

**VILLAGE OF HASTINGS-ON-HUDSON, NY PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING AND CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING
JUNE 15, 2006**

A **Regular Meeting and Continued Public Hearing** was held by the Planning Board on **Thursday, June 15, 2006 at 8:15 p.m.** in the Municipal Building Meeting Room, 7 Maple Avenue, Hastings-on-Hudson, New York, 10706.

PRESENT: Chairperson Patricia Speranza, Boardmembers William Logan, Fred Wertz (8:30 p.m.), Jamie Cameron, Eva Alligood, Bruce Dale, Village Attorney Marianne Stecich, and Village Planning Director Angela Witkowski.

Chairperson Speranza: You'll see that there are some new faces up here at the Board. What I would like to do first is just thank the members of our Board who are not on the Board anymore. Bill Smith served a term with us and we want to thank him for his service. Abba Tor, who was with us for many years as a regular Planning Board member and then the past few years was serving as an alternate for us, thank you Abba for all of your hard work; and most especially, Rhoda Barr, who was on the Board for more than 20 years, a great many of them as chairperson. I know that's a big chunk of someone's life to be able to spend and dedicate to the Village. So thank you Rhoda, thank you Bill, and thank you Abba. Before formal roll call I would like to also introduce the new members of our Board, Bruce Dale, Eva Alligood, and Jamie Cameron. We'll do formal roll call, and then I'd like to have them each tell us a little bit about themselves.

I. Roll Call

II. New Business

Chairperson Speranza: Bruce, do you want to just tell us a little bit about yourself?

Boardmember Dale: Okay, I'm a relatively new resident to Hastings. I've been here six years. I'm an architect and urban planner by training and worked for the city of New York both in the planning commission as well as their housing agency, Housing Preservation and Development. The last 20 years I have worked for Community Preservation Corporation ... a not-for-profit bank that finances low- and middle-income housing in New York City.

Chairperson Speranza: Okay, thank you. Eva?

Boardmember Alligood: I've been a resident of Hastings for five years. My background is also in city and regional planning, also with actually a concentration in community economic development and affordable housing. I worked for over six years at the Pratt Institute Center for Community Environmental Development, which works with neighborhoods on creating a vision of the future for low-income neighborhoods on development. I also worked at the Corporation for Support of Housing, which works with special needs populations on housing with social supports. For the past six years I've been an independent consultant in planning and community development.

Chairperson Speranza: Okay, thank you. And Jamie?

Boardmember Cameron: My name's Jamie Cameron. I've lived in Hastings since 1981. I actually did serve previously on the Planning Board back in the 1980s. I have a strong interest in planning even though I have no training in that area. I've served on pathway committees and other ad hoc study groups in the town over the last 25 years.

Chairperson Speranza: Okay, thank you and welcome. Get ready to do some work now.

III. Old Business

Continued Public Hearing. Accessory Apartment Renewal. Christopher Ryan, 66 Hillside Avenue (Sheet 23, Block 673, Lots 1 and 34). Waivers required for square foot area and parking.

Chairperson Speranza: This came to us as a renewal at the last meeting. There was some concern expressed by one of the neighbors. We recommended that they try to work it out and come back to us. Maybe Angie you could give us, especially for the benefit of the new Boardmembers, just the summary of the application.

Village Planner Witkowski: This is a continued public hearing, as Ms. Speranza said. The property is located on the south side of Hillside Avenue in the R-7.5 zoning district. The applicant is requesting renewal of an accessory apartment approval. The 624 square foot apartment occupies 33.6% of the 1,800 square foot residence, therefore it exceeds the 25% of floor area limitation by 8.6%. There have been no changes to the property and there were some issues that the neighbor had, which Mr. Ryan has met with her about and will go over tonight. The actions required are renewal of the accessory apartment approval, and waivers for parking, and the 8.6% excess over the floor area limitation.

Chairperson Speranza: Okay, thank you. Mr. Ryan, do you want to tell us what's transpired since the last meeting we had.?

Christopher Ryan, 66 Hillside Avenue: Sure. At the last meeting the Board asked -- because my neighbor wasn't here at the meeting you presented me with a letter of her concerns -- me to reach out to her and discuss with her some of the issues. I can report that that meeting took place. We had a pleasant and healthy conversation. I think each side started to learn a little bit more about our objectives and our goals and where we wanted to be, so I think it was very worthwhile.

I think, in the end, my neighbors and I came to a resolution — a bit of a compromise. Clearly, the accessory apartment touches a number of lives, not just my neighbor and myself. My mother is obviously involved in this. This whole thing was really put together for her benefit in the beginning, trying to just help one of the aging citizens of Hastings. It affects the tenants also and there are other people who it affects, but those are the principal parties.

I also took the opportunity to, obviously, speak to my mother and find out what she was comfortable with. Obviously, that's a delicate issue. Also took the opportunity to speak to the tenants, who happen to be my cousin and her husband and child, to get a feel for where they are in their life situation. Obviously, people's lives change -- they evolve, and things happen. As it works out, they are in the process of looking for another place to live. They gave me a short-term window and a long-term window; short-term window being six months, long-term window being a year-and-a-half. I conveyed that to Beth, my neighbor, and her husband Jose`, and a determination of their residency in the house.

I think what I'd like to do is dismantle the accessory apartment. I guess myself, my family, and my mother will try to figure out some other alternative to make sure my mother is okay. We'll deal with that. That's a personal issue and obviously not for this board. My neighbors seem to be agreeable. I think that they, in that meeting, indicated that they would support me in this process, providing with the contingency that I dismantle the apartment when my cousin and her family leave. I think that will work for me. You'll obviously want to confirm that with my neighbor. I do want to thank my neighbors for their understanding of the matter. They certainly have been patient. And I think if the Board can renew this process for one more term I think it will help me, and this chapter in my life will come to an end and I'll figure out some other solution to my personal issues. So that's basically it.

Chairperson Speranza: Okay. At the last meeting there had been some suggestions made in terms of being able to soften the effect of the...

Mr. Ryan: You know, we talked about that, and that would probably require more infrastructure. Neither I, nor my neighbor, are really interested in putting up more infrastructure. I think less is more in this particular case. I think when I originally came to the Board a number of years ago to apply for the accessory apartment -- and I recognize the composition of the Board has changed over the years -- but in those initial approvals my intention was never to make this a permanent situation. I wasn't looking to rezone the property, I wasn't looking to make it into a multiple family dwelling on a permanent basis. This was a temporary solution to a personal matter, and we think that we can come up with another solution that will keep everybody happy.

Chairperson Speranza: Okay, thank you.

Beth Fonfrias, 38 School: Yes, Chris and I actually had a very productive, cordial meeting. He does know of my objections, which I think I worded fairly strongly in my letter, because ... Chris Ryan's house is very close to my house. But I am agreeable, because I think it's nice to be neighborly if at all possible, that I'd be willing to say that you could extend the allowance of this apartment. I will want to put on record that it is six months to a year-and-a-half. I don't know if I have any recourse. I think the accessory apartment is for four years, but I don't know if there's a possibility of putting off deciding this for six months to a year-and-a-half. I just have to trust that when this tenant moves out that he will not rent it again.

Chairperson Speranza: Yes, that's what I was just checking with counsel as far as the existing accessory apartment permit is expired. So we do have to renew it. ...Can we renew it for a maximum other than the regular three years?

Village Attorney Stecich: Yes, I think you can do that. You have the authority to impose conditions, and I would say that's a condition that would be acceptable and stand up.

Chairperson Speranza: Okay, comments from Boardmembers? No? Anyone else from the public wish to speak on this? Well, we should come to a definite term. Should we say two years? That good?

Mr. Ryan: I think things are moving a little bit quicker than I anticipated, even with respect to my tenants' desire or intent on moving. There's a few things involved in it, clearly, and some of those things have happened already. If my sources are correct, and I understand they eyed a house already and are pretty interested, I don't think the two years is outrageous.

Chairperson Speranza: Okay.

Mr. Ryan: Two years, I think, will work for me. I mean, they gave me a six-month to a year-and-a-half window. If I'm back here in two years talking to you, then I don't know, we'll figure that out, too. But I think two years will work.

Chairperson Speranza: Okay, then what I need is a motion from the Board to grant the accessory apartment renewal along with the waivers required for being in excess of the 25% floor area and a waiver for the requirement for off-street parking.

On MOTION of Boardmember Dale, SECONDED by Boardmember Logan with a voice vote of all in favor, the Board resolved to approve the accessory apartment with the condition that it be for a period of two years rather than three years.

