

**VILLAGE OF HASTINGS-ON-HUDSON, NEW YORK  
PLANNING BOARD  
REGULAR MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARING  
MAY 18, 2006**

A **Regular Meeting and Public Hearing** was held by the Planning Board on **Thursday, May 18, 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, Boardmember Rhoda Barr (approximately 9:20 p.m.), Boardmember David Hutson, Boardmember William Logan, Boardmember William Smith, Boardmember Fred Wertz, Deputy Village Attorney Marianne Stecich, and Village Clerk / Deputy Manager Susan Maggiotto.

**I. Roll Call**

**II. Approval of Minutes:**

**Chairperson Speranza:** The first item on our agenda is the approval of the minutes from our meeting on April 20th. Does anyone have any comments or modifications to those minutes?

**On MOTION of Boardmember Smith, SECONDED by Boardmember Hutson with a voice vote of all in favor, the Minutes of the Regular Meeting and Public Hearing of April 20, 2006 were approved as presented.**

**III. New Business**

**1. Public Hearing. View Preservation. Robert Sanzo. 109-111 Southside Realty Corporation, 109-111 Southside Avenue (Sheet 9, Block 620, Lot 41)**

**Chairperson Speranza:** We have a couple of items here. The first is a public hearing having to do with an application for view preservation under the terms of the code for the view preservation ordinance. This board makes a recommendation to the Zoning Board of Appeals, and they are the ones that take final action. So our mission tonight is to make a recommendation to them. We will enter into the public hearing phase of the meeting now. We've got an application for 109-111 Southside Realty Corporation. We had the information submitted to us in the packet. I will ask if the applicant is here. Want to come up and tell us what it is you'd like to do? You have to speak into the microphone behind you. There's a hand mic, too, if you want to put something on the easel to show us. That's fine.

**Robert Sanzo, Southside Realty Corporation:** Basically what I'm doing is reapplying for something that we did in 1998, which was approved. We had put an application in for replacement decks in back of building 109 and 111. We completed 109; we never got to doing 111. The permit expired. Here we are today, reapplying to do the same thing: to replace a deck that was on the building. Here are just some photos from different angles. Do you want me to bring it up to you to see? It doesn't stand up by itself.

**Chairperson Speranza:** I think they're the same things that we have in our packet.

**Mr. Sanzo:** Yes, these are in color.

**Boardmember Smith:** Bring them up.

**Mr. Sanzo:** There's another page in the back, too. This is basically the front looking east on Southside Avenue. The top picture is the way both of the buildings looked before. They were basically identical twins, let's say. We renovated 109. Here's what it looks like in the back now with the deck on the back. Here's a closer look. This is what the steel and concrete deck looks like that was done on building 109. That's what the back of 111 looks like. As you can see, there were porches there originally, and what we want to do, basically, is put that on the back of that. The dimensions are exactly the same. It doesn't have any impact on the view. I'll just show you. That's the survey there. This is Southside, here's the river, there's the view. This was done already. That's what we're proposing to do. Then there's also another picture on the top to see who the neighbors are in the area there. You see the two highlighted buildings.

That's basically my story, I guess. Fire away if you have any questions.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Questions anyone? Anyone from the public wish to speak about this application? The one thing that I just want to make sure that doesn't seem like it would be an issue--Marianne I don't know if you've had any discussion about this--the new deck that's going on, it's gone now, but there is no issue when you met with the Building Inspector as far as setbacks or the need for any kind of variance or anything. Deven.

**Building Inspector Sharma:** No, there are no zoning setback area variance issues at all. It does happen to be in the back of the building, and the building itself blocks more view than this deck will. They did have a permit to do that work some time ago. I personally don't see any reason why they shouldn't go ahead and do this work as well. Probably it will improve the property.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Okay, thank you. That's it?

**On MOTION of Boardmember Smith, SECONDED by Boardmember Wertz with a voice vote of all in favor, the Board resolved to recommend that the Zoning Board of Appeals act favorably for view preservation.**

**Chairperson Speranza:** Okay, thank you.

**Boardmember Smith:** Good luck.

**Chairperson Speranza:** I'm always struck by how much land there really is behind those buildings on Southside. I never think of the greenspace behind them.

**Mr. Sanzo:** Yes, it's about 100 feet to the edge of the deck, actually; 80 or 100 feet.

**Boardmember Smith:** It should be very nice.

**Mr. Sanzo:** Thank you.

**2. 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:** Next we have a public hearing for an accessory apartment at 66 Hillside Avenue. This is a renewal, and requires waivers for square foot area and parking. Again, this is the renewal of an application. Deven, did you want to present this to us? I suppose I should check--I probably should have on the other one--if all the mailings were in order.

**Village Clerk Maggiotto:** The mailings are in order.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Okay, thank you.

**Building Inspector Sharma:** This is an additive that Angela put together. Let me just read that. It says: "66 Hillside Avenue, the property located on the south side of Hillside Avenue in R-7.5 zoning district. The applicant is requesting renewal of existing apartment approval. The 624-foot apartment occupies 33.6% of the 1,800 square foot residence, therefore it exceeds 25% of the floor area limitation by 8.6%. There have been no changes"--you know I did the inspection on the apartment--"to the property and no complaints during the last three years. Actually required are renewal of the accessory apartment rule and waiver of the parking, and the apartment area being more than the required 25% by 8.6."

**Chairperson Speranza:** Okay, thank you. Is the applicant here and wishes...you can come and speak, or you don't have to if you don't want to.

**Christopher Ryan, owner - 66 Hillside Avenue:** I guess formally in the documents I'm the owner of the residence. Nothing's changed since the last time I appeared here. I did want to take the opportunity to thank the Board and the Village of Hastings, and certainly our neighbors and friends in the community, in their support over the years in helping us have this accessory apartment. It's been working out very well for my family. It's allowing my mother to maintain her residence there. She's happy, she's healthy, she's certainly stubborn in terms of maintaining her independence. And we certainly do appreciate the support that everyone has been giving us over the years and, hopefully, you'll renew the application again and I'll be back in three more years.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Okay, thank you. Anyone from the public wish to speak about this?

I did receive a letter from a resident at 28 School Street which, I guess, is next door. She's concerned about how close the apartment is to the house, with a stairway access into the apartment. I don't know if Miss Fonfrias is here. No? As I recall, she spoke at the original public hearing on this. We've all looked at the letter. As I recall, at that time one of the items that we were debating was whether or not her concerns had to do with actually how close the house was, whether it was a function of the fact that there was an accessory apartment there. You've all taken a quick look at it, Boardmembers, if there's any comments or questions about this.

**Boardmember Logan:** This does seem to raise some concerns which maybe can be addressed. She lays this out in some detail, with a lot of photographs. There does seem to be an issue about the entrance and the use of the deck, and the proximity to her porch and her ability to enjoy quiet and privacy on her porch. I think this is why we have these periodic reviews. I think this should be considered. There may be some architectural solutions. It's too bad that she's not here tonight to describe this. The letter is quite articulate. She's concerned about the entrance and the noise associated with the entrance, and the noise associated with the kitchen and lights flooding into her house from the second floor entrance. A lot of these things, I think, can be addressed physically. But we do have an application which exceeds the 25%, and I think we owe this neighbor some consideration of her complaints. I think there may be ways to address it. Perhaps the applicant has seen this letter, and maybe he has some thoughts about what could be done.

