

**VILLAGE OF HASTINGS-ON-HUDSON, NEW YORK
PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING
NOVEMBER 16, 2006**

A **Regular Meeting** was held by the Planning Board on **Thursday, November 16, 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, Jamie Cameron, Eva Alligood, Bruce Dale, Village Attorney Marianne Stecich, and Village Planning Director Angela Witkowski.

ABSENT: Boardmember David Hutson

I. Roll Call

**II. Approval of Minutes
October 19, 2006 meeting**

Chairperson Speranza: This is the set of minutes from October 19th. Do you have any comments, or changes to be made?

Boardmember Alligood: Page 10, the second paragraph on my comments. It says: "What I think the report really could take a closer look at and could address in more detail is a traffic..." it's not "rallying" plan, it's "routing" plan. It's about halfway down on the paragraph. Don't need to rally the traffic.

Village Planner Witkowski: Makes a little more sense.

Boardmember Alligood: And then there's just a correction, another four lines down. The sentence that says: "That's 'where' I think..." I would correct it to say: "That's 'why' I think we need even further study of those areas. I think that's it.

Boardmember Dale: I have a few words in one of the sentences, but I'll give it to you afterwards. It's not very complicated.

Boardmember Wertz: I have three or four little ones. I think it's easier to do it afterwards.

Village Planner Witkowski: That's okay. You can do it now.

Boardmember Dale: Do it now? On page 38, the last paragraph, the third line down: "There's a lot to be preserved here in Hastings. There are a lot of things that 'deserve'" instead of "describe"... "the things that 'describe' it," should say "'deserve' it."

On page 35, my second comment, first line: “But there are...” ‘like star’ should be “historical.”

And one more on page 33, the middle of the page where I say: “I ‘saw’ it on the TV,” not “I should ‘find it’ on the TV.” That’s it.

Chairperson Speranza: Bill, anything?

Boardmember Alligood: I’m sorry. I found one more. Should I just give it?

Village Planner Witkowski: Yes, just tell me now.

Boardmember Alligood: Page 11, my third paragraph, the second sentence: “The issue I see with that is...” I would take out just “that is”: “If that becomes the queue and it’s the encouraged spot, where do all those cars back up to?” and it should be a question mark.

Village Planner Witkowski: Okay.

Chairperson Speranza: Okay, I had one. If you do a search and replace for Newcastle, it’d be good to spell it correctly. It’s two words: N-E-W C-A-S. I know there’s a Newcastle, I think it’s in England, that’s spelled this way. Just so there’s no confusion as to what the other Steep Slopes Ordinance was that we were looking at.

Village Planner Witkowski: Okay.

Chairperson Speranza: It’s the town of New Castle.

And the same thing, page 28. There’s reference in the first paragraph to the Steep Slopes Ordinance from the town of Mount “Kisko,” which should be K-I-S-C-O.

Okay, anything else?

On MOTION of Boardmember Logan, SECONDED by Boardmember Dale with a voice vote of all in favor, the Minutes of the Regular Meeting and Public Hearing of October 19, 2006 were approved as amended.

Chairperson Speranza: I do want to, at the end of the regular business, go back through some of the things that were brought up at the last meeting. I’m just going to keep this here. Please remind me before adjournment that there are some things to follow up on. But I do want to make sure that the applicants and the members of the public that are here for the new business can hear the new presentations.

III. New Business

- 1. Preliminary Presentation by Christina Griffin, Architect. 433 Warburton Avenue proposed expansion of 2-family residence and parking spaces on Ridge Street**

Chairperson Speranza: The first item under new business is a presentation by Christina Griffin for a proposed expansion of a two-family residence on Ridge Street. How are you?

Peter Wolf: Very well. Good to see you all. I’m just going to give a brief introduction of how this all came about. This is really a labor of love for us because we actually started out

and lived in this particular house, for 21 months while we were building our other house in Hastings. We really, really love this neighborhood on lower Warburton Avenue. Subsequent to that, Christina did four townhouses close by on Ridge Street. We sort of let it be known to the then-owners, who of course we met while we were tenants, that if they were ever interested in selling the property that we would be interested. So that's how we came to have this house. It was a two-family house. It's really not much more than a two-story railroad flat. It was built in about 1915 and doesn't meet code in a wide variety of aspects.

We're here for this preliminary site review. We believe that we are to consider three separate issues, one of which steep slopes. In actuality, with our plan there will be less steep slopes than there are now. The second one deals with view preservation. We believe that that's not going to be a great impediment because we're actually going to shorten the building on top and widen it on the bottom.

And the third one is the one that we really would like your input on. Having lived in this neighborhood for close to two years, I presume all of you know that the real problem is parking. So we had this in mind when we created this plan. What we're trying to do is to -- if you had two people, or two cars, in each of the two units it would be a total of four cars -- what we have as an idea is to, on the top, which is the Warburton Avenue side, to try to get a curb cut the width of one space and then put two cars actually in the property. On the bottom, which is the Ridge Street side, we would put two cars as well. What we would really like your input on is that, at present, that area of Ridge Street is now a paper street. It doesn't actually go all the way up. This is just in the way of a brief introduction, and Christina will make the presentation.

Christina Griffin, architect: I'd like to give you an overview of this area before we get to our site plan [starting with] the location of the site. The site is 25 feet by 150 feet, and goes from Warburton Avenue to Ridge Street [the building is] about 32 feet in height. This rectangle shows that this particular house is set back more than all of the other buildings on the street. We have actually taken photographs of the surrounding properties.

What we're showing here is a comparative analysis just to demonstrate how this building compares with others. It's very challenging. Our goal is to develop this building, which is in dire need of renovation, in a way that'll be in keeping with the scale and the charm of this neighborhood. I really see it potentially...it reminds me of San Francisco, with the hills and the little pockets of greenspace, incredible views, and fun little alleyways that are very pedestrian-friendly. What we'd like to do is develop this so that we try to keep the building very much in the same scale that it is now. We're going to maintain the width of 18 feet. I wanted to demonstrate how this building -- before we get into the design -- how it compares with the other buildings, just to show you how similar it is and the problems that these buildings have. The lots are very narrow. There are several lots that are the same width, only 25 feet. Even though the minimum lot size for a two-family house is 5,000 square feet,

the average of all these 30 buildings here is only 3,154 square feet. So you know many -- and probably the majority -- of the buildings are nonconforming in many ways. The average lot coverage, is 43%. We're proposing only 28%.

The number of stories average is 3; we're proposing 3-1/2. The minimum side yard average is zero, although 8 feet is the minimum required by the zoning code. The average number of parking spaces is 0.5, and we're proposing 4. The average number of dwellings for these little lots is 4. We're proposing two, which actually is maintaining the status of what exists.

So I'm just trying to show you -- and I hope this information will be helpful, especially for the Zoning Board -- is that it just demonstrates how there are so many buildings here that are nonconforming. But when you have buildings that are 100 years old plus or minus, at some point they need major renovations. Especially when you have the railroad type arrangement, when you go from one bedroom to another in another room, it doesn't meet egress [requirements]. You're supposed to have a hallway and two ways out of a bedroom. We have windows on a zero lot line, which is not allowed by state code because of spread of fire. We've come up with a design, actually, to get the square footage which we'll need by adding corridors. Even though we keep some of the bedrooms very narrow -- some are only 8 feet wide -- what we've done is expanded the building, but only on the lower level. Because we feel that this level is probably below the view of the houses that are uphill and closer to Warburton Avenue. The upper two stories we're actually going to cut back by 4 feet 3 inches to try to improve the view. Also we felt we didn't need the square footage up there.

This is our site plan that shows the new parking area that we'd like to propose, so that we can give two spaces for the upper unit and two spaces for the lower unit. We lived here. At a certain time of night you actually have to drive almost all the way on the other side of Hastings to find a spot. So what we'd like to do is apply for a curb cut and trade one street parking space for two off-street spaces on the upper part of the lot. On the lower part -- I'm familiar with Ridge Street as I developed the other buildings down the road -- the existing paved area ends here. This is owned by the Village. It's a paper street. We're proposing that we extend this so that there could be a turnaround and access to parking here. I also appreciate the pockets of greenspace that really, especially when you're going south of here, makes this area so attractive once you go behind the buildings. There are trees and yards and little orchards and terraced areas. So we'd like to maintain as many of the trees that we can above. Down below there are existing trees, and we want to replace them and keep as much greenspace and smaller orchard trees so that we can, of course, maximize the view.

Going back to why we're here, there are three items we need to talk about. One is steep slopes. We have a steep slope calculation on our site plan. The existing area of steep slopes is 662 square feet... that is a steep slope area of the land greater than 15%. There are existing terraces here, and they're flat. So that's based on what exists. Our proposal is going to have 541 square feet of slope over 15%. Most of the lot is less than 15%, and then it goes

down steeply here. But the patio is not part of that steep slopes calculation. This was a question that Angie and Deven had, and we wanted to make sure we discussed it tonight. Because, of course, if you didn't have these terraced areas, and you just went from A to B, you'd have a different type of slope area.

I'd like to show you the sections that we have before we get here. We have elevations drawn. A lot of the information we provide in here came from property cards from the tax assessor's office and photographs. Here, we tried to demonstrate that what we'd like to do is lift the building up a half-story and give it a 3-1/2 story height. Because to develop the house so that you have comfortable spaces, avoiding the railroad type arrangement, we need more square footage. But we'd like to do it in a way that is still in keeping with the range of heights that we have in the neighborhood. You can see from this drawing that most of the buildings are around the same height.