Boardmember Alligood: Just note that I can't participate. I'm not participating because I'm within the notice area.

Chairperson Speranza: Right, thank you.

Ms. Fonfrias: Okay, thank you very much.

Chairperson Speranza: Okay, thanks.

2. 10 West Main. Continuation of SEQRA and Site Plan Review Issues.

Chairperson Speranza: Okay, the next item on our agenda is old business. It's actually the next step in the process for us to consider development of the property at 10 West Main Street, something that's been going on for quite a while now. What we have requested is that the applicant do kind of a historical presentation bringing us up to where that project is right now, particularly for the benefit of our new members. First, I would like to have our attorney, Marianne Stecich, go through where we are procedurally in this and then we'll hear about the development, what's happened with the development over the course of time.

Village Attorney Stecich: Unlike many of the applications -- actually most of the applications that have been before the Planning Board over the last few years, the big applications -- this one does not require any action by any other board. It doesn't need a rezoning. It did earlier, and I'll give you a history of that. I don't think they're going to need any variances, if I understand. So the decision will be just by this board, but there's a lot of decisions this board has to make. You're going to have to give it site plan approval, and they're in the course of the site plan approval process. They're going to need SEQRA determination, which I'll get back to. They're going to need view preservation recommendation. They're going to need a steep slope approval.

And then also, I was just checking the law on this, you also have to give them permission to have a residential use on the ground floor. When this proposal first came before the Board the zoning had been changed recently in the CC district to permit mixed use buildings, but in mixed use buildings you can't have residential on the ground floor. So there was a zoning amendment, or a definitional amendment, proposed to the Board of Trustees. I guess that you spent most of 2004, on the definition of the mixed use building. It's since been changed so that you can have residential use on the ground floor, and I'll tell you what the conditions are because it may be relevant when you're reviewing this. The statute reads: "Only residential uses are permitted on the ground floor. The Planning Board, however, after a public hearing held upon the same notice as that required for a zoning variance" -- so that's how we're going to have to do a public notice on this -- "may, in its discretion, permit residential use on the ground floor in the CC district" -- this isn't the CC district -- "but only if such residential use is 1) not located on that portion of the ground floor story that abuts a street and is compatible with neighboring properties and is consistent with the commercial nature of the CC district." So at some point you'll have to make that determination. The proposal is to have some residential on the first floor, but toward the back, and they'll explain that. So that's another approval you're going to have to give them.

This application first came before the Board in October of 2003. Now, it isn't that the Board's been laboring over it for that many years because it comes and goes ... It was ... a year that was spent trying to resolve the issue of whether you could have residential use on the ground floor of a mixed use building.

Also the architects will show there've been some huge changes in the look and the size of the building from 2003 until now. Now, do the new members know what SEQRA is?

Boardmember Dale: Yes.

Village Attorney Stecich: Sorry, not everybody would necessarily. So just to tell you where they are -- oh, yes, well, you're a planner, what am I thinking? I should have been looking at Jamie -- in the SEQRA process in October of 2003, shortly after the Board got the application, the Planning Board declared the intent to be lead agency. Actually, they're the only real involved agency so they're the lead agency. They reviewed an EAF, mostly at that point to identify what they thought were the possibly significant environmental impacts. The Board has not yet done either a positive declaration or a negative declaration on it. The Planning Board was a little gun shy, a little SEQRA-shy, because they had come off of two hugely long EISs, and said, Do we really have to go through that process? Isn't there a more efficient way to do it? So as you I'm sure are familiar, there's been some -- well, it's not so recent now, but in 2003 it was fairly recent -- case law that says that a board can, early in the process, identify what they think might be the potential significant impacts, have those impacts studied. And then if changes are made in response to those studies to the proposal that you ultimately vote, whether it's going to have environmental impacts or not, doesn't have them anymore, then you can neg dec it. And this is what the applicants, I think, are hoping for; the Planning Board, too, in the sense that the EIS process isn't easy.

So they identified as potentially significant environmental impacts, traffic. Not so much the number of cars, but traffic circulation because of the location of it right near that parking lot. Obviously visual impacts because it was much bigger than anything there now. And then I don't know, if they brought the drawings of their very first proposal you'd understand why there was a concern over visual impacts. I was saying to -- I guess it was James -- that I thought you should bring one of those really scary ones from the beginning; scary for the Village. So the visual were the second set.

Chairperson Speranza: And the steep slopes.

Village Attorney Stecich: And then thirdly, the engineering because it would be built on steep slopes. So they submitted their engineering reports. Their engineering was done by John Meyer; their traffic study done by John Collins; and the visual was what the architects brought us. So the Village retained its own experts to look at those same issues, to review their analyses. And they hired Buckhurst Fish & Jacquemart for the visual impacts and for the traffic and, I guess it was through them, Charles Sells for the engineering. We got the reports back from all of them. That's one thing that we should make sure we get to the new Boardmembers. They found that there would not be any significant traffic impacts or circulation impacts. There were a couple members on the Board, Bill Smith in particular, who felt very strongly about that. Even he felt, after the studies came in, that, as proposed, there wouldn't be any significant traffic impacts.

Chairperson Speranza: I want to offer to the members that there was a videotape done by the Village showing the circulation patterns through that parking lot over the course of a couple of days, if you want to take a look and get a good sense of what happens there.

Village Attorney Stecich: It was actually really revealing.

Chairperson Speranza: Very surprising.

Village Attorney Stecich: Yes, it really was. What surprised me was the amount of available parking there on that side of town. It was surprising.

All right, that was the traffic. The engineering, I'm saving the best for last. I was waiting for Eric to come in. Our engineering consultant was satisfied that the engineering and the storm water management, everything, would work on this site even with the steep slopes. So even though the Board has voted on it, generally there seemed to be resolution on that issue. Although you may read through the reports and find something that you're uncomfortable with, what was still an open issue was the visual impacts. I think as of the last presentation the applicants made before the Board it didn't appear as if there was yet a majority of the Board who was prepared to say, We don't think there's going to be significant visual impacts. They asked the applicant to make some more submissions to show how...well, they actually, I think, asked for a model because they were having a hard time picturing how it would fit in with the surrounding properties, size-wise. They had the drawings, but it was a little hard to tell. So there was a proposal that there be a model, but that was the last. That was where we left it with the applicants, I guess, in April. I think that pretty much covers it.

Chairperson Speranza: We'll make sure that you also get the environmental assessment form for this, the most recent one that was done. Because we will have to go through that prior to making any kind of a determination, whether it's a positive declaration or a negative declaration. So we will make sure that you get that. I am not proposing that we vote on any of that today because to make a sound judgment I would prefer that you catch up on that history a little bit.

Village Attorney Stecich I'm sorry, that's the part I left out is what the next step is. The next step is for the Board to vote on the environmental impacts: do you think there's going to be significant environmental impacts, mitigated or not. And if you don't think there'd be any, then you'd go on with your review. If you think that there are going to be significant impacts that aren't remedied or proposed to be remedied, then they'll have to go through a full environmental impact statement.

Chairperson Speranza: Okay, thank you Marianne. Anyone have any questions on that up until that point? We have the applicant here. Eric, Jim, whoever wants to go through the project, describe how you've gotten here.

Eric Anderson, developer - Urban Green: Bad traffic today. Sorry for being so late. A lot of new faces here... So the way we've gotten here is, we were attracted to Hastings because we became aware of a rezone of the downtown which as specifically to the point of trying to create a mixed use community downtown to promote residential living downtown; to support these new businesses; to make the Village of Hastings a more walkable opportunity for residents. Being an environmentalist fundamentally, and being an advocate of this very large notion of smart growth development, the idea of being able to build in a village within a stone's throw, literally, on this side -- a relatively good arm stone's throw -- from the train station we thought, Well, this is terrific. So we had scored your village into sites already. Main Street is under construction. And Division Street, since we were here last we actually closed on the bond financing with New York State. I think they're actually starting to dig today. So these are both emblematic -- not emblematic because they're real. They're the kinds of projects that my firm, Urban Green, does. We are builders and developers of products that are meant to be denser uses of the built environment, and to make them as environmentally sound as possible. We believe fundamentally that the very fact of locating a building in an existing built environment where you are not car-dependent is about the biggest gift that we can give as a developer. Not that developers are into giving gifts, but that's philosophically where I live.