**Mr. Ryan:** Haven't seen the letter, but I know the last time I was here similar issues were addressed. As a matter of fact, the decking that is on the house meets code. What we simply did was replace a deck that was already there. The house has been here for...well, we've lived there for over 50 years and there was always a deck there, so that's not something's that's new. I know there was a question with the stairway that we put in. The last time we agreed, and I guess the location of the stairway--which is actually on the back of the house--the neighbor was concerned about. Then we actually moved it, and it seemed to meet everybody's criteria the last time we went through the review.

The spacing of the apartment, 33% I mean, was a natural cutoff. It's the second floor of a relatively large house. It was a natural cut. There was nothing mysterious about that. I don't think anybody really seems to have an issue. I think this made the most sense. But again, I know this individual voiced some concerns the last time. Haven't really heard any issues in the past three years.

**Boardmember Logan:** Well, this letter's quite explicit and quite articulate, and somewhat convincing that there is a problem. It seems like the problem arises not necessarily from just the deck itself, which may have been there, but the fact that now the deck is being used as part of the entrance to this accessory apartment. And all the activity and light associated with comings and goings are in direct proximity to her porch. Perhaps there's a solution whereby we can create some screening or some acoustic separation, or the railing on the side of her house can be built up so that the lights don't shine onto her porch and she doesn't see people looking into her porch. If I lived there I could understand how there is a concern here, and I think it is addressable. I wish she could be here to articulate this a little bit further, but I think this should be reviewed and I think there are solutions to this.

**Boardmember Smith:** You want to put it over for a month and give her an opportunity to come in?

**Boardmember Logan:** I would like to have this sounded out a little bit more, and I'd like to give the applicant an opportunity to read this letter in some detail, perhaps to speak to his

neighbor, and see if they can come to some sort of agreement. The types of things that I would suggest that may help mitigate this is, on the side of the deck that faces her house, if this is within the code requirements, is to raise that.

Instead of having a railing there, which is an open railing now--3.6 or so--is that you create a screening wall that goes up to maybe 6 feet or something like that so that people cannot look directly into her porch. You have, perhaps, a little bit more privacy for the use of the space yourself, shield some of the lights, and now there's a separation. But right now...and I think this can be done in a fairly straightforward way with some lattice or plywood or shingles or something. I'm not sure whether, Deven, there would be any issue in terms of the code of building up? Have you seen this letter, by the way, Deven?

**Building Inspector Sharma:** Yes, I have.

**Boardmember Logan:** You know, I'm thinking of some sort of attractive screen wall made out of wood or something. Whether there's some visual privacy created, it'll keep down the noise, give both parties their privacy, and mitigate some of this impact. If the code prohibited that because it's on a deck which was whatever the language of the code may be in a required yard or something.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Yes, that would be my concern. With the houses being so close, do you know whether the Hillside house meets the side yard setback? Because if it doesn't, I think, something would be expanding the nonconformity. I don't know. Do you know if it meets the setback, Deven? You might not know off the top of your head. There's no reason you would have had to know for this application.

**Boardmember Logan:** Well, even if that was the case, and we said right at the line of the deck that we couldn't build anything further, the door is set back, it looks like, 4 or 5 feet from the edge of this. So the screening could, in effect, move a little bit further into the deck.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** So within the setback.

**Boardmember Logan:** So perhaps there's something that could be done. I'm trying to find solutions here so we can talk about this and satisfy a real concern, which is what this whole mechanism has been set up for; so the public can review it, we can address issues, there is a feedback point, and we can either refuse the application or amend it or qualify it. We have an application which is 33% rather than the 25%. It has no parking; she raises the issue of parking. Perhaps there's some screening that can be put on the kitchen windows. I know you need light and air, but there's light flooding into her house and there are noises from the kitchen. The fact that these houses are so close together, it seems like there could be some architectural solution to this. I think whoever suggested, maybe Bill I think you did, that we set this aside for a month, let the parties talk about it, see if there's a proposal, and try to get her present at the meeting so we can understand a little bit more what these issues are.

**Boardmember Smith:** I think we ought to be fair to both parties and, obviously, the applicant was surprised which is not really fair to him to all of a sudden see this letter. I don't know, has she never been complaining to you on a regular basis?

**Mr. Ryan:** Hasn't said a word.

**Boardmember Logan:** Well, in her last paragraph she says she has no problems with the people living there and she wishes them well. I don't know if you've had a chance to review it. But there's no personal animosity. She wants to make that clear. I can't paraphrase everything she said, but she has a privacy problem and there are ways that this can be dealt with. And I think as part of consideration of her, and perhaps your own needs, that we can come up with a solution.

**Mr. Ryan:** Well, I can certainly talk to her.

**Chairperson Speranza:** One of the things, and we have to be careful in terms of how much...you know, these houses are close together. Lots of houses in Hastings are very close together. And whether or not there's an apartment, and if there was no accessory apartment upstairs and there's something going on--there were people outside on the upstairs deck--it would be the same situation regardless of whether or not...

**Boardmember Logan:** Right, but now there's an entrance which is associated with that deck, which is different, which is raised specifically because this is an accessory apartment. If there's a way to move the entrance so there's less activity, that's also another mitigating measure. But this has been aggravated by the fact that it is an accessory apartment and not the original house.

**Mr. Ryan:** Can I just make a few clarifications? There is parking, there are two spaces. I think that you indicated that there was no parking.

**Boardmember Logan:** The application says there's no dedicated parking, I believe.

**Mr. Ryan:** No, there are two parking spaces.

**Chairperson Speranza:** For that apartment?

**Mr. Ryan:** For the house.

**Chairperson Speranza:** For the house. Yes, last time you got a waiver for the apartment parking

**Boardmember Logan:** So the waivers listed are: exceeds the 25%, and the waiver listed is also a waiver for parking.

**Mr. Ryan:** No, I understand. And just to clarify the entrance, the doorway that leads into that accessory apartment has always been there. The only thing that's been added is a stairway up to that deck. Okay, I just want to clarify that.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Okay, so we'll keep the public hearing open, make sure you're on the

agenda for next time, then we'll be sure to get in touch with this woman and see if she will come and if we can work something out amicably. That would be the best solution.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Anyone else? Fred?

**Boardmember Wertz:** I certainly agree with that.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Okay, that's it for that agenda item, then. Thank you.

### **3. Preliminary Re-Subdivision Proposal. Presentation of preliminary re-subdivision of property on Whitman Street**

**Chairperson Speranza:** The next item on the agenda is for a preliminary resubdivision proposal--this will be interesting to hear about--for property on Whitman Street. Actually, it's not a formal request before us at this point. There will certainly be more formal subdivision plans prepared once there's an initial feel for this from the Board. Let me get the name right. Mr. Pereira? Yes, hi. Do you want to give us some background on what it is you'd like to do?