Chairperson Speranza: That's from Warburton Avenue.

Ms. Griffin: From Warburton Avenue. Actually, we also have photographs from the back, looking from Ridge. They're down below here. I don't know if you can make out this photograph. This is the front of the existing house on Warburton Avenue, and this is the back. You see there's a tremendous drop here. From Warburton Avenue to the bottom of Ridge Street is 32 feet.

We have cross-sections that help to demonstrate the difference between existing and proposed. I think it will help you. I'm going to just go right by the elevations and just show you the change. The existing grade and the profile of the existing house is in pink. Proposed is in gray, and we're proposing that the building take a slightly different shape. But we've aligned the facade of our new building with the existing one-story vestibule but cut it back in the back because we know that this is the part of the building that affects views. Down below, to add square footage, we're bumping this out 4 feet 3 inches and then another 8 feet here, and this is not simply to add the square footage but to get down below the eye level. At our next meeting we're going to have more photographs from the viewpoint of the neighbors' properties, so we're going to examine a little more carefully how this affects them. But from looking at the photographs, I think most of the buildings on Warburton Avenue are up. There is one building that is similar in position about two houses up. Most of those buildings are at the same level as this part of this building here, which is our first-floor level.

This is a view looking at the other side of the building. It shows also the two parking spaces. To get the two parking spaces in here we would like to really keep the grade as natural as possible, using grass block that allows the grass to come up through, possibly even down here. You know, there's a path with mulch and I don't even know if it would be necessary to pave this. It could be gravel or grass block to just keep the feeling of green as much as

possible. This is the new parking space that would have to have a retaining wall. All the retaining walls would be no more than 6 feet 6 inches, which is the code maximum height.

Do you have any questions?

Boardmember Alligood: Can you talk about how you're going to change the grade down below?

Ms. Griffin: This is the area...when we calculated the steep slopes...you can see how gentle this is, and then there's a drop. These are the existing terraces. The first terrace actually will be the adjacent that we're putting on the building. There are three terraces that exist now and the walls are crumbling, so we're going to have to rebuild them. We're going to put one terrace here, and then we're going to keep a steeper slope, and then carve a little pocket of space here just for parking the cars.

Chairperson Speranza: Christina, you mentioned that the Ridge Street area where the parking is proposed would also be a turnaround. Is there going to be enough room for both cars to be parked there and someone to turn around?

Ms. Griffin: We have considered that. I actually have two schemes with me tonight. This is one scheme that shows a parking space just for two cars just for the lower unit, and the turnaround would really be used for this unit. The advantage to this scheme is just the additional greenspace here. We have also brought tonight, just so we can discuss it, another scheme -- I hope you can see this -- where we've actually provided a turnaround for cars coming in here, and then the parking area. But that would just take away from some of the greenspace we have here to do that. When I worked on the buildings down there, one of the big questions is turnaround. The parking lot provides a turnaround for a lot of the people on that street, I think. There is a pocket of parking at 20 Ridge, but it's narrow. If we were to do this -- this would be 25 feet -- I think that pocket's more like 12 feet.

Boardmember Cameron: I turned around in there tonight.

Boardmember Alligood: I did, too.

Ms. Griffin: Oh, I'm so glad. What did you think of it?

Boardmember Alligood: It's tight.

Ms. Griffin: You have to go back and forth a few times, I think.

Boardmember Dale: You really do have to use that sort of parking lot that's there now in order to make a turn. So if there are two cars parked there it ceases to function as a turnaround for the rest of the people on the block.

Chairperson Speranza: When we were looking at Ridge Street in great detail, providing a turnaround and keeping people from parking at the end of the road were huge issues.

Ms. Griffin: Just for your information, the paved area stops here. We have posts here, a little railing, and the mulched area. So it's about 25 feet away from where this would begin.

Boardmember Cameron: So the pocket and turnaround is on someone else's property.

Ms. Griffin: No, this is Village-owned property, and this pocket is on our property.

Chairperson Speranza: Can you just go through -- the zoning code compliance? Because this is a very unique lot, where the building is really in the middle of the lot as opposed to the ones that are either at Warburton Avenue or at Ridge.

Ms. Griffin: Yes. This is the MR-O zone, and the minimum side yard is 8 feet and the combined side yard is 16 feet. The front yard is 10, and the rear is 15. The existing setback is 42, and we're going to maintain that but have a bay window. So the existing and proposed is going to be 42 foot front yard, 15 is required. The existing rear yard is also about 45...no, no, the existing rear yard is about 62 feet, and the proposed is 50 feet. So we're well beyond the minimum. The variance that we would require would be for the side yards. The side yard that's required for the zone is 8 feet, and the lot is 25 feet wide. So 16 feet from 25, you'd have a 9-foot-wide building. In fact, that's why I did the comparative analysis. It just demonstrates the average minimum side yard is zero because most of the buildings are right on the lot line. Actually, many of the buildings...some fill up the whole site, some have an alley on one side a few feet wide.

The other variance that we would require would be the stories. We will be meeting the 35-foot maximum height. But for a two-story building, if you're doing a two-story building, the maximum number of stories is 2-1/2 and we're proposing 3-1/2. We're going up a half-story and we're going down a half-story.

We are going to meet the lot coverage that's required. We're under that. It's 50%, and we're proposing 36.7. Average in the neighborhood is 43%. The parking spaces required are two per unit, we're proposing two per unit. The average for the neighborhood is 0.5.

Village Attorney Stecich: What's the total square footage of the two parking areas?

Ms. Griffin: About 700 square feet. We're trying to make them minimal, actually 18 by 60. This is not for big cars -- compact cars.

Chairperson Speranza: Okay, questions?

Boardmember Dale: One question on the view preservation. You're adding a story on top of the building, the existing height. Would that block the view of either of the side neighbors from the side of their houses as opposed to from their back windows or front windows, depending on how their houses are oriented?

Ms. Griffin: We've added a half-story here, and I think that most of these houses are not high enough. But when we come to the next meeting we're going to take photographs from the neighbors' properties to examine. We'll take a look at that.

Boardmember Dale: It was raised on another project, and I was curious whether that was an issue for this building or not.

Ms. Griffin: We'll try to get that information for you for the next meeting.

Chairperson Speranza: Just so people do realize, this is a preliminary review by us. Obviously, things are very well developed in terms of the plans that we've been asked to review and the thought that's gone into all of this. But any formal action would be at the next meeting. Certainly, this is our time to express concerns and comments and questions. Bill, did you have anything at this point?

Boardmember Logan: No. I guess we're losing a space on the street with the curb cut, but we're taking two cars off the street. So it seems to be a net gain and, theoretically it'd be an improvement of what's there already because there are two cars that would be parked on Warburton Avenue, presumably. Now they won't be. And the other thing is the steep slopes. I'm not even sure that applies here because it's less than 1,000 square feet which, I think, is the threshold for the definition.

Chairperson Speranza: Yes, that's something which I think we need clarification on. I know you've talked to Angie and you've talked to Deven. Given that this is a lot and it's a new building that's coming down, one of the things that is a bit of a concern to me is that it is terraced down the back now, but in order to make that flat surface at the bottom there's going to be a 6-1/2 foot retaining wall. You're pushing it up, and the building is going a half-a-story higher.

Ms. Griffin: Yes.

Chairperson Speranza: So from Ridge Street it's going to look different than it does today. I also think we have to talk about, and trace, the history of that parking. I believe the property owner is allowing that area to be used as a turnaround, and I don't see him here. Joe Capuano, I believe, owns that building. There was some agreement. His property was being used. Marianne, do you remember?

Village Attorney Stecich: I can vaguely remember it. That's right.

Chairperson Speranza: Yes, I think it was an easement maybe that we received from him...

Ms. Griffin: I think he leases it to the Village as a turnaround.

Chairperson Speranza: He leases it to the Village, and it's to remain as a turnaround. So in terms of that agreement and the ability to provide for a turnaround, as much as that is one concern for Ridge. Because you're speaking now of expanding the pavement. The work that was done at Ridge Street was that if anything was going to be developed further down than

the paved area now that a turnaround would be incorporated. My recollection was that we weren't thinking of coming from Warburton Avenue down so much as the potential to develop at the end of Ridge Street where there is vacant property. There was discussion at the time that there was going to be a proposal for it.

Boardmember Dale: Was that easement added to his deed in perpetuity or was it just limited to...

Chairperson Speranza: I don't know the details of it, and that's what we would have to find out. I mean, if there can be a somewhat similar agreement.

Ms. Griffin: What's interesting is, in Irvington builders have to pay a fee that goes into a pot that is to develop, or look for, parking pockets in the village to try to buy land or develop land. This neighborhood is in serious need of something like that, where when someone is developing property find a way to provide the parking.

Chairperson Speranza: Right. And in this case, this specific instance, it wasn't the parking. It was to facilitate a turnaround. Now here there are additional cars that are going to be going down the street, so the idea of providing for a turnaround as the street pavement gets lengthened becomes even more of an issue.

Ms. Griffin: If you look at the regional map, this is one of the first properties that go from Warburton to Ridge. Well, there are a few more, and these give the opportunity to provide parking down below.

Boardmember Cameron: Sorry, is that existing turnaround on your property or farther down towards...so it'll continue to exist?

Ms. Griffin: It's actually just one property away, about 25 feet away.

Boardmember Cameron: I think it's here in this overview.

Ms. Griffin: Yes, you can actually see it. See this little U-shape? It's like one property away; it's about 25 feet away.