The two buildings, both the affordable building at 422 Warburton and the market-rate mixed use building at 45 Main Street, are both buildings that we expect to have LEED certification on, for those familiar with that term. They are both buildings that will be heated and cooled exclusively by geothermal wells. Division Street, if I can figure out the financing, we'll put a green roof on that building. We're introducing different finishes that are recycled. At 422 Warburton, the 100% affordable project, we have introduced a series of elements that you just simply don't see in affordable housing projects, for which we are very proud. And we think the architecture of the two buildings that are under construction is quite good, and we think that we will make positive contributions to the built environment thereby.

This proposed building, at 10 West Main Street, I think has all of those same qualities and then some. I believe that this is a piece of the Village which is a little bit off the beaten track as opposed to Main Street or Warburton. It doesn't get a lot of vehicular traffic passing by. There's a fair amount of pedestrian traffic because of the stair leading down to the train which is one of the things that attracted us to the site. But I believe that it's a corner of the Village, actually, as you approach the Village ...from the commuter parking ... can be quite prominent because of its location and it's on a steep slope. ...The new zoning adopted two years ago, requires ...parking inside the structure, which is a new requirement in the Village. Because cars are of a certain size and... need to get in and out of a physical space in traffic lanes that are "X", then park in spaces that are "Y-by-Z", you are constrained by the reality of having to park cars in a building that's built under the new zoning. This is a reality.

So we then tussle with this problem. And the only way really to solve it on a project of this scale -- and we are talking about nine units, you're talking about a very modest project -- there are four units on the site now, so we're talking about a net increase of five units. To justify that kind of parking inside a building you really need to be able to use slope to your advantage so you're not having to dig down but you're able to sort of go with the grade. At Main Street we actually are able to use the terrain topography sort of to go up the hill. At Division Street, same thing, uphill. Here we're going down the hill. Then, as we go into the hillside, with its parking, we are presented with a couple of options. And I think that the choice between these two options, from a design perspective, is pretty clear. We could either have the parking read, if you will, from the downslope side -- meaning someone from the commuter parking lot could look up and see a parking garage -- or we could screen it; essentially have the building come further down the hillside, or further out on the slope, in order to screen the parking. We think that the choice between those two -- there may not be A and B, I'm not sure if there's a C but I've only been able to come up with A and B in terms of how to approach this problem -- we think that the screening option is vastly superior to have the garage read, the parking read, from below.

So that reality, or that choice, forces the building to be a certain size at its base. There was a conversation about a model last time which, for us, for this relatively small property is prohibitive. So what we tried to do...the architects, I think, did, at least to my thinking, a good job, as they kind of broke the building down into its components and kind of layered it as a way to kind of illustrate how the volume works and how the volume kind of works on itself and how this screening works as a function of the slope. And it also, I think, does a very good job of telling you, or of suggesting, how much of the building actually is simply a screen for the purposes of the fact that the slope is falling so we have to create a screen at the foundation level which adds what appears to be mass to the building. It's not actually the building. It's actually a skirt, if you will, for the foundation.

So we have this problem, we have this A/B choice, and we've selected this idea of screening the parking. When we first approached the Planning Board, or as we approached the Planning Board with this project, we had sort of a monolithic facade on the southern exposure which is a very modern style. We were met with universal disdain but for Mr. Logan. So reading the tea leaves, if you will, we took a softer approach to the building. But beyond the architecture, I think what the architects did -- we worked very much to break up the massing of the building. Instead of having a monolith, having a single facade, we created this. Actually, I think what we did is construct a footprint that actually, in plan, looks like three buildings, with the most important element of breaking up the monolith being what I mistakenly referred to once as a keyhole. It's a 22-foot wide keyhole, - it's a big key -- which comes sort of diagonally through the building.

Chairperson Speranza: Now why don't you point that out.

Mr. Anderson: I think it's illustrated quite well on the package that was...just the color. And I'm sorry for the cartoon character of the last submission. It was really meant to illustrate the point. I think actually Dave, who is not here tonight but is still with us, right?

Chairperson Speranza: Yes.

Mr. Anderson: I was butting heads with him in the last go-round because he started talking to us about the building. The southernmost piece of the building, I think the way he was talking about it, was that it was four stories, and the building was at four stories all the way through to West Main Street. And, in fact, it's not. It's a three-story building at the southern facade. And then there's a courtyard, which you don't read when you're looking at these flat two-dimensional representations. There's a courtyard, and then there's actually another three-story building. But if you look at it from the south facade it looks like it's a four-story building. So he was asking us, "Well, why don't you make the south facade shorter? Why don't you make it three stories." I wasn't getting what he was talking about, so this is why we took this approach of really trying to differentiate the thing with color and make it read the way that it actually will read, which is, the southern facade has a lot of articulation; the building moves in and out dramatically in a module which is reflective of the module to the east, which are the houses to the east. And that there is this significant view corridor, which doesn't exist currently, which would allow for the public, through an easement, to enjoy the Hudson River / Palisades from a view platform, a daylight-restricted public easement. So we have this 22-foot wide keyhole, and then we also have this courtyard that actually separates the southern piece from the northeast piece. Then there's the west piece which sits entirely by itself, which is fronted with two small retail spaces, which are requirements of the code.

I'm not sure that this satisfies the argument, or encouragement, that Dave was suggesting. But I think the point that I'm trying to make, is that the building itself -- the issue of the view...and that was the issue before we had three new Boardmembers and maybe there's other issues. But the issue that was of the moment in the last go-round was, Man, this is a big building for this site. I don't think we're ever going to agree the righteousness of that position. What we are suggesting is that by having the building articulate the way it does, by having the building move in and out, by changing the material from the recyclable wood that we are proposing to the brick as the building moves in and out, by introducing this keyhole, by having the building step up as you go from south to north, that there's a richness to this proposed building, which doesn't read well in a two-dimensional representation because this side is very deep and there's a lot of things happening there that just don't read right. But as we've attempted to break it down by piece, we're hoping to ... trying to articulate better that this building is quite dynamic, and that the southern facade, which is the one -- I'm speaking for the Board now -- facade that the Board still had trouble with -- not the north or the west facade -- really was quite a dynamic facade and our attempts to mitigate this issue of view was reflected by efforts that we made with these different and various architectural moves.

Chairperson Speranza: Eric, could you just go through... the... overall site plan, building plan, that I saw. If you'd just go through the basic elements, the retail. Just walk it through, what you've got, where you're going to have the retail use along the stairs. First the components, and then walk us through the diagrams that you did with respect to the massing.

Mr. Anderson: Sure. So West Main's here, stairs coming down are here. We have a driveway that goes down into essentially what's a basement when you're looking from the West Main Street side. A parking garage -- which comes as most of this footprint -- and then there's a keyhole, and then there's commercial space A and commercial space B, all right? And this commercial space was a function of a long conversation about, I think, a very righteous notion that the downtown rezoning was about creating a facade on the first floor. Then as you get off of the public facade and as you start to get views to the south, you start to have apartments. We think of this building, or I think of this building, as really sort of like this is one-third, this is the second third, and this is the third third, with the infamous keyhole, and the courtyard being the elements that divide the building into its three parts.

The other thing that happens immediately is that you start to have a lot of outdoor spaces. So this whole corner actually is a response to the neighbors' notion that their view would be significantly decreased by our building coming straight down. So we actually jogged it back, chopped it off, and created an outdoor deck that would go out just to this apartment here. And then these other outdoor spaces, some of which, again, would be private. And these outdoor spaces I think, again, are part of this richness of the activity of the building, the visual activity of the building, and how you perceive the building from the downslope.

And then as you come up we have two elevators. We have an elevator here and an elevator here. So the basement, if you will, this is all parking. The vast majority of that first level is parking and circulation for the parking. So we have a relatively modest amount of residential on this level. Again, this is all the downslope side, so this is all that screening notion that we talked about earlier. And then the first floor, which is the floor that I was just describing, commercial and residential; residential, driveway down into the parking garage. Then this is an entirely residential floor. I think there's four apartments on this floor and three on the top floor. These gray areas, again this notion of sort of stepping back I always think of .. -- I'm very sorry, but all this kind of outdoor space, all this kind of mysterious outdoor space that I think really informs how the building reads and, frankly, how people will enjoy the building -- the notion that we're trying to bring the outdoor into where you live is well exemplified by, I think, the very design these guys have come up with. Do you want the architects to go through the diagrams?

Chairperson Speranza: Yes, I think that would be helpful. I know you've been here lots of times, but just your name, please.