**Felipe Pereira, 48 Whitman Street:** I am the owner of 48 Whitman Street. What we are trying to do is buy a 15-foot sleeve of my neighbor's property--15 by 100--because my house now is legal nonconforming. The house is like 6 feet from the property line. We are planning to add to the house, so we are trying to acquire this 15 feet.

We are in agreement with my neighbor, Mr. Brian Resnick, and I'm just going through the process because the bank required his bank to give me a release letter--actually to give him a release letter. They required that I get a document from the Village saying that the Village doesn't oppose to the sale of the property because they don't want to agree to a sale that's going to make his property nonconforming. So that's the whole issue here.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Okay, and there is a way to do it. You know, we've got the plan that was submitted. Is it lot 27?

**Mr. Pereira:** The part of lot 28 would be the northerly part of lot 28. That would be the part that I would be acquiring.

**Boardmember Logan:** So what's a little confusing about this drawing is what's existing and what's proposed.

**Mr. Pereira:** What you have there is how it's going to look after it's acquired. This is his property before it is acquired. See, this is the sleeve that I'm buying. It's going to look like this after he sells me this piece.

**Boardmember Logan:** I see. So this is existing, this moves to there. Fifteen feet.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Deven, you've seen this? I just want to make sure of the dimensions. Of course, we get a more formal plot showing a switch in the lot line, but I want to make sure that, in fact...one of the rules is that what is being proposed, in effect, does not make your

neighbor's property...

**Mr. Pereira:** Yes, that zone is R-7.5. He now has 9,000 square feet, so when he sells me that 15 by 100 he's still going to have a 7,500 square foot lot there.

**Chairperson Speranza:** And the side lot line will be...

**Mr. Pereira:** And the setback, he's still going to have like 20 feet from the property line even after he sells me the 15 feet because now his house is 40 feet from the property line.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Okay, as far as for an initial read from the Planning Board, we will certainly want a plan that shows exactly what's existing and what's proposed and what the zoning dimensions are. Deven, you can help put that together, right?, to make sure that both lots are, in fact, conforming in terms of area and yard setbacks.

**Boardmember Smith:** And frontage. All of those. Marianne, there's nothing in the code that prohibits this type of subdivision of lots, right?

**Village Attorney Stecich:** No, you couldn't do it if it would run to the other lot nonconforming. It doesn't seem like it would. So that would be the only thing I could see. I mean, I suppose there are things that the Board could consider.

**Boardmember Smith:** No, just legally. It looks like there's a bunch of smaller lots here, and you're taking one lot and breaking it into two uneven parts, right?

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Right, which is why they need subdivision approval.

**Boardmember Smith:** What it is, we're looking at that one lot. Are we looking at that one lot, or are we looking at the parcels which are made up of a number of lots, conforming and nonconforming, based upon the parcel and the aggregation of the lots?

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Actually, both lots would be subdivided. It would be a subdivision of each lot. Because a subdivision is when you change a lot line, so in doing it you're actually subdividing both of them. You're changing the lot line on both of those. I don't know. Since it's one, I don't think there should have to be a double fee or something like that. I think administratively you should be able to work it out.

**Chairperson Speranza:** But, Bill, you're referring to the tax lots.

**Boardmember Smith:** Yes.

**Chairperson Speranza:** The smaller tax lots.

**Boardmember Smith:** The smaller tax lots. That has no impact upon large lots.

**Chairperson Speranza:** That really doesn't make a difference.

**Boardmember Smith:** Okay.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Oh, I see what you mean.



**Boardmember Smith:** It's unclear from this which lots are what. You know, which are the zoning lots as opposed to the tax lots.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** I know, you can't tell from these drawings. That would probably be redesignated as a tax...which is the one that's being split, 28?

**Chairperson Speranza:** Yes, 28.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Then it would probably be 28-A and 28-B. You could do that.

**Boardmember Smith:** All right, thanks.

**Boardmember Hutson:** And I'm assuming from looking at this there's no issue as far as it reducing street frontage in any way. This probably increases the street frontage on the one lot.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Right. Well, all that stuff would have to come with the final submission.

**Boardmember Hutson:** Yes, but I just mean in terms of any...I'm sure you checked all that out.

**Chairperson Speranza:** The actual zoning analysis.

**Boardmember Hutson:** There are no variances that would be required in any way, right? Everything would be conforming, both lots you're saying, in every way.

**Mr. Pereira:** Okay.

**Boardmember Hutson:** I'm asking. Including the street frontage.

**Mr. Pereira:** Excuse me.

**Boardmember Hutson:** In other words, you have to have so much street frontage.

**Mr. Pereira:** No, my neighbor's lot would still have 75 feet frontage, which is the minimum for that zoning. But my lot now has 46 feet front, so you would have 61 after I get the 15 feet from him.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Okay, well, we don't see any reason why you shouldn't come back for formal recommendation.

**Mr. Pereira:** Okay, I was under the impression I was going to get like a document to take to the bank that the Village doesn't oppose the sale. I was under that impression.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Not until there's a formal submittal. This came to us as a preliminary subdivision. Certainly, the minutes from this meeting could show that we have no issue with it right now, but we do make the formal action before anything goes officially to change the lots.

**Mr. Pereira:** Can I get those minutes in a paper? I think that would be good enough for the bank.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Yes, not tonight, though.

**Mr. Pereira:** Okay.

**Boardmember Hutson:** Probably a hearing, too.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Frankly, I don't think that's going to be good enough for the bank. My recommendation would be that you go to the Building Department tomorrow morning--it closes at noon tomorrow--and get your formal application going so that they have time to get the notice out in time for the June meeting because it's running pretty tight. You know, something could come up at the public hearing that the Board's not aware of that they would have to determine, well, either we're not going to give the subdivision or there needs to be further...no, the Board, without having a public hearing cannot give you an advisory opinion on it. All they can say is go ahead with your application, there'll be a public hearing, and then they'll consider it at the next meeting. Again, you should come in tomorrow so you've got time to meet the notice requirements and stuff.

**Mr. Pereira:** How is it going to work if we go through all the definite process? Sorry, my language isn't too good.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** No, we understand.

**Mr. Pereira:** But if the bank, after it's all done nice, and then the bank says that they don't give him the release letter because the bank never guarantees that.

**Boardmember Hutson:** You'll have an approved subdivision.

**Mr. Pereira:** Okay, that's what I mean. Let's say he goes to the bank with an approved subdivision. The bank says we don't give a release letter because we don't like the deal. They can do that.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Not being on the banking end of things...

**Mr. Pereira:** They put it on the letter I'm going to have to pay the fee to get the release letter, but they don't guarantee that they going to give us. They said that they're going to study everything, but they can say after we come here and do the real thing, like you say, they can say we don't give the release letter. So how we stay?

**Chairperson Speranza:** Is your concern, then, how do we make sure that the deal isn't real? Once you get an approved subdivision from us, if the bank says no, is your concern then how do you keep the lot lines the same? Is that your question?