Boardmember Wertz: I think the main issues are the parking and the loss of a spot on Warburton. But as it has been pointed out, we're gaining one spot. Even though it's a private space, it takes one car off the street.

The other issue, I think, is the turnaround. I guess if the turnaround that's currently there is going to remain and it'll still be usable, then there's no loss in that department. And if it's possible to have some kind of additional turnaround with this development, then it's a gain there, too. I think it's a great design and preserving as much greenspace on that lot as you can. I thought it was beautiful architectural work and just lovely. It's a great neighborhood. I really like it, too. And I think it's wonderful that you would come along and improve that

structure in such a nicely aesthetic way and take care of a little bit of a parking situation there which is bad. So I like it overall.

Boardmember Alligood: I think it's a creative solution. It does set a precedent on Warburton for a parking pad in the front lot there, and I'm not sure how I feel about that. I think it solves a very real problem that needs to be solved. There's not enough on-street parking and there's no room on the side to create any kind of driveway. So I understand why it's needed, I'm just always a little hesitant to endorse parking on basically the front lawn.

And then my other concern is the same as the other Boardmembers, which is just that the street is so tight. If their owners are home and they're using those two spots, how do they get in and out? It's really tight. There were some ideas a few years back when the street study was done, and maybe if some of those could be picked up. I don't know whose responsibility it would be, how we could do it, but it seems it's a good time to re-look at some of those ideas.

Boardmember Cameron: I had some of those same ideas, in that I'm sort of curious what you were going to do with the trees that are currently on the property. It's nice that you have a house that's set further back, but it does give a nice break as you go down and suddenly have trees there. As you put your parking in, I'm wondering what you're going to do to try...

Ms. Griffin: You see the photograph. You can hardly see the house at a certain time of year. Actually, we wanted to keep these trees. There's a crabapple tree, and this is an evergreen of some kind. There's also a Japanese maple. And actually we put the parking in to save those trees. I know that there can be some compaction. I think next time I'm going to show this as green because I really am sincere about using grass block or little stripes for the tires so that we make sure we do not use impervious surface, pervious material, and to see if we can actually have those cars just nestled in as greenspace.

Chairperson Speranza: Now you're not going to be able to turn around and get out in that area.

Ms. Griffin: You have to back out.

Chairperson Speranza: You're going to have to back out onto Warburton. That could be a problem. I mean, obviously, it's a county road, they have to give the permit.

Ms. Griffin: Well, we still have to go through that process to get their approval.

Mr. Wolf: Just to answer these last two things -- the entrance where it is -- because what we're trying to do is, there are two large trees in the front yard and we're trying to save them. So we've moved the entrance around to the other side to fit in the two parking places, and we're trying to keep the two big trees that are there.

The other thing I'd like to bring out is, what we're trying to do with this whole Ridge Street is to come up with a net gain of three parking spaces for Warburton Avenue. As I said, we ourselves rode up and down that street many an evening looking for spaces. You know, we came out with this solution because we thought it wouldn't be only saving one -- which is the upper one -- but three, because of the two lower ones. In other words, if you have two units now the way it is, and they both enter from Warburton, they would actually be taking four spaces on Warburton. So what we're trying to do is come up with a net gain of three, and that's why we came up with this idea. It's obviously not the easiest idea because it involves changing the paper street into a real street, but we thought, in terms of the community, that that would be the best solution.

Nobody's discussed this, and there's no reason to discuss it, but there's a huge unknown which is the fact that there is a multi-story, multi-unit building being built right across the street. Of course, nobody knows what the real impact is going to be on the parking on Warburton once that's up. But in terms of our project, what we're trying to do is achieve a net gain of three spaces on the street using this plan.

Village Attorney Stecich: Christina, I'm sorry. When you were mentioning variances, did you mention a lot size? Because it's an insufficient lot size, right?

Ms. Griffin: Yes, actually I didn't. The required lot size for a two-family house is 5,000 square feet, and this lot is 3,789. But we did this analysis because this is just a problem throughout the neighborhood. Even though this lot's only 3,750 square feet, the average for these properties is 3,154.

Village Attorney Stecich: Except they're in a different district, aren't they?

Ms. Griffin: No, no.

Village Attorney Stecich: Are they all in the MR-O?

Ms. Griffin: You know what? I have some houses that may not be.

Village Attorney Stecich: Yes, I think they're not. See, I think that would be in the MR-1.5, where they are probably conforming.

Ms. Griffin: Next time I come I'll make sure that's clear. But I just want to point out that even though the average is smaller than this lot because a lot of the lots don't go all the way through, the average units for that size is 4, and this is 2.

Village Attorney Stecich: And then the other question I have is, was there a misunderstanding on the amount of steep slopes? Somebody said you said there's just 100 feet of steep slope.

Ms. Griffin: No, it's more than that.

Mr. Wolf: ... and with our proposal it would be 500 and something.

Village Attorney Stecich: Right. But the lot has more than 1,000 square feet of steep slopes, correct? Fifteen percent or more.

Mr. Wolf: Right. But because of the terracing it now has 660 some, and with our proposal it's 500 and something.

Ms. Griffin: The existing lot has these terraces. That's the question. That's why we had to discuss it tonight. Because when you measure the steep slopes area, and you really just measure the slope over 15%, it's the area around and below those terraces. So how do you look at that? Has it already been developed to steep slopes? Now we're redeveloping it, so that's why we were going to discuss it tonight.

Village Attorney Stecich: You know, to the extent it's ambiguous -- if it is, I'm not sure it is -- I'd have to look at it from that perspective. Because I just look at it and assume that it is. But it probably is the sort of application that should be reviewed under the Steep Slopes Law, especially since you are cutting into part of a slope, right, and building retaining walls.

Chairperson Speranza: That's the thing that troubles me.

Village Attorney Stecich: So it's to the extent that it is ambiguous it probably should be noticed for steep slopes, which it has been, right?

Village Planner Witkowski: Yes.

Village Attorney Stecich: Okay, I think that makes sense.

Chairperson Speranza: Okay, and the only actions that would come before us on this are view preservation and steep slopes? We don't do site plan approval?

Village Attorney Stecich: Yes, Deven called me later to check on that. Apparently, the notice includes site plan approval.

Chairperson Speranza: Okay, let me see if we have questions from members of the public.

Jim Metzger, 427 Warburton Avenue: I live in the other house that's set back from the street on Warburton; one house, to the south of this. From the initial viewing I'm very much in favor of the project. I love the fact that they're keeping it a two-family house, even though it may not comply with current code. I think we can use the additional housing in Hastings in an area that still is somewhat affordable. I'm not using that with the quotation marks.

I'm on the horns of a dilemma with the parking. I love the fact that somebody's coming before you trying to solve the parking issues before they get raised by the neighborhoods. I think that's great. I'm questioning the idea of having two cars parked right on the sidewalk on Warburton. The flip side of that is, if you go down -- oh, I don't know -- 100 feet down the sidewalk towards John's Bar there's a big paved parking area. There are always cars parked in there. The gentleman that lives just south of that has a very narrow, somewhat

wide lot with a garage, believe it or not. He tends to park his car behind the gate. The reality is it's not very offensive. He keeps his property beautifully maintained. He very often has his car covered with a canvas car cover. So it can be okay as long as it's not a place where you end up with some junk automobiles. I really think that the applicants are sort of bending over backwards to try and solve all of these problems. The idea of doing that as a grass area as opposed to a paved area I'm very much in favor of.

The issue that I have in terms of parking on Warburton is, there are a few other curb cuts on the street in properties just to either side of this property. I would want to make sure that the curb cut that's put in here, if it does happen, does not end up taking a half a spot out of somebody else's area so that we would end up losing a spot that we think might be a spot. So I'd want to make sure that we take a look at that. I also have a huge concern of people backing out of that spot onto Warburton. The traffic has been getting progressively worse instead of better, especially at night. Cars coming down that street 40, 45, 50 miles an hour. There was a good accident there just a week-and-a-half ago, somebody coming up who was late for work at John's Bar. They slammed into the back of another car because they weren't going fast enough. So we want to make sure we look at safety issues. As Peter said, there's going to be a lot more people living across the street. The traffic density's going to get a lot higher. I'm not sure how we balance that, but I think this is a good start. Thank you.

Chairperson Speranza: Just to clarify, parking is allowed in the front yards and rear yards?

Village Attorney Stecich: Yes.

Chairperson Speranza: So there's not an issue in terms of setback. See, I have the same problem with parking.

Village Attorney Stecich: What it says, the code reads, except for driveways constructed in accordance with the various provisions of the code there shall be no paving in the required yard. That's probably the section you're thinking about. But no, that's a driveway, I guess.

Chairperson Speranza: This is a driveway?

Village Attorney Stecich: That's the way the Building Inspector has seen this, as a driveway.

Chairperson Speranza: I'll have to look at this. How long is the curb cut? What's the thought in terms of being able to pull in?

Village Attorney Stecich: Think about it, Patty, if, instead of there being a space between the house, if that were right next to the house. Sometimes you do have a driveway that's right in front of the house that holds two cars. The limit on the width of a driveway is 24 feet, and I think that's under 24 feet.

Mr. Wolf: My thought actually was that people were going to back in so that they would be facing outward. To me, that would be the logical way to do it. I would not want to be backing out onto Warburton. So I would think that somebody would be backing in.

Boardmember Dale: Still just as risky when you stop. You're out in the middle of traffic.

Boardmember Logan: You do that when you parallel park anyway.

Boardmember Dale: Yes, exactly.