Asaf Yogev, Cutsgeorge Tooman & Allen Architects: The one thing that people forget to mention -- it's been awhile -- is that the site has an easement, a sewer easement, that actually prevents us from building on the site on that low side. If you see these detached lines here, that's the extent of the easement. We can't build over it. The area that's left on the downside of the slope is really limited. So we're really limited to that area that...actually, the footprint that we're showing is the limitation of our site.

I want to just show this diagram here that shows — this is what we're allowed to build on the site -- this diagram here. Again, the facet of this shape is determined by the easement. We couldn't go further down the slope. This is what we're actually proposing to build. The total square footage allowable is 58,000 square feet, and we're building 36,500; out of which, I think, about 9,000 or 8,000 is the parking garage below grade.

So this is the site, then -- the restriction of the site. The next move was to put the parking below ground. As tight as you think that 17 cars can fit down there, this is the extent of the parking lot. It's almost close to the edge of the allowable footprint. Then as Eric mentioned, the screening of this parking garage -- with the apartments in front of it around the south and wrapping around the west side and a little bit on the northwest side --originally we wrapped all around that. After we answered the concerns of the traffic consultant we had to actually extend the wrap even further and make it longer. Everything got pushed to the sides more to meet the requirements of the slope, the ramp, and the size of the parking spaces. Everything got pushed a little more that way. We lost the screening that we had on the west side.

These colors represent the easement and, actually, 3 buildings on a platform. The first building that we added here is the northeast building. It includes the commercial space on the ground floor and the ramp that goes down to the parking garage on the northeast side, and then there are two apartments above it. The next building is one on the northwest side. Now again, when you look at the building it appears like a four-story building. Obviously, the lower level is the parking garage, which is screened properly. And this building has four apartments total, including a duplex here, a duplex on the West Main side, and two apartments here. The third component is the south component that always looked like a four- or even five-story building. That's because the slope of the site in this location is the steepest, and for us to cover this it would seem like there were two more stories there. But actually it is only three stories, two above the ground level on West Main and one below. And then the last image shows the screening in front of the stilts that are supporting the building. This was also something that was discussed with the Architectural Review Board about masking this facade.

There were too few photos around the Village to show the things that we were trying to maybe avoid by screening. I don't know the exact address of this building, but this situation where you have a four- or a three-story building built on stilts. This one is, I think, on Southside Avenue.

This is a parking lot, that if you look at it from Southside this is what you see. It's built on stilts, and we're trying to avoid that by covering it. Actually, we followed what the Architectural Review Board proposed, to screen with the stone and extend the drape-down or the wood and stone all the way down to the ground level to screen that. That was all we did to make it appear like a four-story building, but it's actually not. This building has two stories above, and if you look at it from below it's three stories. This one here is a two-and-a-half story building, and it's actually four-and-a-half stories on the west side. Again, this is screened. You don't see the stilts there. These photos were taken from the mansion under the Warburton Bridge. This building is a four-story building but it actually has six stories on the south side. Same thing here, it's actually on stilts. This is something we tried to avoid, and we were working with the ARB trying to screen this to not have this situation here.

Should I talk about the history? I brought what I could find.

Chairperson Speranza: While you're getting that stuff out, let me explain one thing to the Boardmembers. The CC zone does permit the Planning Board to allow a fourth story within the zoning on these sites in order to encourage creativity and to make use of the existing slopes to hopefully come up with a better project. It's a tool that was used at 45 Main Street where the fourth story on that building would actually be set back and it will look like it's a two-story building, essentially, from Whitman. So it was something that was adopted with the zone, but it is at the discretion of the Board. That is an element of this proposal.

Mr. Yogev: All right, this is really old. I had to bring it up from storage. This is one of many iterations that this project had at the beginning. This is the monolith building that Eric was talking about at the beginning. It had four stories and, as you can see, it was a modern building and didn't last long, as Eric said.

Mr. Anderson: It's a great building.

Chairperson Speranza: It lasted one meeting.

Mr. Yogev: Yes, that lasted not very long. Then after that we really went to the softer approach and decided on a softer approach, something that fits more with the Village -- the 22- to 20-foot module that follows West Main Street. If you go down West Main Street, that was a module that was suggested by the Architectural Review Board -- to use a 20- to 22-foot base to break the building down. And that follows down when you walk down West Main Street. This shows 5 iterations and there were maybe 15 of them, and they're all different. I couldn't find all of them, but [these give you the idea].

Chairperson Speranza: That's all right. Well, this started out -- remind me -- with 18 units? It was 18 units.

Mr. Yogev : It started at 18 units, and it started with tandem parking.

Chairperson Speranza: Right.

Mr. Yogev: That was brought down to 17 spaces. And it's not tandem parking. Again, every time there was something a little different there; sometimes with trees, sometimes without trees. The Planning Board asked us to do a rendering with trees, without the trees. The Architectural Review Board wanted to see the trees. So that's why we have so many of them. This is the West Main facade. I think this is almost what we have today, just about. This was the view from Warburton Bridge, and then we have many more iterations. This had a tower in the corner. That tower is gone now. It was the Planning Board that disagreed with the Architectural Review Board who wanted a tower. So it's gone. The last time the tower was still a tower, and now we're down to no tower and we actually chopped that corner completely and reduced the height of the roof. It used to be 3 feet above the highest roof, and it's now the same height.

These are just, again, the views that we always show from all the sides of the building. This is the West Main facade. This would be the south facade. This is the southwest facade with the overlook. This is the corner that's chopped right here. The one thing we did here, we pushed the building 5 feet away from the lot line on West Main just so it lines up with the other buildings on West Main. They're all set back 5 to 7 feet. This one's set back 5 feet. It allows for what we would like to be an outdoor space for a commercial store here. Then this is obviously the entrance to the ramp that takes you down to the parking lot.

The last time we were here was two months ago. You asked us to do two more renderings, one from Warburton Bridge about 20 feet behind the wine store. Now as you can see, if I did take 20 feet away I can see absolutely nothing from our railing. But this is all you can see from between the wine store and the trees because there are just too many of them there. So this is the only view of the building from that point. The other view that you requested was from the train platform. It was under construction, but we think that it's going to be the same place that it was. So this is it from the only place that was accessible.

Again, we were here yesterday morning and we marked...if you take your site plan, we put yellow tape, yellow caution tape, around every tree on the site that does not fall under the footprint of the new building. If I have to do this again after I did this, I actually don't think I'd see any of the building from the platform. I mean, the coverage is too thick there. I wouldn't see anything there. I'd urge you, if you walk around the site -- if you walk down West Main, walk down the stairs, walk to the commuter parking lot -- if you are close to the curb and you look up you'll see all the trees that are going to stay. I think you'll agree that a very small portion of the building will be visible from there, from the south.

Mr. Anderson: It's actually everything that's on the south or west side of the easement. Every tree stays.

Mr. Yogev: Everything that is on the easement, or south or west of it, stays and you're not going to see the building at all, I think. Again, this view here is going to be a lot more

covered that what I showed. You know, it's very generous here. Because a lot of the trees that are there...if you just walk down the stairs, a lot of the trees that are here are not even on our site. There are a lot of trees on this side of the stairs, but it's not even close to us. They're here, but you wouldn't see it; it'd be just maybe a corner of the building. I urge anyone here, or the Architectural Review Board or the public, to walk around the site to see that all these trees are going to stay there. Some of them are close to the building, but I think the intent is to try and save whatever we can – whatever we're not building over.

Boardmember Logan: Quick question? If I could go back to that previous photo montage under that sheet you've got your hand on, the top photograph, the building on the right, is Rockwood and Perry? Is that it, the wine store?

Mr. Yogev: Wine store here.

Boardmember Logan: The brown is the existing house?

Mr. Yogev: I think this is 8 West Main, this one is 6 West Main, this is 4 West Main.

Boardmember Logan: Okay, so this is not a montage of what your building would look like from this viewpoint.

Mr. Yogev : It is. This is the building right here.

Boardmember Logan: That's the building back there.

Mr. Yogev: Right. That's the only thing that would be visible from this point. Anything south of this corner -- a little bit south, like more than 20 feet -- I wouldn't see anything. There would just be the trees here. I'm sorry. These trees here are the ones that are located north of the stair, which is really not on our site. So they all would stay.

Chairperson Speranza: Okay. I just want to make clear, we're here and we're on both ends chuckling about some of the things we've been through with respect to the process. But we do take very seriously the notion that we want a project here that is going to be reflective of the Village and will work nicely with the Village, while at the same time progressing the idea that this is a site...it is near the railroad station and therefore it does make sense to have more units there than may be there now.

