

**VILLAGE OF HASTINGS-ON-HUDSON, NEW YORK  
PLANNING BOARD  
REGULAR MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARING  
FEBRUARY 15, 2007**

A **Regular Meeting and Public Hearing** was held by the Planning Board on **Thursday, February 15, 2007 at 8:15 p.m.** in the Municipal Building Meeting Room, 7 Maple Avenue, Hastings-on-Hudson, New York, 10706.

**I. Roll Call**

**PRESENT:** Chairperson Patricia Speranza, Boardmembers William Logan, Fred Wertz, David Hutson, Eva Alligood, Bruce Dale, Deputy Village Attorney Marianne Stecich, and Village Planner Angela Witkowski.

**ABSENT:** Boardmember James Cameron

**II. Approval of Minutes**

**1. January 18, 2007 meeting.**

**Chairperson Speranza:** The first order of business is approval of the minutes from January 18th. Does anyone have any comments or changes? Believe it or not, I do not.

**Boardmember Dale:** I have a bunch of little ones. On page 6, middle of the page, when I'm speaking, a couple of words are missing. Middle of the page, where I say: "I would argue that it is not a sizable enough lot for everybody. Somebody could buy it *for* affordable housing." And the next sentence: "...would be expensive to build *on*." So there's two words missing, small words.

Then on page 13, in the first sentence: "I agree. I agree strongly. I see this as a residential block with housing development" without the dot.

Page 14, bottom of page: "The first issue, I feel fairly strongly that the Village needs a piece of property or not anymore..." My answer to that is: "I don't think so, and that is okay."

One last one. Page 28, top of the page, end of the sentence: "...but rather just the mechanical issues of doing that reach that does..." doesn't make sense to me now. "...mechanical issues of, does doing that reach to the steep slope 'rule,' or not?" "Rule" is the word missing.

**Village Planner Witkowski:** And it should be a question mark.

**On MOTION of Boardmember Logan, SECONDED by Boardmember Wertz with a voice vote of all in favor, the Minutes of the Regular Meeting and Public Hearing of January 18, 2007 were approved as amended.**

**III. New Business**

**Public Hearing. Subdivision. Application from Michael Foley for the purpose of review and approval of a three-lot single family residential subdivision. The property is referred to as Foley/Farragut Parkway Proposed Subdivision, Sheet 12, Block 43 and Parcels 40, 41 and 41A. The Property includes 1.145 acres in the R-10 Zone to the west (rear) of 270 Farragut Parkway. An access drive will be provided from Farragut Parkway.**

**Chairperson Speranza:** We have a public hearing on a subdivision. The applicant is Mike Foley. It is property located on Farragut Parkway. There has been some discussion as to the actual name of the road, and potential confusion in the mailing that went out. So that's one of the things we'll have to discuss. But what I'd like to have first is...yes, I see Mr. Weinstein here, Mr. Foley is here. Are you going to do a presentation on the proposal first?

**Edward Weinstein, architect/certified planner:** Yes. I'd like to use the portable mic so I can refer to the boards that we have here. Some of it is the same material in your packets.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** If there's a notice issue, it has to be resolved before you open the public hearing. Did you say that there might be a notice issue?

**Chairperson Speranza:** I know several people who've come in have expressed concern about the description of the property.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Yes, so this board would have to, I think, before you open the public hearing, make a determination that the notice was adequate.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Could we have the presentation? Because what I'd like to do is start the process, not close the public hearing. That's what I was thinking. Maybe I need guidance in terms of how do we resolve the mailing issue.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Nobody's told me the issue yet. I think it should be resolved before you move forward. You may decide the notice was improper, and we'll go forward and make them re-notice it. But the problem is, if it's not proper notice they're going to give a presentation that's not really in a public hearing because the public hearing isn't good.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Sir, why don't you come up. I know you mentioned some concern. State your name and address for the record, and we'll figure out what needs to be done.