Chairperson Speranza: Okay, anyone else from the public want to come and speak about the proposal?

So there are some things that I'm hearing need to be looked into. Angie, if you could find out about that situation with Capuano's property with respect to the turnaround. For site plan, Christina, if you could prepare something that gives more detail. You're standing at Ridge Street. What is this going to look like with a retaining wall and then the slope, and then how high it would be. That would be very helpful to me. Because Ridge Street, we took great pains to try to make sure that... the big thing that was heard from the Ridge Street residents was don't keep doing this to us. And I want to make sure that we're not going to, in terms of additional traffic. Granted, it's only conceivably two more cars maybe, but still we were very, very careful when we were designing some of the other housing that was built down there recently to make sure that we could be as sensitive as we could to the character of Ridge Street. Just the thought of the retaining wall and pavement there as opposed to a nicely terraced, sloping yard coming down, that's a change in my mind.

Ms. Griffin: We will bring more information next time so we can show you a design for that. I would probably lean toward very soft materials terracing the walls and as much greenspace as possible.

Chairperson Speranza: Also runoff, if there's going to be any change. Because that was something else that was done as a result of the work of Ridge Street. The sewers or the catchbasins were redone as part of a community development grant.

Ms. Griffin: We have to keep all the run-off on-site in the gravel area and in the greenspace. That's all part of the requirements.

Chairperson Speranza: So that's something that would be good for us to see.

Ms. Griffin: We will have details for the next meeting.

Chairperson Speranza: And the certification is what we usually get. You may as well do this as a steep slopes.

Ms. Griffin: The same requirements that you always need...

Chairperson Speranza: Yes, the engineering, the engineering firm.

Ms. Griffin: [All of the] calculations...

Chairperson Speranza: But not the volumes.

Boardmember Cameron: Given the slope going down to the house, what I'll call the third floor -- whatever you want to call it -- is now visible as you go down. How do you measure the height of this building, the legitimate height it can have? And now you're on the back side. We now actually have got four-and-a-half stories, wherever you want to measure it on the back side. We have three-and-a-bit. Well, we have some on the front. I just don't know how you measure the height limitation. It's significant right now. We're all standing on the sidewalk looking at it, and maybe that's how we should be looking at it. But it actually slopes down to where you have the top floor of unit one sticking out of the ground only by a bit of a floor. I just don't know how you measure the height. Where you measure from, and whether we fit within the limitations.

Ms. Griffin: [Apparently, it] doesn't, and the 35 feet is from the average [at-grade] elevation. .. So it's taken from the average grade at the building, not taken from the lowest point.

Boardmember Cameron: So you walked around the building and averaged the

Village Attorney Stecich: So at this point, closest to Jamie, that pink line. Oh, that's the existing building. How high is it there?

Ms. Griffin: Here ... the existing?

Village Attorney Stecich: No, what you're proposing. How tall is the building going to be?

Ms. Griffin: At this point?

Village Attorney Stecich: That seems to be the highest point. Whatever's the highest point.

Boardmember Logan: The same as existing, or a little less.

Ms. Griffin: You see this line is 35 feet?

Boardmember Logan: It's below 35 feet.

Village Attorney Stecich: It is? Okay, I'm sorry. I can't see.

Ms. Griffin: Here, probably our building is -- I don't have exact measurements -- about 28.

Village Attorney Stecich: Oh, okay.

Ms. Griffin: Any point at the grade along the building, the height will be less than 35 feet.

Chairperson Speranza: So this is one of those circumstances, where we've had discussions about steep slopes and about wanting to create a way that people can use the slope to their advantage in terms of being able to construct something. This could be very good example of why we continue to go through all of these things.

Boardmember Dale: Right. Well, it shows that terracing actually takes away the problem as long as the water is properly handled. The engineering works. The building sits nicely on the site, even though the site is that steep.

Ms. Griffin: Actually, if you go down Ridge Street and you go past the existing parking there are all of these wonderful terraces. And even the existing lot now has three terraces. I wouldn't be surprised if a few of the other houses have this kind of greenspace or terrace so that they can have some usable space.

Chairperson Speranza: And legally I think there's going to have to be discussion about how the extension of the paved portion of Ridge Street gets worked out. That's something else that's up to you attorneys to figure out in terms of the Village accepting...

Village Attorney Stecich: Yes, what's the plan on that?

Ms. Griffin: Honestly, I think it would be very nice to have something other than asphalt, but I don't know.

Village Attorney Stecich: ...in terms of what you think, because the Village owns the street.

Ms. Griffin: I know we'll have to...we're just starting here, discussing with the Village.

Village Attorney Stecich: You know, that would be up to the Board of Trustees to say yes, you can work on it because they would be the owners of it, the stewards of it.

Mr. Wolf: I'm sorry. Could you repeat that, please? Because to us, that was one of the biggest questions, or the biggest question, about the paper street. What is the procedure?

Village Attorney Stecich: Well, we'll have to figure out what the procedure is now. You can talk to me separately about it but, certainly, I'm not sure exactly step-by-step. But you're going to have to get the Village's permission -- not the Planning Board's permission, the Village Board's permission.

Chairperson Speranza: The last time we did this, because it's a paper street, it's Village-owned land.

Mr. Wolf: Correct. That's our understanding.

Chairperson Speranza: I believe it was up on Pearl Street there had to be the extension.

Village Attorney Stecich: Civitano.

Chairperson Speranza: Right. It was an extension of the paved area and the Village right-of-way. So there was a transfer, or there's some sort of Village Board action, to allow that improvement and an improvement which was different than what's set forth in the Village code in terms of the width of the street. Now, this is a minor extension, as was that, and it just took it to the end of that property line.

Village Attorney Stecich: I believe there was a transfer of property. It still stays Village property.

Chairperson Speranza: It still remains Village property.

Boardmember Cameron: And they're going beyond their property line to create a turnaround. They're suggesting going beyond the edge of their property line, looking at the drawing.

Ms. Griffin: Yes that was because of the turnaround and to find out how we make it work.

Mr. Wolf: We were going to sacrifice 9 feet in order to get a 25-foot turnaround, if that's what the Village deemed appropriate. Otherwise, if you just look at it as two cars, then you don't have to do that if it's of benefit to the community to have a 25-foot turnaround. This was calculated based on what retaining walls are there now along the road. It would have to come onto our property, 9 feet into the property, in order to give a 25-foot turnaround. I think that's considerably bigger than what exists now.

Chairperson Speranza: Right. And that wasn't the intent. As a matter of fact, when we did the work originally nobody wanted to do anything. That was that big, which is why this agreement was worked out for the T-shape or hammerhead.

Mr. Wolf: It was just that we were just trying to come up with a creative solution that would benefit the Warburton Avenue problem, which we found out empirically can be really nettlesome.

Ms. Griffin: Thank you for your input. We'll take your comments into account and come back with some more information.

Chairperson Speranza: Okay, great. Thank you.

2. **Saw Mill River Road (Route 9A) at Holly Place. Petition to Rezone 8 properties from 2-R (2 Family Residence) to MR-C (Multiple Residence – Commercial) and text amendment to allow Self-Storage with State Road Access and other conditions in the MR-C zone. Prepare recommendation to Board of Trustees**

Chairperson Speranza: The next item on our agenda is review of a proposed rezoning for property located at Route 9-A and Holly Place within the Village. What I'd like to do with this -- come on up Mr. Tarricone -- is ask Marianne Stecich to just explain how this proposal came to the Board. Because it's something that is a little bit out of the ordinary for us.

Village Attorney Stecich: The proposal is a zoning amendment, and a zoning amendment is made by the Board of Trustees. Originally the applicant came before the Board of Trustees asking that a bigger portion of the property be rezoned. The Board of Trustees was not disposed to making that its own amendment. There are a couple of ways you can get an

amendment to the zoning code. One is if the Planning Board recommends one, or if all of the property owners in a particular area ask that their property be rezoned. So the applicant went back and narrowed the scope of the amendment. They put in an application to rezone that was an application of everybody who lived in the district to be rezoned. Then that came to the Board of Trustees, and the Board of Trustees then has to consider it. The first step is to refer it to both the Planning Board and the Zoning Board for their recommendations. That is why it's before you.

Chairperson Speranza: And this is actually a two-part zoning amendment. Because one is actually a change to the MR-C zoning district, or the permitted uses within it, as well as the mapping of it in a different location than it appears now.

Village Attorney Stecich: Yes.

Anthony Tarricone, applicant: Thank you for reviewing the proposal. I'd like to thank my neighbors, who have taken time and effort to review the proposal and come to this meeting.

Marianne explained it pretty clearly. The area outlined in red represents the amended area requested for the zone change. Please note that two property owners that requested the zone change have been excluded from this proposal. Based on the feedback from the neighborhood, we adjusted the proposal to rezone a very small area along Saw Mill River Road and limit the depth of the self-storage building to 150 feet deep from Saw Mill River Road. The original request was to rezone approximately 4 acres, or the entire area. The current request is to rezone 1.6 acres located on Saw Mill River Road, or abutting the current self-storage facility. Furthermore, we have restricted the depth of the proposed self-storage building to 150 feet from 9-A/Saw Mill River Road, with access gained only from 9-A/ Saw Mill River Road. We believe these changes address the majority of the concerns of the residents in the area and relate to the mixed use development and the concern that the new building would run the distance of Holly Place.

