bring
7 your garbage can in by 5:00 that night, you got a
8 notice from the HOA, a warning. Then the next time you
9 got a fine from the HOA. So I love them because it
10 keeps -- there's no cars up on blocks. There's no
11 boats in the front yard. There's no RVs parked in the
12 front yard forever. I think it's great. It brings up
13 everybody's value in the neighborhood up to snuff as
14 well. Everyone's house gets painted at the same time.
15 The roofs get done at the same time. The yards get cut
16 at the same time. The flowers get planted at the same
17 time.

18 MS. LANZETTA: I don't know. I've been doing
19 research, and I find that with the HOAs they start out
20 as condominiums and then it usually ends up that over
21 60 percent of them end up as rentals, and they do have
22 a lot of issues with -- amongst tenants. So I guess
23 I'm reading different things than your experience.

24 Well, it just -- like I said, to me, the
25 thoughts of, you know, of having these other issues is

-BOARD BUSINESS-

1 not equal to being in a more public sphere. That's why
2 I wanted to bring it up. Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN BRAND: Thank you. Anything else?
4 (No response.)

5 CHAIRMAN BRAND: All right. We are
6 adjourned.

7 Time noted: 7:54 p.m.

8

9 C E R T I F I C A T I O N

10

11 Certified to be a true and accurate transcript.

12

13

Stacie Sullivan

14

Stacie Sullivan, CSR

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25