**Mr. Pereira:** After we have the meeting, it's done. The subdivision is done, isn't it?

**Chairperson Speranza:** Well, there's got to be a way to undo it. It's not being filed, right?

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Because you've got your subdivision approval, and then there's a certain amount of time before the final plat has to be filed. I mean, there's a way around, but the Board really can't help you with that. Either somebody at the bank...I don't know if you have an

attorney working with you on this, but those kinds of things this Board can't deal with. All the Board can decide is whether your property can be subdivided.

**Chairperson Speranza:** But once he gets our approval, if, for any reason, the bank says no, they can just not file the papers with the clerk, right?

**Village Attorney Stecich:** That's what I would say.

**Chairperson Speranza:** And then there's no subdivision. So that you won't have to worry about having to come back and undo it.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** But you've got to be careful. So that's why I'm saying either make sure that the person at the bank understands exactly what's going on, or you have a lawyer look at it.

**Mr. Pereira:** Well, what I was trying with this meeting here, with the preliminary meeting, is that the paperwork that is going to come out of it would be good enough for the bank and the bank would give the release letter pending, of course, that the Board approves the...

**Chairperson Speranza:** Well, that's up to them. I mean, you can go back to them and you can say that we said it was okay for you to file a formal plan, a formal application. And if that's all the bank needs, then that's fine. It's just whatever they need.

**Mr. Pereira:** They had a list of items that they needed. The way it was written it looks like they don't want some official thing, they just want to know if the Village would oppose that.

**Boardmember Logan:** You can also read in the code what the required frontages and so forth are in the R-7.5 district, and a plain reading of that would lead you to this conclusion, which is sort of what we're doing, basically. You can take the minutes of this meeting for whatever they're worth. I don't know when they're available.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Probably not for a week.

**Boardmember Logan:** And if the bank is happy with that, fine, you can always try it. If it's not, then there's the next formal stage, which we'll have to go through anyway.

**Mr. Pereira:** I don't mind that. I just want to avoid, first of all, the expense. If the bank just say no, we just pack our bags and leave. That's it.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** That's a bank issue.

**Chairperson Speranza:** There's no reason right now for you...

**Village Attorney Stecich:** You have to talk to the bank.

**Boardmember Smith:** Do you have an attorney?

**Mr. Pereira:** Yes.

**Boardmember Smith:** Yes, you need to talk to your attorney because it could be a complicated

process. You know, you're just going to have to go through the right steps. But he should be watching after that stuff for you to make sure you do number one before two, and so forth so you don't end up with a piece of property that you don't want to have.

**Chairperson Speranza:** And this has been done in the Village. I mean, we've had other applications like this, so there is a way to do it. But certainly you can feel free to go to your bank and say that you've gotten the okay from us to submit a formal application. Maybe that's all they need. Maybe they'll want to wait until the application is formally approved.

**Boardmember Wertz:** And I think the minutes will show that we find no problems with it and don't see anything that would be problematic at this point, although we can't review it formally until there is an application.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Right.

**Mr. Pereira:** Yes, I think that would be good enough for the bank.

**Boardmember Wertz:** Well, it's going to be right in the minutes what we said.

**Boardmember Smith:** Give it a try.

**Boardmember Logan:** Okay, we'll all stop talking now. You can just show him the bottom line.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Well, they can't do anything until there's a formal filing. So hopefully we'll see you next month and you'll get everything you need from the bank. And if there's something more formal that the bank needs--I don't know, if there's anything odd--I really don't know anything about the banking stuff.

**Mr. Pereira:** Yes, to tell the truth...

**Chairperson Speranza:** But we'll make sure that once the final approval has been issued that we'll obviously get the things that you need on the record.

**Mr. Pereira:** Okay, I think the most thing that they stress there is the appraisal. They just want to know if the property is going to be worth the same amount without the 15 feet and with it.

**Boardmember Wertz:** That wouldn't be hard.

**Mr. Pereira:** It doesn't interfere with you, but still they put there the item that they need.

**Chairperson Speranza:** It's always good to come first and make sure that there are no problems, especially since, as you mentioned, things get expensive.

**Boardmember Logan:** And you could always take them a page out of the zoning code, too, which is available and show them that.

**Mr. Pereira:** Okay.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Deven, did you want to add something?

**Building Inspector Sharma:** I remember doing a letter when this property known as Stepping

Stone was being subdivided. I don't remember the exact language, but we did issue a letter for the Becks property that if the property were to be so divided it would seem to meet the criteria for a building lot as set forth in the zoning provisions in our local laws. So conceivably some letter like that can be done if subdivided.

**Chairperson Speranza:** With the sentence that it still needs to go through formal subdivision approval through the Village.

**Building Inspector Sharma:** Oh, yes, yes. Currently if it were so subdivided it would seem like it seems to meet all the criteria set forth in the zoning code.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Okay, thank you.

**Mr. Pereira:** Thank you. Appreciate your time.

#### IV. Other Business

##### 1. Discussion of LWRP

**Chairperson Speranza:** All right, the next item on the agenda is a discussion of the Local Waterfront Revitalization Program (LWRP) plan. I know that there was a presentation Tuesday to the Board of Trustees on this. I did not see it on Channel 75 yet.

**Boardmember Hutson:** I think it was just a brief introduction. It was supposed to be, I don't know.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** I wasn't there.

**Chairperson Speranza:** For those of you who are not here, we have a draft LWRP. We just received it so, obviously, we do want to take look at it. David, I'll do the thing I like to do best and put you on the spot, and just find out if you are aware of how this process is going to move going forward in terms of comments and public review and knowing that it's been issued to us and to the Board of Trustees.

**Boardmember Hutson:** It's going to be reviewed, obviously, by the Trustees, but there will be a public hearing. I don't know whether that date has been set. There were a couple of them kicked around, but I'm not sure that that's been set yet. But the document, once the Trustees have had a chance to look at it and so on, is going to be available to the public and then there will be a hearing and full discussion.

I think one of the things in particular to look at, there's so much information in here, just so people are aware, there is a whole background discussion and inventory and analysis of the various resources in the Village, and then there's a major section on program policies and then something on proposed projects. And then a key one is going to be this section on techniques for implementation of the program, where you have to address your local laws and regulations, make

changes there and any amendments to those, any zoning changes, and so on. That's going to be the real challenge. The other information is really important because it gives you the background to help make judgments about those implementation questions, but that's always where public input and elected decision-makers and so on have to make their judgments as to what are the changes that make sense in terms of the way the waterfront would be zoned, the way it would be managed in terms of the developmental strategy and so on that would be used. Particularly where you would look, so far as establishing or raising the necessary funds, whether from private developers or public support, and probably both.

So that's the process that has to be gone through. I wish I knew, but I don't, if that date for the beginning of the public review has been set. I suspect it hasn't because they're probably waiting until the Trustees have had a chance to take a look.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Right, and I know they just got it this week also, the same.