There are a few new faces here tonight, and for their benefit I would like to quickly go over the background of the request. You have already received some books so you see where we're going with this. This is a zoning map for the Village of Hastings. The Hudson River's here, the downtown Main Street/Warburton area is located here. The only other MR-C zone is located here. The high school is here. Saw Mill River Parkway is over here. Ravensdale, which turns into Jackson Avenue, comes here. And the subject area is located here in the most southeasterly portion of the Village. This is where Hastings meets Yonkers to the south and the Town of Greenburgh to the east.

The next board shows Saw Mill River Road, how it looks today in the area in question. These pictures can be found in section 2 of the book submitted earlier. The top half of the board represents Hastings. This is zoned 2-R, two-family, on 10,000 square foot lots, or a single-family home on a 7,500 square foot lot. Directly across the street, the bottom half of

the board -- this represents 9-A/Saw Mill River Road -- represents the Town of Greenburgh, which is zoned light industrial. This is directly across the street, and allows such uses as light manufacturing and processing, motor vehicle sales and repairs, experimental laboratories, electrical substations, printing plants, and dry cleaning plants, to name a few. That's directly across the street.

The next board shows the southern border of Hastings where it abuts Yonkers. The red line running down the middle of the board represents the border of Yonkers and Hastings. As previously mentioned, Hastings is zoned 2-R, with a minimum lot size of 7,500 for single-family homes and 10,000 square feet for two-family homes; that's this area here. There are only three properties which comply with the existing zoning, and they're shaded in yellow. This is Saw Mill River Road. Traveling south along Saw Mill River Road is Yonkers. The zone is CM, commercial. This is an intensive use, including industrial parks, check-cashing stores, and automotive storage and repair, to name a few. The complete list can be found in section 5 of the books previously submitted.

The point is, the surrounding communities -- Yonkers and Greenburgh, which Hastings has no control over -- allows industrial or commercial uses and receives a tax benefit as a result. Hastings has the effect of the uses on the property and none of the benefits. This proposal would allow a mixed use, or transition zone, along 9-A/Saw Mill River Road, while keeping the 2-R district, or residential district, intact behind it. This is a typical solution to neighborhoods adjacent to commercial thoroughfares. Economically, this would be a windfall to the Village. We are fortunate enough to have an existing facility, and therefore a real-life example, as to what would happen if the proposal was approved. Hastings Self-Storage was built in 2000 on a similar-sized piece of property. The tax base went from approximately \$20,000 a year in taxes to \$150,000 a year in taxes. After review of the Hastings budget, every \$50,000 of additional tax revenue reduces the overall Village tax by 1%. The proposed self-storage facility could conceivably reduce the overall Village tax by 3%. Last year alone, Hastings taxes increased by 6%.

I don't think I have to tell you that we have the highest school taxes in Westchester County. Typically, to gain this type of tax revenue a municipality would have to make concessions, or at a minimum provide additional services such as schools, water, sewer, and police. This facility actually uses less services, while generating greater tax revenue for the Village. The Village is concerned over additional development in the area as a result of the zone change other than the proposed self-storage facility, so we took a look at that.

For the most part, the area's fully developed. Existing homes on Holly Place are already two-family houses on 5,000 square foot lots, again nonconforming. With the new MR-C designation, these homes would become conforming. Due to the placement of homes on the existing lots, coupled with the setback requirements, expansion would be difficult without a variance and a tear-down or replacement of the structures, and therefore unlikely. The

property located on the corner of Saw Mill River Road and Holly Place could possibly accommodate an additional three-family house, provided the property was subdivided and subject to further review of the setback requirements. The homes on Edison would face the same challenges as the homes on Holly Place as they relate to additional development.

In conclusion, we believe the zoning request is in keeping with the surrounding area. We believe the zone request will give the Village a win-win scenario, with an increase in tax revenue and a decrease in services. Fifty percent of the neighborhood signed the petition twice supporting this change. We believe there is strong community support for this project.

Thank you for considering this application. Are there any questions?

Chairperson Speranza: Okay, before we take any comments or questions from Boardmembers or anything, I think...

Boardmember Alligood: I am going to recuse myself from voting on this matter or discussing it with my fellow Planning Board members. My husband is the Tarricone's architect on a different project, therefore, I think it represents a conflict of interest.

Chairperson Speranza: Okay, thank you. Comments on the proposal or questions? Before that, let me remind people what our task is for this. We are to be making a recommendation to the Board of Trustees. They have set the public hearing date for sometime in January.

Village Planner Witkowski: January 9th.

Chairperson Speranza: And it is requested, or required even I think, that we have our recommendation to them before they make any kind of decision. So they probably won't make a decision in January.

Village Attorney Stecich: No, they also have to do SEQRA. They declared themselves the lead agency under SEQRA. So they have some work to do, but they put that public hearing off until January 9th in order to give time to receive the Planning Board and Zoning Board's recommendations.

Chairperson Speranza: Okay, great. Thank you ... Bruce?.

Boardmember Dale: On the diagram in front of you now, can you show me the existing profile of the existing storage area.

Mr. Tarricone: This is it. It's in green, I don't know if you can see it. This piece of property is the self-storage that's preexisting, this is the Nextel dealer, and this is a junk yard.

Boardmember Dale: And how deep is the existing facility?

Mr. Tarricone: The building itself is 200 feet deep, and I believe it starts about 30 feet back. So the building ends here. The proposed new one would end no further than here.

Boardmember Dale: So my question, in effect, was, I understand your concept of wanting to create a barrier. This is a pocket of residential neighborhood that has to cope with the Saw Mill River Road and all of the traffic as well as the other activities that take place there. I can understand the concept of wanting to complete a barrier that protects the residential area. I was concerned in your choice of zoning, moving the Holly Place lot on the right-hand side of the road all the way back as far as you did rather than stopping it at, say, Edison?

Mr. Tarricone: I'm not sure I understand your question.

Chairperson Speranza: Why are there additional lots included along Holly beyond where you think...

Mr. Tarricone: These are the residents that have asked for this change to take place for their properties, as well.

Chairperson Speranza: Mr. Tarricone doesn't own all of it.

Boardmember Dale: I understand. What benefit do they gain from the zoning change?

Mr. Tarricone: I think the primary benefit is that they're currently preexisting nonconforming. The zone change would not only allow them to be conforming, but allow them to -- if they have, for example, a two-family house -- be able to use it as a two-family house. I think that's the primary reason. It makes the house conforming.

Boardmember Dale: Would it allow them to sell their house and have it used for some other purpose under the zoning? They could use it for anything that qualifies under the zone?

Mr. Tarricone: Yes, but for a practical matter, if you read the zone -- which I've studied pretty carefully -- the other uses in this area, first of all they'd have to come back to you for approval. But there are more uses, like a bookstore, an artists loft, things like that. I think the best use is as a home-based business, and I believe some of the other residents wanted to do that. If they wanted to have a home-based business out of their house they can do that. It's primarily a residential zone; it is not a commercial zone.

Boardmember Dale: Right. Which I why I was concerned with your expanding the commercial possibility deeper into the residential rather than having it function as a barrier.

Mr. Tarricone: Well, that's why we limit it to 150 feet on the commercial. We've said in the proposal to you -- because that was our neighbors' concern, we heard them loud and clear -- that we've worked closely...we've tried to answer their questions. And I never even thought of, quite frankly, expanding the self-storage way down Holly Place. Economically it couldn't be supported. So their concern was, "Hey, what's to stop you from building this building all the way down Holly Place?" I guess if this were zoned that, nothing. However, now we've put into place in the application the fact that the building cannot go any deeper

than 150 feet, which is this first lot which is where I live now, and you have to have access to 9-A. So two things. That also prevents somebody else from doing something down here.

Boardmember Dale: See, that's the part I was concerned about. That would be defeating the purpose of preserving the residential area.

Mr. Tarricone: No, it does that.

Chairperson Speranza: Someone else can establish a business further beyond the end of the self-storage, or the proposed self-storage, because it's MR-C. So it doesn't keep it...

Boardmember Dale: They can do anything that an MR-C can.

Village Attorney Stecich: Maybe we should read the list in the MR-C, because it is more than just bookstores.

Mr. Tarricone: Well, we've submitted that to you.

Chairperson Speranza: We have it, right? In terms of our deliberations we have to...because it does include business and professional offices.

Village Attorney Stecich: Right, but you said the retail sale of antiques and books; restaurants, with a proposed floor area of 2,500 square feet or less; artists studios; health, fitness, or athletic clubs; business and professional offices; and mixed use buildings.

Chairperson Speranza: Now, some of the properties, I could see they're going to be small for any kind of an establishment like that, particularly if you've got to provide off-street parking.

Mr. Tarricone: All of these properties are 5,000 square foot over here. This one is 7,500 square foot, but the building is already taking up most of the lot.

Chairperson Speranza: That exists now.

Mr. Tarricone: That exists now.

Chairperson Speranza: Let me ask you, the current self-storage facility was established in 2000. How was it constructed there? It's not a permitted use in the 2-R zone, but it's new. So it wasn't grandfathered in.

Mr. Tarricone: We got variances. Marianne can better explain it than myself.

Village Attorney Stecich: Yes, Patty asked me before. I vaguely remember. You got a use variance for that, right?

Mr. Tarricone: Yes.

Village Attorney Stecich: But somebody suggested to me that there was litigation. I said I don't remember any litigation over there. Was there?

Mr. Tarricone: Well, I don't know that there was litigation. What happened was, this was a prior commercial use and the neighborhood did not like...you know, it was forever there, for 50 years. And to better accommodate...you know, the neighborhood wanted different change. Because we had trucks back here, and there were diesel, and this was a concession.

Chairperson Speranza: It was the fuel company.