One of the things that I know we had talked about at the last meeting, and I thought, Mr. Stadler, that you had mentioned, that you would allow the photographs to be taken. I'm wondering if that's...so there's something that we'll...okay, we'll get. Because again, I think it was helpful for you to go through what you've got -- I'll just call it the model -- but one of the items has always been the context. This again is just without the context.

Certainly the photograph that you've taken now from the Warburton Avenue Bridge across does give us a sense of what that additional vantage point will be. But also it will be helpful, since we will be looking at this for view preservation and neighbors' views are important also, to be able to take a look at how this works with respect to the neighbors there as well. Does anyone have questions about this at this point?

Boardmember Dale: I was going to ask if you could describe the materials that you're using to build, and what would be visible.

Mr. Yogev: Eric mentioned earlier recycled wood. This is actually something we'd tried before and used successfully – wood from recycled water tanks in New York City that we found they just throw away. We've asked that whenever a water tank is being replaced in New York we get to keep the wood to recycle. It's either cedar or redwood. That's the wood siding. The other components are the brick and then the roofs are just metal roofs.

Boardmember Dale: And the screen is stone? The screening for the parking?

Mr. Stadler : Stone. Stone from the ground to a certain level, and then it just picks up the material that is located above. That's one of the reasons that it appears like a four-story or a three-story building when it's just a two- or a three-story. Because the material is actually pulled down towards the ground, then the stone is brought up from the ground.

Boardmember Dale: Are you going to vary the color of the brick in different portions of the site?

Mr. Yogev: We didn't think about that.

Boardmember Cameron: The illustration indicates that.

Mr. Yogev: It could be the shape.

Mr. Anderson: But aren't we also going brick/wood?

Mr. Yogev: Yes, the idea was that we can alternate between brick and wood, and that would illustrate the breaking up of the module on this side and on the West Main side.

Boardmember Dale: So the middle part is wood?

Mr. Stadler: This is wood. This is brick and metal, this is wood, this is brick and metal, and then there's another bay here that is wood and another bay here that is brick and metal.

Boardmember Cameron: What kind of metal roofing do you put in? That's not really that common in our town. I know you have a planned elsewhere, but...

Mr. Yogev: There's this new building going up...

Boardmember Cameron: I know, I know.

Mr. Yogev: ... coated copper?

Craig Tooman; Cutsgeorge tooman & Allen, Architects: We at one point proposed regular copper, and at this point we think it may be some sort of a zinc coating. But a metallic color, not a shiny finish.

Mr. Yogev: No, the original proposal is to have copper green.

Boardmember Cameron: And the roofs on the back are the same thing? They look

different.

Mr. Yogev: Yes, these are the same.

Boardmember Cameron: They're all metal roofs.

Mr. Yogev: Yes. They're not mansard, but they're the same [material].

Chairperson Speranza: Okay, any other questions or comments from the Board?

Boardmember Cameron: Yes, just one other thing. This corridor here you describe as 22 feet wide. In fact, in the middle it's 8 feet wide, isn't it?

Mr. Tooman: That's right. It does vary.

Boardmember Cameron: The keyhole is 8 feet, and it's the entryway that's 20.

Mr. Yogev: Yes, the entryway is 22 feet.

Boardmember Cameron: Okay, just so we have that.

Boardmember Alligood: And how will that be closed off at night? You said it's going to be just accessible during the day.

Mr. Anderson: We don't know yet.

Boardmember Alligood: A gate or something?

Mr. Anderson: A gate, yes. But something that would be...you know, again, it would be a visual opportunity.

Mr. Tooman: We were thinking a very large fold-down garage door.

[laughter]

Boardmember Dale: Having been new to this project, is the parking -- the 17 spaces -- is that what's mandated by the zoning?

Mr. Yogev: By the room count, yes.

Mr. Anderson: So I think it was referenced earlier. This is a project that requires no variance. As we believe, it requires no variance, and that's been tested pretty well by the consultants.

Boardmember Cameron: I guess one question I have is, and maybe it's really a question for us rather than them, we have all these trees and let's say they do survive. What's to prevent the future owners from trimming them, cutting holes in the trees? Is there anything that we can do to keep the trees in place, or what does happen? People have this propensity to make trees disappear when they want a view.

Village Attorney Stecich: Aren't these trees on Village property?

Mr. Yogev: There are three large trees that are... Village of Hastings, right?

Boardmember Cameron: But all the trees on the sewer right-of-way are on your property.

Mr. Yogev: This one, for instance, is not. It's not on the side above the easement.

Village Attorney Stecich: Jamie, were you saying...oh, you mean the trees on the property? On their property. Well, you would make that a condition of site plan approval, yes.

Mr. Anderson: And we would certainly have no problem with that.

Chairperson Speranza: Okay, does anyone in the public have anything they want to speak to on this? Since we're doing a history of the project and the Board's deliberations, we might as well have...

Jim Metzger, 427 Warburton Avenue: Welcome to the new members of the committee. Some of us have been here for many years reviewing this project. While Mr. Anderson's presentation sounds all kind of soft and warm and fuzzy, I believe that the reality of the project is actually a little bit different.

To start off with, I attended a seminar two weeks ago on the ethics of sustainability in architecture. It's very easy to say, "We're going to make the building green." And that's great. I applaud the fact, actually, that this developer is looking to use sustainable materials, etc. The problem is, it's not really green when you put too much of it on a site that the site really can't function. Let's talk about the size of the project. Originally, this project, I believe, was going to be 12 units and there was an affordable housing component of that. When we said this project is really too big, they said, "Not a problem. We'll cut it down to nine units." Well, that got rid of their affordable housing component, which I don't believe was a good idea, but that's what it was. But when you took a careful look at the building, the building actually grew in size by 300 square feet. So they went from 12 units to nine units, but the building got bigger. Now, they said the building is 36,500 square feet. Nine units, you do the math. It's about 4,000 square feet per unit. If we take all the houses that everybody here owns and dropped them on that site it still wouldn't be as big as this building is going to be. So we're talking about building units that are excessively large; larger than any of the private housing stock -- or most of the private housing stock -- in Hastings, and we're concentrating it in one small area.

They talk a lot about the apparent height of the building and they show you these beautiful renderings with trees. Anybody who's done major construction, especially when there's excavation involved, knows that root systems extend far out from where the actual tree is. I'd be very, very surprised to find out that any of the large trees on this site would actually survive this construction.

The other thing that's interesting to note is that this site is unusual in Hastings. Most of these big areas that we're talking about, looking at, are all rock. Except this area is clay. Clay's a very difficult material to build in. Those of you that know, it's an expansive material. It responds with huge swings for the amount of water that's going through it. So it's going to be a difficult project to engineer to put a foundation in that's not going to move when the water in the clay starts moving. So there are issues that haven't been addressed. The keyhole that they've talked about, if you were to take a straight-edge long ruler and lay it at the entry and the exit of the keyhole to indicate the sight line, you probably find that you can only see through that keyhole through a space of maybe about that. So you're talking about looking down -- I don't know, is the building 120 feet, 200 feet long? -- a car about that wide is what they're offering you as their, quote, view preservation.

The building that they're eliminating here is four units, and they say, "Well, we're only doubling the number of units." But the building that they're eliminating is about the size of two of the units that they're talking about putting in, and the floor-to-floor height is significantly less. So while we can talk about generic building and it's wonderful and it's green, I would ask you to take a really close look at what all of those issues mean and I'd believe that you'd find that this project is really too big for the site. I believe that there's going to be a conflict with cars trying to get in and out of this parking garage. I don't know if this is still the case, that they talked about doing parking where the cars are parked back-to-back. That's not. Okay, that's been eliminated. That's a good situation.

We have a corner of Hastings. It's *the* first thing that people see when they get off the train. This is an issue that we've discussed before. People that get off in Hastings don't want to think that they got off in Yonkers or even in Glenwood. When you get off the train there you see this huge building and there's big columns coming down. That's what we're going to end up with here. While Urban Green probably does a good job, I'm not familiar with their projects in New York City. They probably do a nice job in New York City, where they're building to that level of urban density. They're trying to create that level of urban density in Hastings and I don't believe it's appropriate. Thank you.

Chairperson Speranza: Thanks, Jim. Anyone else?