**Boardmember Hutson:** Right, on Tuesday night.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Well, I have a note to find out when that is. In terms of us being the Planning Board, I'm thinking that it might be worthy...I mean, obviously, we should all take a look at the document and get comments, any comments. There are, first of all, the formatting-- the format, typo, whatever those kinds of changes on this document. There are none? Is that the impression?

**Boardmember Hutson:** Well, it has been reviewed and updated and corrected.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Okay, so maybe there's not.

**Boardmember Hutson:** I'm sure there are some, but there's been a lot of attention paid to that. I think we're particularly interested to hear people's response in regard to the policies and the projects.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Substantive.

**Boardmember Hutson:** Yes, more of the substantive matter. Keep in mind, this began in 1997, this process. Those of us who have been with it throughout are really happy this is here, that it's at least to this point.

**Chairperson Speranza:** I've got to say it's a very impressive-looking document. And if the substance reflects the way that it looks, it's going to be great.

**Boardmember Smith:** It's a very impressive document, and it seems to reflect very accurately the public discussion that's taken place on the revitalization of the waterfront. I recognize what everybody's been talking about, and it's put together in a very organized and articulate way. I think, as David said, the substantive sections are the ones on the policy and the proposed developments.

**Chairperson Speranza:** So you've gotten further along in reading this.

**Boardmember Smith:** I looked through it. There's a lot of material there, it's true.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Maybe what we can do, I'll talk to Angie and coordinate this with her. Because obviously we don't want to step on the toes of the Board of Trustees. However, we are the Planning Board and it's important that we weigh in on what's contained in here.

**Boardmember Hutson:** Yes, I'm sure that the Trustees will. This is a subcommittee, the waterfront committee is a subcommittee, of the Planning Board. So they're going to for sure ask that this be reviewed and discussed, and I'm sure recommendations from this board. So we're going to have to have a work session or two as well.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Yes, that's one of the things that I was thinking of: knowing that as of right now our June meeting will likely be...well, we may have two carryovers from this meeting now. We're also expecting a new submittal from Urban Green on 10 West Main Street for the next week. Whether or not they make the deadlines for that meeting we'll see, but that's what the correspondence with them so far has shown; they're anticipating getting us the information in time for our meeting on June 15th. So I don't know that we will be in a position to discuss this fully then. What I'd like to see, and I know June is a very tough month, if we can try to get something extra and do LWRP and large tracts, which will be nice because they can mesh together very, very well. So we'll have to canvas for some dates to do that in June, avoiding, of course, graduation, which is very important to three of us up here.

**Boardmember Wertz:** All of the ancillary events around that, so it's going to be very tough because there are a lot of events for those first three weeks.

**Chairperson Speranza:** We'll work on that. David, your almost 10 years spent on this is very impressive. Does anyone have any comment on the LWRP?

**Jim Metzger, 427 Warburton Avenue:** I was at the Trustees meeting last Tuesday. I just wanted to inform anybody in the public who didn't happen to see that meeting, after much discussion the Trustees had decided to post the current iteration of the LWRP on the Website even before your review period is over so the public could start spending that time reviewing it as well. So I would ask people who are interested to go to the Website. I don't know when it'll be posted, but it should be fairly soon so that everybody can get up to speed.

**Boardmember Hutson:** Jim, do you know if they happened to set a date for when they're going to present it to the public?

**Mr. Metzger:** I won't comment on that only because I'm not sure if they did or they didn't, and I don't want to give anybody the wrong information.

## 2. Discussion of Transportation Plan and Pedestrian Enhancements Workshop 2 Summary, Priority of Potential Projects and next steps

**Chairperson Speranza:** The next item on our agenda, this is another follow-up to an ongoing

process. As you may recall, goodness it's probably three years ago now, the Village participated in a Safe Routes to School endeavor, which is a state Department of Transportation program. I believe it was Safe Routes to School, and also a walkable communities initiative that was done with a consultant who specializes in going into communities and, with a fresh eye, kind of saying, Well, this intersection looks like it could stand some improvements, and doing various things.

As a result of the Village's commitment to continuing to look at what could be done to make the Village more pedestrian- and bicycling-friendly, we were successful in getting a grant from the state DOT to undertake a transportation plan to look at areas where the Village could implement some improvements to sidewalks and roadways and intersections.

There was a consultant who was hired. There were two workshops that were held, the most recent one being on March 30th. That one I did see broadcast and it was very interesting to get people's reactions to things. Bill Logan was our representative there and, Bill, you've seen the report.

**Boardmember Logan:** Yes, I've seen the report. The meeting, as you said, was the second. About the same number of people; we divided up into, I think it was, five groups. George Jacquemart of Burkhurst Fish & Jacquemart presented a lot more elaborated descriptions of the various proposals, including a computer simulation which you may have seen on the televised version, which helped explain how flow could work around even a reduced-size traffic circle. It's very hard, it's sort of very counterintuitive, but the graphic, the animation was very convincing. It realistically showed traffic pulses and movement through the intersection at peak hours quite convincingly.

The key to all this, as he described it, was the fact that you slow vehicles down and it drastically reduces the number of accidents and fatalities on the order of 60%-80% from signalized intersections. And also pedestrian accidents because it cuts crossing times. You cross in several phases, and there are traffic calming devices. So it does address the safe routes issue and the safety of pedestrian routes through the community. I think it's a little bit hard to intuitively grasp because we don't have too many examples in our county of where you can actually drive through. But I think there is one in Bronxville which was brought up, and I'm not that familiar with Bronxville but there is one about the same scale. You know, the roundabout was only about one of five, six, seven, or eight basic proposals, but it addressed the issues of emergency vehicles and truck turning radii. You know, there are some apparent benefits to this, not only in terms of vehicular accidents and pedestrian accidents, but also in reducing the amount of paved surface we could have there and the possibility of creating a landscaped island at this focal point in Hastings.

So I think the report speaks generally for itself, but it was quite an impressive presentation and all these recommendations are worth rightly pursuing and prioritizing. Because what was also surprising was how relatively inexpensive it seemed to be as a solution; the roundabout I'm speaking of. It was roughly the same price to build the roundabout as it was to put a sidewalk on



Fairlane Drive. We're talking orders of magnitude of 3-4 hundred thousand dollars. So this was not a \$10-million project. Because you're not putting wires in the ground, you're not installing electronics. You're basically taking them out, striping, and removing asphalt. So there's a lot to consider here, and I think this deserves some scrutiny by the general public. I do recommend reading this report and looking at the televised account as well.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Do you know if there was any discussion about... one of the things that concerns me is the changing grade, particularly Main Street in terms of entering a circle like that. I know that through my own work that this is something the state DOT really is very strongly reconsidering for a lot of intersections. I've never seen one that dealt with the kind of..., I haven't seen very many, but I would just be concerned that the level of change that would have to take place with respect to the grading and what kind of impact that would have.

**Boardmember Smith:** The topography is the only issue that sort of popped in my mind. Because I was thinking about that when I drive up through there, and especially when people are coming down-the sight lines and so forth. I mean, how important is that when you're in the roundabout?