Mr. Tarricone: And then we had a repair shop back there.

Village Attorney Stecich: My point is that you got the change in the use variance. It was directly from the Zoning Board. I don't recall that being the product of any litigation.

Mr. Tarricone: No, it was not the product of any litigation.

Chairperson Speranza: Okay. That's something I just want to take a look to see if there are any conditions on there in terms of size. If you could take a look at that.

Village Attorney Stecich: I will. I'll find the file.

Chairperson Speranza: And where would you park? Where would there be more parking? Because, of course, any kind of new use that would be established would have to comply with off-street parking requirements for that use.

Mr. Tarricone: Well, the beautiful thing about the self-storage business is it does not have a large parking requirement. Existing now, today, we have seven spots, and for the most part we don't have any issues with parking whatsoever. The new facility -- and we haven't really proposed anything because we don't know that we're going to get the zone, but we're hopeful -- is talking more about an L-shaped type of building so everything would be shielded from the neighborhood. All the parking would be in here. We have an existing lot here. It's not drawn here -- this was actually the preexisting building -- but there's an existing parking lot here, and we're talking about having that parking lot extended here and having the access and entrance still from the prior entrance. So not off of Holly Place, that's what we're talking about. But it doesn't demand a lot of parking. The traffic is enormously low. It would actually be less than having residential housing there.

Boardmember Cameron: I noticed in the zoning you wanted for the storage, you also wanted to have a residential unit for the manager. Could you go into that a little bit?

Mr. Tarricone: This is my home now that I live in, and there's actually a paper house over here, if you look at your book, that doesn't exist. We also own this house here, which is a two-family house. What we thought we would do -- one of the things that you do typically with the self-storage, but we've never done with this -- is allow the manager to live usually on premises so that it's a little more secure. It's a perk for them, and that's kind of what we do. It's almost like a catch-all that we put that in there, but this is a preexisting two-family house that would be their residence.

Boardmember Cameron: It's not going to be in the storage facility.

Mr. Tarricone: No, this would remain in place, not taken down.

Boardmember Wertz: I think that kind of development would increase the commercial presence in the area, and I guess that's the one thing that concerns me. It is a residential area. I know there are, especially across the street, commercial activities. It's mixed, but I guess that's my main reservation about it.

Mr. Tarricone: Well, no matter how you slice it, it's commercial. This is zoned light industrial across the street, and if you've been up and down the road, it is. There's a garbage transfer station right here.

Boardmember Wertz: Right. I'm thinking about the west side.

Mr. Tarricone: West side, yes.

Chairperson Speranza: On the other side of the view. Take that front board down. Yonkers is showing a two-family zone right adjacent to it.

Mr. Tarricone: Yes, but this is Saw Mill River Road. This is Yonkers.

Chairperson Speranza: And even that's all residential.

Mr. Tarricone: This is zoned two-family residential. The zone we're talking about is on Saw Mill River Road. It's in this piece here. Like I say, this would basically allow...it's mostly for a residential application. I mean, you wouldn't take a property down here and turn it into a commercial piece of property, per se.

Chairperson Speranza: Well, that's what you're doing.

Mr. Tarricone: Well, I'm also having access off of 9A...

Chairperson Speranza: Oh, you're talking about off of 9-A...okay. You're talking about coming off of Holly.

Boardmember Wertz: I was talking about 9-A itself.

Mr. Tarricone: Well, this already is commercial on this side of the road.

Boardmember Logan: I think it's very appealing having additional tax revenues. I think we need that whenever we can get it. My question is similar to Bruce's. If you could put the other board back up -- you have no intention of expanding back more than 150 feet -- why that little leftover square there where your house is, why is that included.

Mr. Tarricone: Well, this is my house. This is another neighbor that asked to have their zone changed. These are non-related parties.

Boardmember Logan: Right. I'm just talking about that little section.

Mr. Tarricone: This here?

Boardmember Logan: No, right there.

Boardmember Dale: The four lots.

Mr. Tarricone: Here?

Boardmember Logan: No, right there. Why, if you have no intention of going back any further, is that included. You say you have no intention of moving or taking that house down. I guess it enhances the value of those three properties if they could eventually become professional offices or health or athletic clubs. I think if there is a concern amongst that residential area -- that that would increase the commercial presence down Holly and somehow change the character of that neighborhood, and if you had no intention of doing that -- then why include it in the zone you were interested in changing?

Mr. Tarricone: Well, I can tell you my house that I own right here is sitting on a 5,000 square foot piece of property. It's a legal, nonconforming two-family house.

Boardmember Logan: But it'll continue to be legally nonconforming.

Mr. Tarricone: Well, if you want to expand the use, or if you want to do anything to it, you need a variance. I mean, it becomes problematic, more expensive, to do anything to fix it up.

Boardmember Logan: So the argument is that it provides the people on those four lots with an ability to enhance their properties.

Mr. Tarricone: Absolutely.

Boardmember Dale: It increases their value because they have flexibility.

Boardmember Logan: Increase the value.

Mr. Tarricone: And also encourage investment in the property. I mean, you have pictures of these properties. They haven't been reinvested in in years... I find myself coming here for a variance. It costs a lot of money, and you don't know that you're going to get it. So you just kind of throw your hands up in the air and say why bother. If it was as-of-right and you wanted to fix it up, you go and get a building permit and there you go.

Boardmember Cameron: I know they're now colored yellow, the ones on the west side of Edison, and they're not part of your petition, even though they were in favor of this. Why is it their back yards aren't in blue or yellow when you were coloring? Is that just a mistake?

Mr. Tarricone: These are different lots. This is a different lot than this.

Boardmember Cameron: No. Behind each one of those lots is their back yard, I believe.

Mr. Tarricone: Where, here?

Boardmember Cameron: Yes.

Mr. Tarricone: No, that's another house. These are all undersized lots.

Boardmember Cameron: But how do they get access when there's no road?

Mr. Tarricone: They access here. This piece of property's 40 feet wide by...

Boardmember Cameron: There's another road in there?

Mr. Tarricone: Yes, this is Holly Place.

Boardmember Cameron: Right.

Mr. Tarricone: So they access here.

Boardmember Cameron: That's a road you just put your finger on.

Mr. Tarricone: No, that's their house.

Boardmember Cameron: Okay, but now the next one over. How do they get to that one?

Mr. Tarricone: In here?

Chairperson Speranza: No, closer to 9-A.

Boardmember Dale: It's all one property.

Mr. Tarricone: This is all one property.

Boardmember Cameron: Yes, that's what I was asking.

Mr. Tarricone: Oh, I'm sorry. Yes, this is all one piece.

Boardmember Cameron: They should have all been colored the same color.

Mr. Tarricone: No, they didn't sign [the petition] These people wanted to have their property change. They didn't.

Chairperson Speranza: Jamie, the lots go north-south.

Boardmember Cameron: Oh, I see.

Chairperson Speranza: So the yellow is just one.

Boardmember Cameron: One lot. Oh, I see.

Mr. Tarricone: This is one person's property. This is another person's property, this is another guy's, and this is a small piece.

Boardmember Cameron: They switch directions at that point, all right.

Mr. Tarricone: They do.

Boardmember Dale: The two lots that are left out, where you have that sort of step.

Mr. Tarricone: Here?

Boardmember Dale: That's the house that's vacant and for rent right now?

Mr. Tarricone: This is the junk yard, and this is the house next to it. I don't know if I'm defining it properly. Again, you have pictures, I believe. It's blue, if that helps you.

Boardmember Dale: When I went to look at the area...was there a for-rent sign in front?

Mr. Tarricone: Yes.

Boardmember Dale: The other houses that are included in your area are all occupied?

Mr. Tarricone: Yes.

Boardmember Dale: Except for the one that you own and that you rent.

Mr. Tarricone: They're all occupied.

Chairperson Speranza: Okay. We want to hear from anyone who's got any comments from out in the public about the proposal.

Linda Merchant, 35 Marion Avenue: I'm on the other side, the two yellow ones over there, on Marion Avenue. First, I'd like to thank Mr. Tarricone because he really has bent over backwards trying to make sure that we all in the neighborhood got the information we asked for. I think my husband and I are one of the few people in the neighborhood who actually went to his house to talk with him about some of the things in here for questions. I congratulated him for doing the 150 feet off Saw Mill River Road because it did solve a few of my problems. But I think there are ambiguities in some of the information that you have in front of you.

One thing that we don't know, if this change is made, is the property.... It's like 719 over there on the left which, I believe, is the Shea property. That's the other piece that has a Saw Mill River Road address. So they could conceivably come back and do another self-storage or something there. I don't know that they have any plans to do that. But what this thing opens up is, there are other opportunities for people in our neighborhood to change what our neighborhood looks like. In the lawyer's letter, he says 50% of the people express support for his proposal. But I know some of the people who signed the initial petition didn't support it after that initial signing. So I think there needs to be some clarification there.

And he said at one point that there's been no opposition from the neighborhood. I didn't think it was the time yet to oppose anything. So we've gone to the Board of Trustees meetings, we've come here as a neighborhood group. You know, I think the public hearing

is the place to oppose it. So I think that was a little troublesome for me. I mean, I'll put myself on record right now to say I'd rather see a residential house on that lot than a storage unit but, you know, that's all I can say right now. I think we have 13, maybe 14 people in the neighborhood who are skeptical about this process.