Jim Stadler, 8 West Main: At the April meeting I had requested a rendering be done showing the north-south plane from the Warburton Bridge looking directly west. The shortcoming of that is it's not taking into consideration the seasonal factor. Those leaves will be gone. It doesn't present a wide enough angle. The view is very minimal there. I was talking about let's see the whole building, from the back of the buildings on West Main Street to the entire south side of this building looking at, as I say, looking from the north-south plane. I know these people are very good, they can do it. So hopefully, next meeting.

Chairperson Speranza: Jim, why don't you point out...in that photo, which is your home?

Mr. Stadler: It's this one. What's not shown here...and this is higher than my building. My building's three stories, but this is a higher three stories. So from the back windows I can see the river and the Palisades. It was mentioned that a terrace will be put there. I could be looking at a terrace. I'd rather look at the river and the Palisades. Thank you.

Chairperson Speranza: Thank you. Anyone else wish to speak on this?

Jim Surdoval, consultant to Urban Green: I was going to speak after Eric, but when Mr. Metzger went ahead of me I figured, let him go. I just wanted to add a point with regard to the view, the whole view issue. I think that the Village's consultants basically eliminated a

lot of the other issues with regard to view. I think that one thing that's kind of interesting in terms of view when you talk about view preservation is that in Hastings view preservation is most often talked about in terms of preserving important public views of the river. The interesting thing about this site, because of the bluff it's located on, is that after this building is built it isn't going to impact at all the public views of the river. When you're on the Warburton Avenue Bridge and you look out towards the Hudson River you're going to see all the river you see now. The difference is that in the corner of your right eye the framing of that view is going to be different because the building will be there, in with the trees, but it's not actually blocking the river. Really, the issues of view here have been the view of the building almost more than it's been how does the building block the view of the river. To demonstrate that, a lot of the views that we've been asked to look at, people actually would have to have their back turned to the river to take in that view, such as from the train station looking up. So while there are some private view issues with regard to the immediate neighbor, in terms of the important public views, whether from the parking lot as you come outside of Pizza Grill or whether you're walking across the Warburton Bridge, you're still going to see a great expanse of river. So it's not really so much a river issue.

Now, the building is larger than the buildings that are next to it. It's a much larger site than the three buildings next to it. But yet, the building size is very consistent with the fabric and character of downtown Hastings. As was demonstrated in those photographs, there are a lot of buildings in that section on both sides of the parking lot where the structures come down and are built into the slope.

Throughout the Village there's small buildings, medium buildings, big buildings. That's the character. Hastings isn't a New York or Greystone urban scale, but it is definitely an urban village scale in terms of its character. This building is nowhere near the 220-unit River Hill Tower or the 96-unit Greystone Tower. That's a pretty powerful statement: "We don't want Hastings to become Greystone." Well, neither do we, and that's not what's there. But I just think that it's important to clarify a particular comment like that.

Really, the issue is how does this building get experienced by the people who live in the Village. We believe that we've mitigated that by great architecture. You create a building that looks good, that will be worthy of affection of the people in this community. A lot of care was placed into designing that building and choosing its materials and building a building of quality. It is an important part in the Village. As you come up the stairs today you're greeted by asphalt and the rear of stores. This building will give Hastings, we believe, an important gateway, a greeting point of good architecture, and a café that will have the opportunity for outdoor space that will really be a welcoming point into the Village as you climb the steps; when right now what you get is asphalt and the rear of the retail stores along Warburton. So we think it'll be a vast improvement in terms of creating a visual experience, a gateway if you will, when you enter the Village.

So we ask that you take all of these things into consideration. That we think that this project would be a significant positive that is completely in keeping with the spirit of the new downtown zoning, and trying to bring more people downtown, and doing so in a way that is responsible building, sustainable development, and really good architecture. Thanks.

Chairperson Speranza: Thanks. Marianne?

Village Attorney Stecich: Could I just clarify one thing, both for the developer and for the new members, on the view preservation? Interestingly, the view preservation law as it existed in the books for many years only protect the views from neighboring properties. It was amended because somebody said the public views are important, too. So it was actually an amendment to the zoning code that added that it also protects the views from public property. So while that may have been a concern -- and I'm not saying one way or the other what the view preservation issue here is -- just so nobody misunderstands it, what you have to do is look at the view preservation for the view from neighboring properties and adjacent public properties and rights-of-way. It also was neighboring property, then it was the public property and rights-of-way that were added. So you actually had it a little backward there, Jim. Just so you guys understand and also so the members understand.

Mr. Stadler: I'd just like to submit these pictures ... from the parking lot now. That's the view from the parking lot. When ARCO finishes cleaning the waterfront, this aluminum building will be gone also, so you'll have a clear view of the Palisades and river looking up and down. Probably goes down about 6 miles that you can see, at least. So that will be lost to an 8-foot wide keyhole basically.

Mr. Surdoval: Could we have a quick look at that photograph, since we haven't seen it?

Chairperson Speranza: We need one for the files.

Mr. Surdoval: When you're walking on the sidewalk, the site is...all right, this is a fall view. It's not a summer view. If you go there today you will see none of this river. And it's also angling specifically down the river next to our site. There's no question that our building will impact this view. I think the question the Board has to ask is, is that an important public view. Because when you're in that parking lot you have an expansive, panoramic view of the Hudson River, and when this project is built there will be an expansive, panoramic view of the Hudson River. So that's the question you have to make: the benefit of that piece of the view versus a very significant project for the Village.

Chairperson Speranza: And there are a lot of things that we do that we do need to do to balance with this application.

Danielle Goodman, 28 Ashley Road: Just historically, I have spoken on behalf of the commuters, of which I am one, who get off the train and are greeted with a wooded hillside. It's very dynamic and creative, and it's about to be lost. The downtown commercial zoning was a mistake, and it was an opportunity lost not to preserve a hillside. So with that in mind,

I know that the developer's representatives are telling us that a certain number of trees will be preserved. I did happen to have dinner at Maud's tonight and saw trees tied off with yellow ribbons, yellow markings. My question is, has an arborist been brought in to ascertain whether the trees will survive? And if not, isn't that something that you might think about asking for in the SEQRA process?

A friend of mine right now is building a house and there were all sorts of concerns about the trees. She's sick about the trees. But they had all these good intentions; brought all the engineers in three, four, five times. And guess what? They couldn't save the trees. They had to cut them down. And that was a pretty simple flat site, not with the engineering difficulties of this site.

So on behalf of the commuters and the view shed, you have a view shed -- you have a hill that's a view shed -- that's been left unprotected by our zoning, apparently by our steep slopes, perhaps our view preservation law. I would say we should take this as an example, and take stock. I mean, this is the only wooded hillside you have left in the middle of the downtown and it's about to be lost. So I would say preserve what trees you can. We should ask for proof that the tree roots won't be disturbed and that we can save as much as of them as we can.

I heard the developer's representative say that our Village experts took care of a lot of the concerns with respect to the view preservation. I guess I've been following this, but maybe missed a couple of meetings. So were there reports generated by the Village experts?

Chairperson Speranza: There is a report. Is it one report, or two reports?

Ms. Goodman: On the view preservation?

Chairperson Speranza: The engineering -- the site engineering and the traffic.

Village Attorney Stecich: Yes, not on view preservation.

Ms. Goodman: Okay, thank you. Then I misunderstood what was said. Thank you.

Chairperson Speranza: And we can get those out. Stop by and we can give you a copy of what Buckhurst Fish & Jacquemart did.

Okay, anything else on this application right now? We are not voting on anything tonight. We are not taking action because that would not be appropriate.

Boardmember Cameron: Could we keep a couple of the boards? Because there were a couple boards there that had downviews on the building, which we don't have in our packet. Maybe they could leave a couple of them with us.

Chairperson Speranza: Any problems?

Village Planner Witkowski: You can e-mail those photos to me, Asaf.

Mr. Yogev: Do you want all the references, too?

Boardmember Cameron: No, the only other one I thought was interesting was the one -- and I know it's a prior version of the building -- where we had the four adjacent buildings in a row and then we had the building coming up. And I know it's the wrong building sitting next to it now, but that's allowing us to sort of...

Chairperson Speranza: The one that shows the other buildings on West Main.

Boardmember Cameron: Yes, the four buildings in a row, and then the one next to it.

Chairperson Speranza: That was something we had talked about maybe getting as well is, potentially, a model. Again, within the context; you know, put this within the context of the site. That is the one thing that remains a little bit troubling is that we have yet to see this within the context, I think, for a better understanding -- use Legos if you have to -- to develop something that has that kind of streetscape.