**Boardmember Logan:** You have to get George Jacquemart to comment on this. He really is an expert on roundabouts in general and he's studied many of them, has a lot of data. But it seemed like the basic mechanism that allows these things to work is that you're slowing down traffic so traffic enters this circle at roughly 20, 25 miles an hour. So the grade component of it may actually contribute to keeping the traffic slow.

**Boardmember Smith:** I think it's just intuitively that none of us have ever seen one on a grade like that, and we're wondering does that pose an issue, is that at all problematic. It's kind of conspicuously unaddressed in the report, and so I think we're just wondering has that been discussed? Did Jacquemart say anything about it?

**Boardmember Logan:** It was brought up, but I don't think we're at that level of engineering of this thing. This would have to be brought to another level of engineering.

**Boardmember Smith:** But to even consider a roundabout in that particular area would suggest to me that he thinks it's unproblematic. Because otherwise, why make such a big deal out of it and recommend it so highly as a possibility?

**Boardmember Logan:** To go into this depth of analysis.

**Boardmember Smith:** Since the grading problem is one that's intrinsic to the site. So I would assume that his opinion is that it's not a problem.

**Boardmember Logan:** You can imply that. Also, you know, the roundabout takes up a lot less space than the current intersection does. So you have an opportunity to plateau a little bit before you actually hit the roundabout. It's quite far, it's east. As far east as you can put it without impinging on the Aqueduct itself.

**Boardmember Hutson:** You can even get a sense of that on this picture on the first page here. That it's not as far down as what used to be the Food Emporium.

**Boardmember Logan:** Yes, it would be great if we could just close off the intersection one night, put traffic cones, and test this thing.

**Boardmember Smith:** Chalk it out and put the cones in. Bill, could you say something about the process that an idea like this would have to go through in order to become a reality? Where are we now, and what steps would we be looking forward to as this moves forward?

**Boardmember Logan:** You have to basically get the Board of Trustees behind this. You have to get public support for it. It has to be put on a list of priorities. Funding is available, but you'd have to go after funds which are sort of six-figure orders of magnitude for each one of these different aspects. I think the public--and the document will speak for itself--feedback was that sidewalks are probably the first priority, and making sure that the school routes are addressed. Some of these things are sort of low-hanging fruit that can be addressed pretty easily. Other ones, like a median down Broadway, costs a little bit more. And, you know, the roundabout is a pretty major change to the Village. But potentially, when you think of it as a gateway point to the Village, it's something which in terms of aesthetics and the perception of the Village and the green quality of the Village, and the way you approach it and the way you move through it, it's a pretty major thing.

**Boardmember Hutson:** We always talk about making things more Village-like, if it functions right, I think it would be a big plus in terms of your sense of when you come in to the Village.

**Boardmember Logan:** And the scale. Right now it's like a big freeway intersection. That piece of it is like a piece of Central Avenue. If this could be brought down to the scale of the Village, where the pedestrian has priorities and traffic is slowed down, and you don't have trucks idling and buses and cars idling at intersections when they're waiting the turn for the fourth cycle of the traffic lights--noise, fumes, pollution--it's hard to beat. So I'm not sure what the mechanism is. Whether the Board of Trustees reviews what we have so far and prioritizes these things and starts to earmark funds or go after grants.

**Chairperson Speranza:** At some point, and I did talk to Angie about this a little bit in terms of what happens now, we're dealing with Broadway/Route 9, which is a state road, and Farragut Avenue, which is a county road. So certainly, you know, I encouraged her to, either she herself or with the consultant, open up a dialogue with those two agencies and make sure that we don't get so far down the path and have them stand up and say, No way--we won't accommodate it. But as I said, I do know that the state DOT has been promoting this for a lot of those reasons--safety and keeping traffic moving--and there truly is a benefit to air quality if you don't have to have people waiting at a light. But again, this is kind of an odd one with the grades. That we would just have to make sure that engineering-wise it doesn't have the opposite impact of filling in what's now kind of a...or maybe there's nothing special to the little dip down at the Food Emporium, but we would certainly want to be careful about exactly how dramatic a change it could be in terms of cost and priority. You know, is this in fact something where the problem is so big that it's really a \$1- or 2-million investment, \$3 million investment.

**Boardmember Logan:** One or two million dollars these days sounds like the average home in

Westchester.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Yes, but I think some of the stuff that was in here was really interesting. I think it would be great if we could do more with respect to sidewalks. You know, a sidewalk on Broadway has always been something that has been very important. We all want the kids to be out there and be able to walk around and do things. Fairlane's an interesting road, and the idea of putting a sidewalk in there and having it open is certainly worthy of much more discussion.

**Boardmember Hutson:** Is this on the Website?

**Chairperson Speranza:** We can make sure it is. It is here for us, it's not labeled draft. We'll check with Angie. I don't see any reason why it couldn't be. And also I know that there were some specific things with respect to improvements right at the school. I mean, this issue of what they call "bulbing out" Mt. Hope and Rosedale is interesting. And allowing the kids to be able to cross a shorter distance and better define even those parking spaces that are all along Mt. Hope I think would be helpful. So there's more to come on this. Anything more?

**Boardmember Wertz:** It's very interesting. Many of these are very good ideas. A roundabout is very exciting if it can be funded and it actually works. As we were talking I was thinking about people coming out of the train station go up there. They're obviously very much in a hurry. The two lanes would have to go into one lane because of cuing.

**Boardmember Hutson:** Supposedly it's much less. And all the data that he presented and the examples in terms of just the delay and any kind of cuing going back is less than it is now because things keep moving. You know, you don't have to wait on nothing happening. And it's not only the effect that sometimes there's maybe no one waiting at the other side, but that even once there's a green light it takes you a long time to get from here to the other side. That's all wasted time. Of course, there are some people who are going through the red, so there's not as much waste time as there should be sometimes. He felt strongly that that was not a negative; that, in fact, it helped on that score.

**Chairperson Speranza:** And obviously all these things would have to meet a very thorough scrutiny.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Hi, Rhoda. You can sit in this chair.

**Chairperson Speranza:** You're here just in time for the end approaching the intersection.

**Boardmember Barr:** I figured it might be like that.

**Boardmember Hutson:** My thought on this, the only thing is, that coming from the parkway on Farragut and going to go down to the Village and so on, and there's snow, and I'm coming around the roundabout, where do I end up at?

**Boardmember Logan:** You come around the roundabout slowly.

**Boardmember Hutson:** For a change? Is that what you're saying?

**Chairperson Speranza:** Okay, anything from the members of the public?

**Mr. Metzger:** I unfortunately didn't make it to the second meeting, but I was at the first transportation meeting. It seemed to me like there was a lot more skepticism from the public than you seem to be talking about tonight. I actually was the person who, I think, originally raised the issue of the sight lines and the slope coming from Main Street turning onto Broadway and the idea of doing that as a continuous flow with pedestrians coming. I know a lot of kids come through the parking lot of the church to cross over. Mr. Jacquemart was kind of like, "Oh, yes, I hadn't really thought about that." That was at the first meeting.