But I want to make sure I understand., as a neophyte to this government business that I'm going through now. We went to the Board of Trustees meeting twice for the petitions. We're here now to listen to this. You make your recommendation, then we have to go to the Zoning Board as well because they'll look at this and make their recommendation to the Board of Trustees, and then the public hearing, and then we're back again to discuss the storage units. They're not linked, so that if the Board of Trustees decides that this MR-C zone goes through that it also includes an implied approval of the storage facility itself.

Chairperson Speranza: Only if the decision is to amend the zone to allow self-storage facilities as a use within the zone. That's the first one. Then the zone gets mapped in this location. Then there's an application for site plan approval which comes back to this board.

Ms. Merchant: And then we'll do this again. I mean the zoning or variances.

Chairperson Speranza: Specifically looking at the details of a proposed building, and access and parking and all the other things that go into the specific construction on a piece of property. So you're right.

Ms. Merchant: Still a while to go.

Chairperson Speranza: There's still process.

Ms. Merchant: Right. One of the other things I'd like to say about changing a zoning like this is that, if it does change, I think we're opening up our little neighborhood to attending a lot of these meetings. Because I just think we'll be here a lot, which isn't a bad thing. I'm learning a lot about local government. I don't know, but that's my comment. Thank you.

Chairperson Speranza: Thank you.

Rick Shea, Hastings resident: I owned 1327 Saw Mill and I own 42 Edison. I think it's a good idea. I don't plan to build anything but a house, if I can, if the zone goes through. I have a son and a nephew. They're going to need living spaces. I'd like to put another home there. I have a legal easement that comes in off Edison Avenue for parking for 1327. The lot is big, but not big enough. But I'd like to put another home there. I've been here 52 years in Hastings. It was my grandmother's house, my parents', and mine. I built a modular in the back yard, we subdivided. I think the plan is good. If I can build another house it brings in more tax money, my children can live there. I plan to stay here another 52 years. But I think it's a good plan. I've lived with a junk yard for 52 years in my neighborhood. It can only help the neighborhood.

Boardmember Dale: Can you show us which lot is yours?

Chairperson Speranza: 1719, right?

Mr. Shea: Right. I'm on the corner of Edison and Holly.

Boardmember Dale: Number 15 on this map?

Mr. Shay: There's around 9,000-9,400 square feet left after I built my house. With a plan like this I have a better chance of building another home for my son. He plans to stay in Hastings, maybe teach. He's interning with the police. He can't buy a home anywhere else, my nephew can't buy. I can give them a good start. My parents live in back, my two sisters live in 1327, I live at 42 Edison. I only want to improve the neighborhood. I can't see any businesses coming in. The houses are small. If a business did come in somebody's basement apartment -- chiropractor's office or something like that -- but nothing that would change the neighborhood. That's all I've got to say. But I think it would be a good plan.

Chairperson Speranza: Okay, thank you.

Ioannis Stylianou, 48 Marion Avenue: My question is -- again, I'm new to government -- isn't this considered spot zoning? That we're changing, we're picking up spots, on the zoning and we're changing it just to suit one or two people? That's my number one question.

Number two question, as far as improving the neighborhood, I know that if we have another storage unit in the neighborhood -- and I live on Marion Avenue -- I know that would bring the value of my house down. Because I did spend a lot of money on my house, I improved my house, I expect to sell it in the future and move to the better side of Hastings. But if we do something like this, that would definitely not improve the value of my house and the value of the houses of all the people who are here. There's at least seven families here.

So my main concern is yes, we're going to have the bigger tax revenue, but what do we do to the families and to the residential people who live there. I'm quoting you, when you said before don't keep doing this to us. You said that before and I'm quoting you. Thank you.

Chairperson Speranza: I did say that. Can you show...on Marion Avenue which is yours?

Mr. Stylianou: I live right here.

Chairperson Speranza: Okay, thank you. Anyone else wish to speak about this?

Gjoka Perpepaj, 41 Marion Avenue: I, at one time, said yes to this proposal. Mr. Tarricone came over, he explained a lot of things to me. Initially he led me to believe that he was going to build another two-family home on the property that he has, and I said all for it, go for it, it's a beautiful deal. After learning what he is intending to do, I'm not for it or against it right now. I'm more so leaning against it. That's why I'm standing up here. It will bring down the value of our property. Yes, Hastings will gain more revenue from it, but I do take offense in trying to say that he's looking out for the better of me. I look out for the better of me, not him. He's looking out for him. And I invite you, please come down, take a look. We have done a lot of work. That's it.

Chairperson Speranza: Okay, thank you.

Carolyn Caruso, 45 Marion Avenue: Again, I just join all my neighbors in the concern that we have in depreciating the value of our properties. We're all pretty much a young group of people that have moved into the neighborhood. We've recently revitalized a lot of the houses on Marion Avenue and, you know, we work hard. I'm a second generation Hastings person; my husband's a third generation Hastings person. We have families and we want to stay in this area. It's very difficult.

This was one of the pictures that we were given. I don't know if you have it in your booklet, but this is what we would see on Holly Place. I think the distinction needs to be made that Saw Mill River Road is commercial. But we're set back, we're buffered, we're away from that, and I don't want to bring that into my neighborhood. Thank you very much.

Chairperson Speranza: Thank you.

Linda Wray, 37 Edison Avenue: I live in a house that my family has owned for close to 60 years. Grew up there, lived there, have just totally redone the house to bring it up to all of the codes and everything else. And I'm very upset now that I'm going to walk out my front door and look at a storage building. Because I'm on Edison, and I face it.

Chairperson Speranza: Okay, thank you. Anything else from the public? So Boardmembers, in terms of being able to make a recommendation to the Board of Trustees, there's a little bit more research, a little more information that I would like to get. You know we're looking at doing a rezoning, and we're rezoning it to a zoning district. The proposal is to rezone it to a zoning district which was created for a different area of the Village. One of the things that I was looking for, and I'm going to ask Angie if you could dig it up, or Marianne, is the local law that established the MR-C district. Because the intent and the mapping of that district, where it is, I think there were specific things that were in mind with respect to the geography that it was mapped at. I want to take a look at what the legislative history was for that to see if it's applicable here. Also, the information on the use variance. There's a use variance there now. I would like to see what that is. And quite frankly, ...we know the complications of a rezoning with respect to what actually is allowed - - MR-C and the whole cascading effect that our zoning code has -- and the fact that this is a 2-R zone now, and MR-C is proposed, I don't know that there is necessarily a lot of relief that is given to single- or two-family property owners by going to the MR-C. I want to look at that a little more. Certainly, there are additional uses which are permitted under MR-C. But in terms of resolving some of the nonconformities with respect to the area of these lots, I don't know that there's a lot to be gained. So I want to take a look at a lot of that.

Village Attorney Stecich: I'll try to make some kind of a chart that would show that.

Chairperson Speranza: Okay, that would be helpful to me.

Village Attorney Stecich: I'm not very good graphically. Last time I made a chart you made fun of it because I used lines instead of the computer, but I'll do my best.

Chairperson Speranza: Okay, that would be helpful. Now, that's my view. You know, there may be other things that you as Boardmembers need to have additional information at this point prior to making a recommendation? And making a recommendation as a board, we're not going through any kind of SEQRA process. They just take our input, right?

Boardmember Dale: Has the Zoning Board had this proposal yet? No? Just us, and the Trustees.

Village Attorney Stecich: That'll be at their next meeting. The agenda, I'll see if it's on.

Chairperson Speranza: Jamie, anything, or Fred? Anything you feel?

Boardmember Cameron: Not right now, no.

Boardmember Logan: I need to go to the site. I haven't been there. I want to take a look at it.

Chairperson Speranza: So the idea is that we will take this, we will get the additional information prior to the next meeting of this board, and at that time it would be good if we could make our recommendation. So we should absolutely go take a look at the area, take a look at the history, as well as what the implications are of the zoning. Okay, thank you.

IV. Old Business

None

V. Discussion Items

1. Planning Board Members' Items

Chairperson Speranza: As I mentioned at the beginning of the meeting, there are some things that I want to make sure...when I read the minutes my memory got jogged about certain things. And I know, Angie, you had even put forth some dates for a joint meeting between the Planning Board and the Board of Trustees. I'm wondering if there are any dates. We're coming into a very difficult season.

Village Planner Witkowski: Right. And we were thinking the last Monday in November, but I wanted to get any other comments if anybody has any more comments that they want me to pass on to the consultants on the transportation plan.

Chairperson Speranza: Okay, take a step back. So we would be having a joint meeting with the Board of Trustees only on the transportation plan?

Village Planner Witkowski: Wasn't it decided we wanted to have it at separate meetings because there also was steep slopes? And I think that the Mayor said that he would prefer having those separate. Because the thing is, at the transportation

meeting, that would also be an opportunity for the public to comment, too. It'll be more like a workshop meeting.

Chairperson Speranza: So they're going to be given the draft?

Village Planner Witkowski: Yes, the idea was that as soon as I got all of your comments to the consultants, they'll make those revisions. Then Georges Jacquemart will send me an electronic version of it that I can put on the Website and distribute to the Board of Trustees, the Planning Board and the Safety Council, also. I think we want some input from them, too.

Boardmember Dale: I have a question about what you mean by our comments on the transportation plan. If we have positive or negative opinions about any of the specific plans?

Village Planner Witkowski: Yes, if there's anything you want to add to it, anything you think is missing. I did send him that excerpt from the minutes where there was the discussion last time so that he had all of those comments. Eva and Patty gave me comments.

Chairperson Speranza: Yes, I have to give you the marked copies.

Village Planner Witkowski: Right. I wanted to have a marked-up copy. If you've marked up your copies you can get those to me, and I'll consolidate any markups into one.