Boardmember Logan: I think models can also be misleading, especially to the wrong skill and the raw materials. But what I think would be very helpful is on this site plan, the grade level plan, to put in the existing houses, the wine store, Mr. Stadler's house, the adjacent house and, perhaps what's there right now so we could look at a superimposition of the adjacent. Maybe you already have this drawing someplace, but it would help us...

Mr. Yogev: We don't.

Boardmember Logan: Is there a survey of that part of the Village?

Mr. Yogev: A survey with the existing buildings, but not the three more up the block.

Boardmember Logan: I think that would help us get a sense of the sight lines. I don't know how difficult that is to extrapolate those all from Village maps, property maps, in an outline form.

Mr. Yogev: How accurate are they?

Village Planner Witkowski: We have that all on GIS, so why don't I give you a call tomorrow and we can figure out how we can do that?

Chairperson Speranza: And then we'll also have the photo, Mr. Stadler, and then how that superimposes the view from your home.

Village Planner Witkowski: Yes, I can e-mail those photos to you tomorrow, Asaf.

Chairperson Speranza: Okay, so we'll expect to see a little more information for next month's submission, and then we'll make a determination. Angie, you and I have to talk about what to get the other Boardmembers in terms of the prior materials, particularly the SEQRA environmental assessment form. And then we'll see if we will be ready to make a determination as to whether or not we will require an Environmental Impact Statement or issue a negative declaration on the project.

Boardmember Logan: I would sort of like to know -- unfortunately, I can't be here at the next meeting, I'm going to be traveling, maybe somebody else is, too, but I don't know -- whether I can respond to this in absentia.

Chairperson Speranza: Actually, Marianne just reminded me. One of the things we had mentioned at the last meeting was that we did want to notice this as a public hearing because there have been so many significant changes to this project since the last time we had a public hearing on the project.

Village Attorney Stecich: A public hearing, and then you can vote at another meeting.

Boardmember Logan: And then we'll be voting in August.

Chairperson Speranza: Right.

Village Attorney Stecich: So you should be in touch. The hearing notice is going to have to include a lot of things, so let's be careful ... that we include all the issues.

Village Planner Witkowski: Okay.

Chairperson Speranza: Thank you. Thank you for coming and taking the time to bring the new Boardmembers up to speed on this, too.

IV. Other Business

1. Discussion of LWRP

Chairperson Speranza: The next item on our agenda is a discussion of the LWRP, which we received a copy of. Dave Hutson was unexpectedly called out of town this week. Since he has been the Planning Board's liaison with the LWRP committee, I really don't want to go through this too much. If people have not read this document, please read it. It is so good. I don't want to say I was surprised. I was surprised at how really easy it was to pick up and start to read through. There are so many fascinating facts in here. Even the things that we as a Planning Board when we deal with things like applications from a developer or the ideas with respect to the quarry plan, things that have happened and occurred with the Village. This is a document, because it's so recent and up-to-date, it captures all of the things that have been done recently. I know that the Board of Trustees has started serious discussions about having a Comprehensive Plan developed. I think it's really important that one of the first steps that is taken is a determination as to exactly what else it's felt is needed. Because you read the LWRP, there is so much in here with respect to kicking off such an initiative that a scope of work for anything which might be done with respect to the development of a plan I would think should be something that builds on this.

Along those lines, I have also left for people the report that had been done some time ago -- and Jamie, I think you even came to a meeting or two -- on the large tracts. We have had a real dog of a time trying to get all of the numbers, all of the boundaries, acreages, tax information finalized. But I decided that after reading the LWRP and hearing about the discussion to move forward with a Comprehensive Plan of some sort, I thought it was important to first of all get this out to everybody again and to go through it. For the purposes of people watching this at home, what is in here really -- and, again, I will take full responsibility that it hasn't been finalized -- there is a whole history of the plans and proposals that have been put together for the Village over the past years, back to 1970, and what the various focuses of those studies were, and what they found when there was an analysis done of major properties, and which major properties were focused on. Because over time there were different concerns. The methodology for how this group, the large tracts group, went through and looked at the properties, there was an inventory done. People went out to the sites. The owners of the institutions, representatives from the institutions, walked the properties. Photographs were taken. Some of the special features, the special characteristics, of the property were identified. And there are recommendations in here for each of the sites. Again, when we talk about moving forward, if there is really a sense to hire someone? Hire them, but make sure they have all of this. Save ourselves some money.

The way all of this fits together in terms of the impact on the Village, the potential: if all of these properties were built out, the major concern that was expressed was not people. It was a) losing characteristics of some of these properties which people felt were important and may now be hidden and lost to us. If a property is simply rezoned to 2 acres you're not protecting the source of Rowley's Brook, which is something which was pointed out in this document that that may be something that is going to be important the to Village.

So please take a look at this. In July, along with a discussion on the LWRP and how these two fit together and what the implications are, the findings of these two documents are, for the Village, moving forward. It gives something that we, as the planners, the Planning Board, have to discuss and have to document in some way. There are some kind of fluky things in this document which Angie and I and Rafael will work through.

I wanted to get that out, given the discussions. Comments, questions on this?

Village Planner Witkowski: Also, I'm preparing a couple of applications for the enhancements program, so maybe at the next meeting I could...a couple of those are projects that are being proposed in the plan. But they're not having another funding round for another year-and-a-half. I wanted to at least get something in. But I thought maybe we could have maybe a summary. I'll ask George Jacquemart if we could have like a summary document.

Chairperson Speranza: Of the applications?

Village Planner Witkowski: No, of the plan because they've been working on it and moving along with it.

Chairperson Speranza: Oh, the transportation plan.

Village Planner Witkowski: Yes. I'll find out from him how far along they are in getting the report together. I know they've been working on the estimates on the projects, too.

Chairperson Speranza: Okay, and you mentioned you are preparing applications. We spoke about one, an enhancement project that's going to be submitted for the potential to provide another connection to the South County Trailway.

Village Planner Witkowski: Right, in conjunction with the one that's being required if Saw Mill Lofts does go forward. It would be a combined project which would provide that one and the one in that existing trestle bridge that's just north of the Ravensdale Bridge.

Chairperson Speranza: Okay, and that's one also, if I recall, your mentioning that the Westchester County Planning Department was looking at as well to provide additional parking.

Village Planner Witkowski: Yes, that's right.

Chairperson Speranza: And I'll be honest, I've got mixed views about that because I've been out to that area. It's very nice, wooded as it is.

Village Planner Witkowski: But it used to be an access road.

Chairperson Speranza: Yes, I know.

Village Planner Witkowski: And I did talk to Doug Cotton (NYSDOT) about it, and we've met with Pat Natarelli (Westchester County Planning) and we'll be meeting with Pat Natarelli probably Tuesday. I will be working on that application ... over the weekend.

Boardmember Logan: Angie, I missed something you said. You said there was a trestle access bridge north of the Ravensdale Bridge.

Village Planner Witkowski: Right.

Boardmember Logan: You mean formerly?

Village Planner Witkowski: It's there and it's actually in fairly decent shape. It needs to be rehabbed, it needs guardrails. But it was an access road for the old Mt. Hope train station.

Boardmember Logan: You mean from 9-A west.

Village Planner Witkowski: From 9-A, and it's very level right there. It's almost directly across from the cemetery entrance, main entrance.

Boardmember Logan: Is that near where the train station used to be?

Village Planner Witkowski: Right. So there's an historic element to it, too, which is nice.

Boardmember Logan: There used to be a pedestrian crossing as well over the Saw Mill Parkway right there.

Boardmember Wertz: From the other direction.

Boardmember Logan: From the west.

Boardmember Cameron: The roadway in is like two lanes and concrete sidewalks on both sides, and it's in pretty good shape. I went over it on Monday.

Boardmember Logan: And it's just buried in the woods?

Boardmember Cameron: It's actually not buried, but getting to it is buried in the woods. It's at the Mt. Hope Cemetery driveway just down from the bridge. Just go straight in there, you'll go right across it.

Village Planner Witkowski: Right. We went the wrong way. When we went in we went down from the Ravensdale Bridge. Jen and I were with Susan Newman and someone else from Ginsburg. We ended up finding our way back to 9-A and we found the way to go that's more level. Decided that would be the better solution.

Chairperson Speranza: Yes, it's very interesting what you see once you get through all of the brush.

Village Planner Witkowski: But the county, because of the parking, there's a lot of cars that park down south of Ravensdale. So that's why county planning was interested in putting in some additional parking there for people using the trail.

Boardmember Logan: Park so you can walk -- drive so you can walk, right?