I'd ask that we all kind of take a step back, take a deep breath. It's exciting to know that there's something, potentially something, better. In the several months that we've been discussing this I've yet to hear of a specific instance where the thing exists and we can either go see or talk to people that use it. Instead of finding out two years from now and a million dollars down the road that this thing is a nightmare we should probably do a little bit more investigation. If these things do exist, and the DOT is promoting this, they have to be up and running somewhere. Somebody should go see this for themselves.

**Boardmember Hutson:** But, as he said, the one in Bronxville has been there a long time.

**Mr. Metzger:** When we asked him originally, he said, "Well, there's some out there, but there are none in the area," I believe is what he said.

**Boardmember Hutson:** But there's another one.

**Mr. Metzger:** Apparently there is one in Bronxville. I'd love to know where it is. I'd like to go down and drive through it and see what it feels like.

**Boardmember Hutson:** Just as you go into on Bronxville over from the Saw Mill. Palmer, right. Thank you. Palmer Road runs into it. There's also one out by the Westchester airport.

**Chairperson Speranza:** There's one at the airport. The one at the airport is a little different though because you don't have a lot of pedestrian activity.

**Boardmember Hutson:** Right, and there's not that much traffic most of the time.

**Chairperson Speranza:** It works, it functions well for vehicles.

**Mr. Metzger:** Right. I also don't think it's a five-way intersection at the airport.

**Chairperson Speranza:** No, it's not.

**Mr. Metzger:** Right, so you have more of that.

**Chairperson Speranza:** But it was preferred over a traffic signal, and that's what I think some of the benefit is. An intersection that was stop-sign controlled and confusing and big, but was a signal the best solution to it. The idea was no, put this in. I want to make sure you understand the discussion that we're having. We're not saying, "Hey, yes. We're ready to sign on and buy in." We're not at all.

**Boardmember Hutson:** We're assuming the basic skepticism.

**Mr. Metzger:** Okay, good. When they talked about reducing the traffic down to one lane coming in and out of the circle--and I understand the need to do that in order to keep things moving--but if you have an accident in that one lane it means nobody gets through. They're talking about continuing the divider up Broadway or, I'm sorry, Farragut to Broadway. Visually it would be very nice to have this kind of tree-lined divider. But the issue was brought up, is the street really wide enough to do that. On Sunday mornings, when Farragut is parked bumper-to-bumper with cars using the churches, how does that affect the traffic flow through there.

So there are a number of issues that are specific to this site that may not be present at the airport where it is a continuous flow of traffic and not a stop-and-go and parking situation. I just wanted to make sure we're looking at all the issues before we give any sort of go-ahead on this.

**Chairperson Speranza:** No.

**Boardmember Hutson:** And in this document, most of those things...

**Mr. Metzger:** I'd love to see that, so I'm hoping it gets up on the Website.

**Boardmember Hutson:** And things like somebody says, "You know, we once had medians on Mt. Hope and we took a bunch of them out." There's skepticism in it.

**Mr. Metzger:** And clearly, at the first meeting it seemed that many more people were interested in dealing with safety issues around the school than they were with having to sit at a traffic light for one or two signal changes. I know anybody who's driven there in the morning, it's incredibly dangerous for pedestrians as well as cars. Especially trying to inch your way up Olinda, for example, which is a very steep hill, a stop-and-go situation is a problem. With a traffic light you get a flow of traffic and then everybody stops. If it's trying to merge into a circle it may be more of a stop-and-go situation. Without seeing where that other traffic is coming from there could be some potential fender-benders. I just want to make sure we're all looking at this on the same page.

**Chairperson Speranza:** As I said, the consultant is doing some additional work with respect to coming up with some cost estimates and concept designs for many of these improvements. I think, as Bill said, if it's going to cost just as much for a sidewalk along Fairlane as the traffic circle, well, then it is a function of this body and the Village Board and the Safety Council. Okay, well, where is the priority then? Is it more important to get the sidewalk on Fairlane than to do this traffic circle which we are all skeptical about. You know, where do we put our dollars based on what our priorities are going to be.

So I think there is still a lot before we go out there and start ripping up pavement or anything.

**Mr. Metzger:** Thank you.

**Chairperson Speranza:** But we'll make sure that this is available.

**David Skolnik:** Also, I agree with Jim. I was at both meetings and I've been watching this issue, and I agree very much that my sense is that I am also a skeptic with regard to some of the larger projects. And that my concern, and I feel the focus, is a little bit--from my own opinion--

it's a little misguided. And the focus, most importantly should be around the school as a starting point. I want to mention that I was at the safety committee meeting just now.

**Chairperson Speranza:** I saw them breaking up, yes.

**Mr. Skolnik:** I distributed something that I would like also to be able to at least provide to this committee, which will not mean anything to you until I follow up with some more specific information. But I've spent some time--I spent a good deal of time, actually--around the school area watching on different days, watching what goes on. It's hard to, in any short sense, describe the scene there. It's not anything that can be fathomed by a general statement. It's a circus.

But I guess I would ask, in terms of process, it's not clear to me where the input from the public...I know this is a report which, hopefully, will be made available--it's not clear to me at what stage we are able to actually engage more in a discussion of this. And also that the various--you mentioned the Safety Committee--they're still...my sense is that there's a certain lack of exchange at this point. Which I'm hoping that something like this will be able to address and encourage. Because I think the Safety Committee...and the problem with this for a long time has been, I think, that as a whole the issues of walkability and the transportation are very large and they pose a tremendous number of problems which can tend to make addressing some of the specifics very hard to address. So I feel that the school is something that somehow we need to address sooner rather than with the kind of funding...we need to address it before the state, we have to deal with all the issues. This could take years. So if it's all right I'll give you this, and the follow up with the text at some point.

**Chairperson Speranza:** And with respect to process, certainly this report--and this is the report of the second workshop--as I had said, I know that the consultant still has more work to be done under the contract. I don't know if there's a third session, but there certainly has to be a preparation of the additional materials I know that they're working to pull together. So this workshop was certainly not the end of public participation or involvement at all.

As a matter of fact, having started with Safe Routes to School and Walkable Communities, this is the kind of thing that really does have to have a great deal of public input because we are all walking and driving through the community and if we're going to make any changes we want to make sure that they're the right changes. One of the things that I like about the focusing on the school is that those roads are, in essence, Village roads. They are much more under the control of us than of the state and the county with respect to being able to actually design and make improvements, those things which can be completely local decisions.

**Mr. Skolnik:** I'm sorry. Actually, Farragut is county.

**Chairperson Speranza:** You know, I'm thinking around the back: Hillside and School Street and Mt. Hope. But you're right, Farragut is county. Well, we have to bring them in, certainly, on anything else having to do with Farragut Avenue. But the other streets on the back side of the school and up towards Hillside are certainly areas where we can look at doing more on our own to make sure that there are things that we want rather than having to meet state standards.

**Boardmember Hutson:** Can I ask a question? The business around the school has been talked about now for, you know, a year or two. Has anything come to the safety council, safety committee, that seems to make some sense? I mean, is there some progress being made there? Because I know there was a lot of dialogue and a lot of circles about that issue in terms of traffic and safety around the school. Are there some prevailing points of view, or is still pretty much just, Gee, what are we going to do?