**John Gondor, 153 James Street:** I read the legal notice, which is quite small, in the Hastings paper. It says "Access to Farragut Parkway." I'm a long-time resident. I was born in Dobbs Ferry, and resided in Hastings all my life except for a few years in the service, so I know the area well. Farragut Avenue starts at the Five Corners by the First Reform Church and... keeps on coming past the high school. The directory will always give you Farragut Avenue. Keeps going past Ravensdale Road, Saunders, Green Street, then it bears left toward the Saw Mill River Parkway. Farragut Parkway starts approximately 60 yards south of Green Street and goes to the parkway. There's four or five houses on the north side of High Street and four or five on the south side. When you say Farragut Parkway in a legal notice -- I'm thinking about Uniontown ball field, and at one time I think the fire department owned that -- that land that comes down toward Farragut Parkway, where the [name] is Farragut Avenue. I think a lot of people in this community don't know what you're talking about. Whoever put it in is in error. The signs say Farragut Parkway south of Green Street, Farragut Avenue from Five Corners all the way up to Green Street. So I think it's an error, and I think they should reconsider and re-put it in.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Could I see the notice?

**Mr. Gondor:** Yes, you can see it.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Just so you understand, the general context isn't so much is it technically exactly right, but is it written in such a way as to give the people you want to give notice to notice. I haven't seen it before. Good thing I brought my reading glasses.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Now, if notice was given from the property -- whatever the notice says, if the notice is in error -- I think that's one issue. But it seems to me that the notice may have been given correctly to the people who are located, what is it?, 500 feet from the parcel.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** I think, actually, for a subdivision it just has to be the adjoining property owners.

**Chairperson Speranza:** The adjoining property owners?

**Village Attorney Stecich:** I believe. The Village may do the 500 feet.

**Village Planner Witkowski:** I believe it's 300.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Three-hundred feet? Okay, that's more than required notice. Now, is the address also known as Farragut Parkway?

**Mr. Weinstein:** Steve Anderson is here. He is the surveyor and civil engineer working on this project. They have a lot of experience with the maps of this Village. They actually prepared the former Village zoning map. We also have a number of surveys and maps that use both names. I think Steve can address that.

**Steve Anderson, architect - Gabriel Senor:** It just so happens I have in my file that I have with me tonight a copy of the 1931, what they call, Atlas Books. They're all Westchester County. There'd be a company that went around and they updated it. It was kind of like Hagstrom of the day. They were big huge books.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Sanborn Maps.

**Mr. Anderson:** They referred to it under both names. Then I have another survey from 1962 which gives two corner ties and they refer to both names, Farragut Avenue and Parkway.

**Michael Foley:** I don't think there's any confusion about where the property is, for a couple of reasons. One is, I've gotten mail at that address for the last 30 years and I know of no case where a letter addressed to me has been marked Parkway or Avenue and returned. Everyone who wrote me, as far as I know, got their mail delivered to 270 Farragut. Also, the name Foley is pretty much braided on that block and most people know which house I used to live in and where it's located.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Patty, I would suggest we just meet for a second for advice of counsel just on this, and then the Board can make a decision.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Do we need a motion?

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Not for advice of counsel. I don't think it should be a question of debate.

**Mr. Gondor:** No, it's not a debate, but I wrote letters for over two years to 270 Farragut Avenue and that's where they were delivered.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Okay. We're going to take a break, get advice of counsel on this.  
[BREAK IN MEETING]

**Chairperson Speranza:** The Boardmembers do believe that the notice is adequate to start the public hearing this evening. We will re-notice it and put another ad in the paper. We will use Farragut Parkway, also known as Farragut Avenue, because there is a great deal of confusion. People use the terms interchangeably. Our map shows that it's Farragut Parkway/Farragut Avenue. But we do feel it's adequate to begin the process tonight. We will keep the public hearing open to the next meeting. So now we'll move on.