Chairperson Speranza: Yes, right.

Village Planner Witkowski: Well, some people come from farther away.

And then the other application that I'm starting to put together, I talked with Mary Wirth before our meeting -- is linking some of the projects around the school.

Chairperson Speranza: Oh, good.

Village Planner Witkowski: So we can at least get those in the pipeline.

II. Approval of Minutes: May 18, 2006 Regular Meeting. (Note: This item was moved from the beginning to this later point in the Agenda).

Village Planner Witkowski: The minutes from the last meeting, they have not been approved yet.

Chairperson Speranza: I have to request advice of counsel on this.

Village Attorney Stecich: Uh-oh.

Chairperson Speranza: Approval of the minutes from the May 18th meeting

Village Attorney Stecich: We don't have enough people.

Chairperson Speranza: That's what I was afraid of.

Village Attorney Stecich: You need four people who were there.

Chairperson Speranza: We will never have four people who were there. Can we have Rhoda come in to vote as an alternate one evening?

Boardmember Cameron: Or can't you do an approval in writing?

Boardmember Logan: We need to vote on it.

Village Planner Witkowski: We could wait until the next meeting and ask Rhoda to come.

Boardmember Logan: I won't be at the next meeting.

Village Attorney Stecich: You know, you don't have to get all that hysterical. The minutes don't have to be approved for them to have standing, even a decision. If the Zoning Board makes a decision, once the minutes are filed, even if they're not approved yet, starts the applicant's time -- I mean, if somebody was denied -- it starts the time-to-appeal running. I actually had a case where somebody challenged it. I made a motion to dismiss, as it was too late. And they said, "Yes, but the minutes weren't approved yet." I argued they don't need to be approved in order for the time to run. So some places it does, but in Hastings it doesn't.

Boardmember Logan: There weren't any huge decisions made at that meeting.

Village Attorney Stecich: What you might want to do, though, is note the minutes. That when they came up for approval there wasn't a majority of the Boardmembers remaining.

Village Planner Witkowski: Right. Did anybody have any comments on it? Because I wasn't at that meeting -- first one I missed.

Chairperson Speranza: There's one typo, if you want to just note, page 19 on the third line down.. If you read that sentence: "...you're here just in time for the end approaching the intersection." "...approaching the intersection" just doesn't belong there. That was the only thing that I saw. It looks like it's a word processing error. Now Bill, did you see anything?

Boardmember Logan: I went through them, but I didn't see anything.

Village Planner Witkowski: Where was that, Patty?

Chairperson Speranza: Page 19, if you read the third line.

Boardmember Dale: Actually, on page 24 two words are repeated: “months back” and “months back” in the first sentence.

Village Planner Witkowski: Bruce, where was that one on page 24?

Boardmember Dale: Page 24, the first sentence: “...months back...”

Village Planner Witkowski: Oh, okay, typo.

VI. Discussion of Other Issues

Chairperson Speranza: Okay, any other questions or issues from the public? Trustee Swiderski..

Trustee Swiderski: No comment. Just welcoming the new members. I wanted to make sure somebody from the Board was here to say welcome aboard. It’s a great responsibility and a great trust. And I have to say, universal excitement on our end in our selection. We are very pleased with the quality of the people on the Board. I’m personally jealous. You’ll never face reelection, so you can make decisions without any fear of what your neighbors think. And secondly, you don’t have to worry about every two years -- you’ve got a few more years than that -- to develop some perspective and to really bring a long-term view to what you do since you don’t have to worry about your neighbors, you just have to worry about your own intellect. We’re just very pleased with your decision to join the Board and look forward to your contribution. I think it’s going to be great.

So welcome aboard.

Chairperson Speranza: Yes, sir?

David Skolnick, 57 Rose Street: I don’t know if this is entirely appropriate, if I were to address a question for clarification from Angie about something that she was just presenting, albeit briefly. Would it be possible to elaborate a little bit on the process of what you’re trying to do and what the steps that would be taken and the procedure that would take with regard to whether it’s a proposal, whether it’s a grant agreement, and just what the process would be?

Village Planner Witkowski: The applications?

Mr. Skolnick: Right.

Village Planner Witkowski: Well, they’re sort of works in progress right now.

Mr. Skolnick: I understand that there’s a deadline for submitting...

Village Planner Witkowski: Right. The enhancement program is the funding that we're applying for, and it requires a \$100,000 minimum project with a 20% match. So what I did was look at the projects that we had on the list so far generated by the transportation plan. There were a couple of projects that were right near the school that were less than \$100,000. That's what I met with Mary about, was to have it like a phased project so we could link those and do one application linking all the school area projects together. I have to write up the project descriptions and all that. That's what I'll be working on over the weekend. Those are due at the Poughkeepsie office of the state department of transportation June 30th. But what I wanted to do was try and get a couple of other applications in addition to the one I'm looking at. Because we're working on the transportation plan now, and they won't do another funding round for this enhancement program for about another year-and-a-half. So I thought we could at least get...just because you do an application doesn't mean you're going to get the project approved.

Mr. Skolnick: Right. But assuming -- I don't know what the time frame is where you find out whether it's approved or not -- assuming it does get approved, is there then a process where the actual measures taken would be open for review?

Village Planner Witkowski: Yes, you just have to have a concept and a budget -- you know, basic, preliminary budget and a schedule -- for the purpose of the grant application. Then if your project is approved you get into the more detailed scope of the work. I think by the end of the year they'll probably make their decisions. I think they're thinking by December they'll decide. But the competition is throughout the entire state, so it's probably by the end of the year. And then they probably won't get into getting the contracts all scoped out from whoever gets the grant until sometime next year. So there's much more detail if you do get approved. They don't want you to spend a lot of time coming up with a really detailed scope if you don't have a chance of getting it.

Mr. Skolnick: So our challenge, then, would be that somehow even in the interim, while we're waiting, the issues that we're trying to address in these...

Village Planner Witkowski: The plan's not done yet. These are projects that there was pretty much consensus amongst most of the people that were there; you know, the projects around the school primarily. That was kind of a priority, so those are the ones we would start with.

Chairperson Speranza: Is your concern the ability to provide more input to the projects -- we'll be optimistic here -- once we get the grant approved? Or is it speed, or lack of speed, that this process is taking?

Mr. Skolnick: No, no, I think the former. In terms of that grant process will take whatever time it takes, but I guess the question of continued input and the process. I know that we've had the two workshops...

Village Planner Witkowski: Yes, and they're still working. What they're doing is developing the projects further from that second workshop and doing more detailed cost estimates.

Boardmember Wertz: Is your concern that the grant has been applied for and it appears that the project is going ahead towards realization before the public has fully aired the issues and discussed the possibilities?

Mr. Skolnick: I think Angie's made it clear that's not the case. That it simply has to be put in motion and that there's still a process of developing. So the other thing is, asking where...

Village Planner Witkowski: Where they are in the plan?

Mr. Skolnick: Not where they are, but where are the opportunities. Where would be the continued public input process.

Chairperson Speranza: For the development of the overall transportation plan?

Mr. Skolnick: Right. Because I'll be frank, having attended both meetings I think there was not quite as much consensus as might be represented in the report. And I think it would be of use to keep a certain amount of input and process evolving, if nothing else to really help guide the planner and the group that's working on it -- the consultants.

Village Planner Witkowski: And that's why I put that up on the Website. I want people to continue...you know, as people send comments to me I feed those to our consultants. Because they're still working on it, and there will be another public meeting. We just haven't scheduled anything yet, but they're still working on some of the details. And also part of the scope of their work is meeting with the department of transportation and the county on those projects that might affect those agencies as well. So they want to do that before they...

Chairperson Speranza: So is it likely that once the consultants have finished the cost estimates and have met with the state, and they've received all of the comments on the summary of the transportation meeting, that that might be a good opportunity to then have another public workshop for, again, the presentation of that information and to make sure that everything is adequately being reflected in the products?

Village Planner Witkowski: Yes, that would be the time to do it because they'd still...

Chairperson Speranza: So maybe in the fall?

Village Planner Witkowski: Probably by September. I think September will probably be when they would be presenting all of their findings and their final recommendations and further input from the public.

Mr. Skolnick: Okay, thank you.

Chairperson Speranza: Thank you. Anyone else have anything?

VI. Adjournment

On MOTION of Boardmember Wertz, SECONDED by Boardmember Logan with a voice vote of all in favor, Chairperson Speranza adjourned the Regular Meeting at 10:15 PM.