**Mr. Skolnik:** I think that's more the case just because I think the conflicting issues make a solution very...even taking some sorts of small steps end up having ramifications somewhere else. And to address it, it really needs to be addressed as a whole. I know that there were some changes made in the last year or two. There was some zoning off a little bit.

**Boardmember Hutson:** Well, even beginning with the stop sign and so on.

**Mr. Skolnik:** Well, the stop sign's been there for awhile.

**Boardmember Hutson:** It's been there for awhile, but that kind of was the beginning of the effort. Weren't there professional consultants brought in at one point before this about the school thing?

**Chairperson Speranza:** Yes.

**Boardmember Hutson:** I don't know, were they hired by the school or by the Village? By the Village, right?

**Chairperson Speranza:** No, they weren't hired by the Village. It was through a regional transportation initiative.

**Mr. Skolnik:** Meg Walker, I think, was involved at the time.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Yes, Meg got them up here, right. And it's probably worthwhile to dig out that report.

**Boardmember Hutson:** Was there a report? That's what I thought.

**Chairperson Speranza:** I know there was a report or summary. This gentleman actually did some work down in Mt. Vernon, the same kind of thing: walking around certain areas of Mt. Vernon and looking at how you could improve pedestrian flows and stuff. I'll dig out a copy of the report that was done for the Village. You know, Iris Arno from the school district actually presented something up at the county center when there was a Safe Routes to School forum. They showed the little video that had been prepared--Rafael, you remember that--of what it actually looked like at school drop-off time and how disturbing it was to watch how people were getting dropped off and crossing the streets. It was troubling, and it's probably worthwhile again now to bring it back into this context.

**Boardmember Hutson:** Because I think everybody agrees that that is the priority. As Bill said, even at the meeting people thought that was a priority. It's not that the roundabout is necessarily the program; it's the one that is in some ways the most interesting and succinct, and also

controversial. Nobody disagrees that something's got to be done at the school.

**Mr. Skolnik:** The only point to consider, too, is that the perspective is that the problem there exists for an extremely short time. It's not an hour, it's not a rush hour, situation. It's at most 20 minutes, and usually less than 20 minutes. So in trying to come up with solutions that has to be kept in mind. You're addressing such a small fraction of the time. The rest of the time the dynamics of that whole area are different, and anything that you're trying to address it just doesn't apply. You have to be there, and it's not even something that you can see on one visit because in that 15 minutes you'll have...it's like a three-ring circus. So if you're looking at what's going on at one place you're missing what's going on somewhere else. But as soon as I can I'll write that up and try to supply it.

**Boardmember Hutson:** All right, thanks.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Great, thank you. Yes, sir.

**Mark Rosner, 24 Branford Road:** I was at the last workshop, and before I went to that workshop I was skeptical about the roundabout. I realized at that workshop that I didn't really know what it was. It's not what I thought it was, it's not other things I've driven through. This study seemed comprehensive to and statistically valid, and I have an open mind to it. We're a small town, so the fact that we haven't had a recent fatality at Five Corners doesn't mean that it's safe statistically. And yes, I think we should proceed cautiously. I think we should go upstate or wherever we need to see one in action. They are out there, but at the same time I don't think we should miss our chance on this to make some improvements in safety.

The other thing is, I want to just briefly share with you some of my experiences on Walk to School Week. I picked up my daughter a couple times by foot in late April and took her home. It may have been more aptly named Dodge to School Week. Because I didn't realize just how terrifying the walk is until I actually did it. Some of the things we encountered in a 9/10ths mile walk were 9-inch cracks in the sidewalk, places where the sidewalk disappeared, reappeared; blind curbs; wires.

There was a place where the sidewalk was kind of buried. And I was surprised to see a relatively new home that didn't have a sidewalk. Clearly, they had the permission to build a home, but there really wasn't much in the way of a sidewalk or appropriate drainage in that spot. And at the end of the walk--and I'm serious about this--we saw chickens, but that wasn't really a problem. I've got pictures of them here.

I was at the safety council meeting a couple months back and one of the resolutions I heard was that Village residents would be invited to clean things up a little bit in terms of brush and in terms of just getting sidewalks in good order. I'm not exactly sure where that communication broke down, but I don't recall that coming to residents by mail or by e-mail.

**Chairperson Speranza:** I think that was Hastings Clean Up Day last week or two weeks ago.

**Mr. Rosner:** But we have that every year.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Oh, you think this is something different?



**Mr. Rosner:** It was more specifically targeted to this particular week where children would be walking to and from school. To get ready for that and, you know, not just pick up trash but do some repairs. Trim some shrubs and so forth. You know, the Village could take a harder line with people. They do have the right to enforce code and make sure things are safe. I'm not suggesting that they do. I think there's probably a gentler way to go about it, and ask people things to spruce up--you know, people to spruce things up. But, you know, they should understand that you don't have a constitutional right not to fix your sidewalk.

That's really it. I'll give you three copies of the walk I took, and it has photographs. I hope you can just continue working with the school to keep things moving along.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Yes, great. Thank you.

**Boardmember Hutson:** That was probably interesting, too, when you're talking about what goes on right at the school. I mean, what goes on some distance away may have an impact on how many people feel they have to drive their children to school for some of these reasons that you're citing.

**Mr. Rosner:** Absolutely. You know, when I walk out my door in the morning I really have to look every direction, be alert. There's a crosswalk where Branford becomes Rosedale that people just don't even realize it's a crosswalk. You step into it and they hit the gas, and you step back and wait. Anyway, thank you.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Okay, so I'll speak to Angie and we'll follow up on this. These are some really good observations. As I said, certainly it's not the end of this initiative.

Okay, does anyone have anything else to bring up?

**Village Attorney Stecich:** I just wanted to mention that 422 Warburton, there is actually going to be a closing on it.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Well, that's great.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Yes, I reviewed the final documents today that the Village had to sign in preparation for the closing. Now I forget whether the date's May 24th or June 1st, but sometime within our lifetimes. No, it's actually going to be very soon. They're going to close and, apparently, after that they'll get going. But the documents are in place, they've all been, I think, signed by all the municipality. So they're closing within the next week.

**Chairperson Speranza:** So the closing means--and I don't know if I want to ask this question, but I will--the closing means that real construction starts.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Well, it means they're getting the financing.

**Chairperson Speranza:** The money is all in place.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Yes, and if I understand from Eric that's all that they were waiting on

was for the money. At the closing, they'll have the money.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Bonding and everything.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Yes, and then I kind of lost track about where they are in the building permits. I think they're current on that because I think they needed a demolition permit. So that kept them going. I'll have to talk to Deven to make sure that's in line, but sounds like they're ready to go.

**Chairperson Speranza:** That is good news. Okay, if there's nothing else.

## **VI. Adjournment**

**On MOTION of Boardmember Hutson, SECONDED by Boardmember Smith with a voice vote of all in favor, Chairperson Speranza adjourned the Regular Meeting at 9:45 PM.**