**Mr. Weinstein:** I am an architect and certified planner. I'm here tonight with Steve Anderson, a surveyor from the office of Gabriel Senor. We presented this project previously, and will go through it briefly again. The property is west of Farragut Avenue / Parkway... West of Farragut Avenue -- and is bounded on the south by the Pulvers Woods, a Village park, by Hastings Tire, the Valero service station, which is located right here, and two-family homes because south of the property line it's a 2-R zone. The 1.14 acre property in question is an R-10 zone. It currently has one single-family house on it.

What we have today is a formal preliminary plat submission. This is the last informal drawing. This drawing shows you, in orange, how the subdivision is proposed. This is the existing house towards the east, closest to Farragut. We're creating two additional lots that are slightly over 10,000 square feet net after the steep slopes deductions. One parcel will be an access for the property, a private way, which complies with the requirements of the fire code as far as width and distance to the homes. The code allows a private way to be up to 300 feet if the properties are sprinklered. Under our code the new homes will be sprinklered.

The next drawings are the actual formal preliminary plat, the drainage and steep slopes analysis, and some of the details on how the drainage and contouring of the site would work. We previously had discussions with the fire inspector, the Village Planner and Village Attorney, and started on a whole different route. But today we're here with this formal request to approve a subdivision that would allow two additional one-family homes on this property.

I can answer questions. If they're of a more technical nature relating to drainage and grading, I think Mr. Anderson would be the best one to answer those.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Let's hear from the public first. Does anyone in the public wish to speak about the proposal? Questions or comments or clarifications?

**Andy Hayden, 246 Farragut Avenue:** I've been given a letter to read on behalf of a petition that I have that people have signed. And then after the letter I'll try to clarify some of the things and give you my added features of what I think may be of some concern. Which sounds like some may have already been addressed. Let me just preface it with my own personal feelings. I'm not against people just building. When I originally saw this, when I heard about this building, I always felt that if you didn't want somebody to build on property then buy the property. That was my attitude from the beginning. One of my neighbors came over with plans that he had from like 1972 of where these buildings would be. I don't know that they match completely today. I have to look at these plans and, excuse my tardiness, I'm looking at these plans. But I think they are similar. One thing that was definitely the same was the tract of land and how it went. When I heard 10,000 square feet, I said, "Well, 10,000 square feet, the other one's 10,000 square feet." But it wasn't your traditional -- what I had in mind -- square building lot. When I actually looked at this odd, slim tract of land I had some genuine concerns. Those genuine concerns were, one, safety, and the other one was aesthetics -- it was pleasing. Because while I'm not against somebody building, I don't want it to look like a Queens neighborhood either. So why don't I read the letter, give you what's been written up and people have signed, and then I'll go on with some of my own personal additions to it.

It says here: "The residents of Farragut Avenue" and Parkway "and the immediate surrounding area are opposed to the Foley Farragut Parkway subdivision proposal of the nearby property on Sheet 12, Block 43, Parcel 40, 41, and 41A. We are opposed to increased traffic and congestion, ingress and egress of different areas on the Farragut Avenue" and Parkway. "This will create more activity in the area and increase more parking problems on the already congested streets, possibly more accidents in the surrounding area. Also, schoolchildren walk through that area daily. What about their well-being?"

"The nearby properties of Sheet 12, Block 43, Parcel 40, 41, 41A, which will give everyone less privacy, has grown to be valued highly. The water table is high, and there are underground streams and wells on the neighboring properties which all join together. Once the properties have other buildings on them it will affect the neighboring lots, the underground streams, wells, and higher water tables."

"Presently, when there's a heavy precipitation," rain, "the water table rises and lingers in the neighboring yards at surface level. The ground is unable to absorb and retain any more water. Once the rocks and trees are gone, where they're on some, there may be higher water table problems on the properties that are at lower levels. There is steep terrain at the back of the proposed properties bordering residents of High Street. Pulvers Woods is registered as a parkland in the town of the Village of Hastings-on-Hudson, New York and is neighboring the proposed properties and may affect concerns of the residents."