Chairperson Speranza: Okay. Do you know if they've had discussions with the county and the state? Because I think when we talk about the major ones -- before we go much further with the projects that are going to cost a significant amount of money and those which require approval of other jurisdictions -- I think before we have a work session, simply where those become a topic of conversation we need to have input from the county and state.

Village Planner Witkowski: Right. They're doing some more work on the plans, and I know Susan is going to talk to them. They wanted to do a bit more work on some of the areas before meeting with the county and the state. But the intention is for them to meet.

Chairperson Speranza: Right, but it hasn't happened yet.

Village Planner Witkowski: No, but it will.

Chairperson Speranza: I'm just wondering, and I know it's unfair to put you on the spot like this this evening. I'm just concerned how much more work they're going to do, the consultant's going to do, prior to talking to the county and the state. Because it may be that we would want their efforts channeled in a different direction, like doing more design work with respect to sidewalks and things that we know we have a better possibility...

Boardmember Dale: There's a lot of money proposed to be spent on Broadway, and Broadway is under who's jurisdiction?

Boardmember Cameron: Well, the good news is it *is* the state, and the good news is that the consultants seem to think that the state wants to do this. But I think we better find out whether their wanting to do it includes money, and then we get a better feel for whether or

not some of those things might or might not be done. And they may just be totally impossible if it's going to be paid for entirely by Hastings. But if it's going to be paid entirely by the state, that'd be a different question. We need to know the parameters of what we're dealing with. And what concerns me is that we need to know those before we meet with the Trustees. I know that's what you were saying.

Village Planner Witkowski: That's why I need your comments.

Boardmember Logan: My comments are along the same direction. But aren't we really critiquing this report, per se, rather than going into what are we going to do, how are we going to find funding, who does what? I would just like to see some of these tables expanded to say whose responsibility is each one of these categories and what are the funding sources so we don't spin our wheels hypothecating about something which is not in our jurisdiction. Focus on what we can do, and channel it to other parties to do those pieces. I think the report is just lacking in some of those specifics.

Village Planner Witkowski: Okay, that's fine. But the other thing, before they want to talk with the state and the county, we also wanted to make sure that those were the projects that everybody wanted them to talk with them about, if there was anything additional. I mean, they wanted comments on anything, and then before the meeting with the Board of Trustees they'll be talking with the county and the state. And I did ask Susan to let me know when she was going to be doing that so I could go with her so we would both be there.

Chairperson Speranza: Okay, so you said George already has the minutes from the last meeting, and there was a lot of discussion at the last meeting.

Village Planner Witkowski: And Susan has them also. Then I also got part of that grant application that was done for Route 9 that the county had put in. They just got the funding awarded for the scenic byway. So Jeff Williams from the county e-mailed me part of that, the Hastings portion of that, and I sent that on to George and to Susan so they'd have that, too. So anything that's going to affect or impact any of the proposals in this plan I want to make sure that they know about when they go to the county and to the state.

Chairperson Speranza: Anything else that anyone has with respect to comments on the document get to Angie before anybody goes away for Thanksgiving. Make sure that she has everything that we feel needs to be transmitted for the report to be considered a final draft. This way the report can be revised, there can be a discussion then with the state. And it doesn't have to be the state committing to half-a-million dollars. It could be that the state commits to letting us re-stripe the roadway and have it one lane in each direction and see what happens. Before you decide to put in a median, see if you like one lane in each direction. I mean, there are different things, different steps that could be taken. The county could say absolutely not, no way.

These are things that I think is important before we go to the Board. They should be aware of those things. And what we have heard several times at the meetings is, When do we get this out? So if those discussions can be held -- you know, you get the comments from us -- they can modify the plan, have their discussions with the state, and then put the revised document on the Web in preparation for our work session with the Board of Trustees.

Does that seem to flow with everybody? Does that make sense? Because we do want to get it out there, but we do want to make sure that there are some additional things that are inputted in here.

Village Planner Witkowski: Yes, so if any of you has a marked-up copy that you want to just leave with me tonight, that would be fine. And then I can, over the weekend, get them all put together and get them to George right away so he'll have them, and to Susan, so that they'll have them before Thanksgiving.

Chairperson Speranza: Okay, because I don't know that any more design work needs to be done before the document.

Village Planner Witkowski: Well, there were just some details that they wanted. Like one of the engineers called me today because of the reconfiguration of parking on Maple Avenue. So I know he's working on that just to make it a little more than just a concept when they talk with the county.

Chairperson Speranza: That's ours, Maple Avenue.

Village Planner Witkowski: Right, but you know that's the kind of stuff they're doing now. They're basically waiting for any other comments.

Chairperson Speranza: All right, we will have them.

Village Planner Witkowski: So if anybody has anything they want to leave with me tonight, that would be fine.

Chairperson Speranza: By the way, you mentioned Route 9, which reminded me of Route 9-A. I think it's really great, for those of you who may not have heard and those of you at home, that the Village actually did get an award for additional parking and access to the Putnam Right of Way.

Village Planner Witkowski: Yes, \$148,000.

Boardmember Logan: I'm just trying to picture where that is, though. ... Where is it?

Chairperson Speranza: It's right across from the entrance from the cemetery on 9-A.

Village Planner Witkowski: It's directly across.

Boardmember Cameron: If you walk north from the bridge and you go up maybe 60 yards, 50 yards, you'll just see this thing going in. Or the other way to do it is you walk up the Putnam Right of Way until you come opposite where the bridge is, the old bridge. Just plunge straight for the trees there and you'll find the roadway going across. The roadway's quite nice. It's two lanes, in good shape.

2. Steep Slopes & Project Updates from Director of Planning

Chairperson Speranza: We're not going to start this discussion again now tonight, but Angie did provide us with a map. This is the first iteration, just to show what we can do with respect to identifying the steep slopes within the Village, the red areas being slopes over 25% and the beige being 15- to 25%. So this goes to addressing some of the things we had discussed at our last meeting with respect to identifying what we're actually talking about with respect to steep slope areas within the Village which may be impacted by any change in our Steep Slopes Law. Angie, do you mind talking about the next step on this?

Village Planner Witkowski: Ana Hiraldo, who works in the county GIS department and is a consultant and has been great, put this together really quickly. But I just wanted to at least show you what we could start with. Then what we're going to do, we have all of the tax parcels, the square foot area, for all of the tax parcels. So she and I are going to put together a map that will have ranges; like up to 2,500 square feet, up to 5,000 square feet. Color code all the lots, and then it'll be sort of an overlay on this so that we can see the sizes of the lots. That's sort of what we have in mind. We haven't started putting it together yet, but we want to do a big map. What we can do is, once we get it put together we can e-mail it to BPI and they can do a large-scale map for us so we'll have a good display.

Boardmember Dale: I was a little concerned about the scale of this map. Based on what you've done here, 10 West Main Street doesn't appear at all.

Village Planner Witkowski: I know. That's why I wanted to make sure you knew that it'll be much bigger so we get all that detail.

Boardmember Dale: But in this case it would disqualify it for the Steep Slopes Law.

Boardmember Logan: This still wouldn't relieve an applicant from having to provide his own topo maps.

Village Planner Witkowski: No, because I think these are 5-foot intervals. I think the applicants have to do 2-foot. But next year we're going to have a lot more detail on the GIS, where we will have 2-foot intervals. They're just doing amazing stuff with GIS there.

Chairperson Speranza: Yes, there are some things, and maybe when it's brought down to the tax parcel level they may be better. But there were certain things that I was curious

about, too, that I would have thought were steep slopes. But maybe it's just when you're walking up and down them they feel steep, but in reality they're not.

Boardmember Dale: Up Villard, for example.

Chairperson Speranza: That may be a function of the way that the parameters are set for the definition of steep slopes. Maybe it's a larger area.

So there is effort to move that initiative, go over it. Angie, do you have anything else for us?

Village Planner Witkowski: I didn't know if everybody knew that we did get a grant from Hudson River Valley Greenway -- I can't remember if I said -- for \$15,000. It's a 50% matching grant to apply to the comprehensive plan.

And then I just submitted an application today to Quality Communities for phase B and C of the comprehensive plan. In that one I asked for \$56,000 on a \$70,000 project. That only requires a 20% match that's required, so we could use that toward a consultant contract. A lot of the stuff for the phase A part can be done in-house because my time would be reimbursable under that grant.

Chairperson Speranza: Any word from that group? Did they report back to the Board?

Village Planner Witkowski: They're going to be putting together a report. They read a lot of different plans and they're going to put together a recommendation as to what kind of process...basically what the scope of the plan should be.

Chairperson Speranza: Right. And there's been nothing back from them.

Village Planner Witkowski: Not yet, but they're pretty close to finishing up their mission.

Chairperson Speranza: Does anyone have anything else to talk about tonight?

Boardmember Dale: Have we heard from 10 West Main Street at all?

Chairperson Speranza: No, and not from Ginsburg either.

Village Planner Witkowski: Not a peep.

Village Attorney Stecich: The silence is deafening.

Village Planner Witkowski: Next month they should be ready. Yes, December.

Chairperson Speranza: Okay, then our next meeting is December 21st. Are we expecting people to be here at this point, December 21st? I'm going to be here. Okay, it works for everybody.

Boardmember Cameron: I think so. I don't know yet.

VI. Adjournment

On MOTION of Boardmember Wertz, SECONDED by Boardmember Dale with a voice vote of all in favor, Chairperson Speranza adjourned the Regular Meeting at 10:25 p.m.