I think these are legitimate claims. When I read this letter it did motivate me to look further. I actually looked at where this drive was going to be, the access drive. I looked at the property. I do know about the precipitation, I do know about the water table. It's definitely a serious problem in that area. I know previous building inspectors have mentioned it; it comes up through my basement through the bottom, I'm genuinely concerned. Pipes run through my property that were put there years ago, because of the water table.

So I guess what I'm going to do tonight is no so much argue against anything because I don't think that's where we are in this process. I put a lot of trust in your expertise in looking into these matters and the architect presents, I'm sure, in all good faith. But nonetheless, we need to put the minds together and find out do we have a problem here. And if we really start banging away at this stuff and ripping it up, what kind of problems we cause for the residents surrounding it. Because you don't want to do that and all of a sudden find that, wow, what a nightmare. We know where that leads and, obviously, part of the process to avoid that.

I looked at this letter...and had concerns of frontage road. I'm not real big on my knowledge of building, so I'm going to work with you on this and, hopefully, you can guide me in the right direction. I believe that frontage of a house has to be 100 feet. Am I correct on that?

**Chairperson Speranza:** It varies according to the zone.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** This is R-10. No, you need a lot width of 100 feet, and then the frontage has to be 70% of that, so it would have to be 70 feet.

**Mr. Hayden:** Okay, looking at the house, again, on the old architectural plans I looked at -- but, again, dealing with the same tract of land -- it seemed very odd where the frontage of this house would actually be and how they're going to squeeze it in. Again, it's not a traditional space. So I'd like you, if you could when you oversee this project, if it should even be at all, to pay special attention to that.

Mr. Weinstein mentioned the fire department. I'll tell you, and I have down here 300 feet down the driveway, I did a little checking. I didn't want to sound like a complete layman when I walked in here. I was out doing some investigation. So I do have 300 feet down the driveway. When I look at that driveway it's well-traveled. The Amoco station, or Valero now, is a busy place. When you look at that driveway, to make that a road seems to me that you're going to cause a couple of problems there. One, interference with the gas station's activities already happens with cars pulling in and out. Two, 300 feet down the roadway it seems to me that you can't get that kind of width there. Again, I just want you to pay special attention to it. It seems odd that you can, looking at the property the way it is. And if you do, it seems like the property's going to abut the garage on one of the houses I believe already owned by Mr. Foley and presently rented out. Which, in and of itself, is not exactly what I would call aesthetically pleasing, using that as your roadway. Plus, they get oil deliveries and I just imagine that being a fire problem. One oil delivery truck in front of that roadway, there goes your access. Whether you got 300 feet or not, nobody's getting up it.

Additionally, in this day and age we're not a one-car household in Hastings, as we know. We're not a two-car household anymore. I would go to say we could be a four- and five-car household easy. If you throw in maids and nannies and landscapers that's going to be one busy little street. If there's one party -- and I don't know if you've had this happen to you, your neighbor has a party -- all of a sudden there are cars up and down your street. It's a severe impact for that time being. Well, if that driveway has cars in it, there's a medical emergency, the ambulance isn't getting to that person 300 feet away. You're not getting up that drive, putting aside just the fire truck. Those seemed like some legitimate things to look into in regard to safety.

The road width, looking at an old plan, said 28 feet across, but it wasn't really across. On what I looked at ... it was diagonal, the 28 foot of it going into this access road. So you don't have 28 feet directly across. It was done at an angle, which seemed odd to me. If you go at an angle you're going to get 28 feet in a different way as opposed to straight across. So that didn't seem reasonable to me and, again, I just ask you to just look at these things for us.

The gas station, years ago apparently -- and you may want to talk to the owner of the station - had underground tanks put in. We're going to put a road there ... I don't know exactly where these tanks are located within the ground, but definitely something we got to look at. We're going to build a road there, and he's going to have his underground tanks there. I guess anything could go wrong with the tanks, but even just if you've ever got to pull them up or go into them for some reason, you're going to block complete access off to those residences. Another issue which, I think, is something we have to look deeply into: where are these underground tanks? Jot them down in the notes because, again, I'm throwing it out there. I'm giving you investigation work. This is the initial process, I haven't done all this. These are the things when you start looking, you pay attention, you start finding..

There's a reason for subdivision. The intentions are here, I believe, to build a couple of houses. Looking at the subdivision of the first house -- and we don't have to get complicated about this -- looks like you need the subdivision because you needed to move one of the setbacks back and need to move the house back more. Looking at the Chiko property, which is my direct neighbor, I don't know that you have enough room there now to the Village requirements from the setback from his property. I'd like you to look at that. And when you look at that, if there are variances needed, keep in mind that my house is 107 years old. It was built in 1900. I think it was last remodeled in 1905. It has a barn, I get to work in it every day. I live with a hammer in my pocket. But it has a 100-year-old barn. It borders the Chiko property. If this house goes where I think it's going -- and go look at it, you're more than welcome to come on over -- it looks pretty overwhelming. I don't know, I mentioned a Queens neighborhood before. Take a look at it. Just try to envision it. I looked at it and said, "Wow ... and you're going to put in an alleyway with his property." So let's think about him for a bit, too, and where he might be in this process. While that may not affect me as much, it's not all about me. It's about everybody else as a whole.

I didn't see any room for a cul-de-sac in there, maybe you can look. I do know... other places in town where we've forced people to build cul-de-sacs...and I'll get on to that in a second. The second house is 42 feet wide. Again, looking at older plans, please look at that. Look at the widths of those houses that are 42-foot wide. Are they still 42-foot wide? Is there enough width there in that property frontage? See how it'll fit, where that side door is, where that front door is, are you going to have the correct amount of frontage, etc.

Let's go back to accidents and safety for a second. Personal knowledge -- that is an accident-prone area. There've been some serious accidents on that street. It wouldn't take a whole heck of a lot of work. if you wanted the statistics on it, for me to get it for you. You're more than welcome to it at any given time. But it's been so unsafe in that particular area where they want to put that access drive that the Village has deemed it unsafe enough that they've put barricades up there now and won't even allow cars to go through there. Now we're going to put another street there? That's something we want to look at.

Now back to what I said about the cul-de-sacs. There were similar streets, I believe, where proposals were made -- and I know one of them for sure -- was mine. I probably wouldn't have been able to afford my house had it never been subdivided, had those other two houses not been built behind it and that property sold off. It would have been one enormous piece of property, probably well beyond my wealth of being able to afford it. But since it was subdivided, I believe -- I'm almost positive -- that one of the requirements was to make that road wider. There is a nice 30-foot wide road, nice cul-de-sac at the end you can pull into and turn around. You know, you could put cars on both sides. You're not supposed to, it's illegal, but you could put cars on both sides and still get a fire engine down it. That, I think, is something you have to really look into. Can you do that any other place if you really had to? Again, I don't know how it goes when you approve stuff, if it just says it on black and white. Maybe you look at it and say, well, it may say it here, but you know what? There, it's unsafe. Sprinkler system, that may be fine. But if somebody's having a heart attack, that's not going to help anybody. You can't really get the fire truck up there because the oil truck's in the way. There's a problem. So there might be other issues like ... "We got 300 feet, but you can't get up to it or there's a problem getting up to it. So again, take good, copious notes. We'll get Raf to play it, Jen to play it back for us. She'll make you all a DVD.

Another place was Vinnie Civitano, one of the nicest fellows in town. I say that wholeheartedly. But when he built his house, I believe he had to widen the street, too. And that was for one house. Good. So ... these are the things we're concerned about.

**Chairperson Speranza:** I know. Your point is made on it.

**Mr. Hayden:** Okay. I'm not going to go ahead and be redundant for you because we got a long night and there are people behind me, I'm sure, that I don't want to bore them either.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Our night's longer.



**Mr. Hayden:** I'm going to leave with three last things. A hydrant consideration. I think a hydrant has to be brought in here. Somebody mentioned there was only one hydrant, I believe, up by my corner. I think there's only a couple of hydrants in the neighborhood and there may not be one sufficient for this particular residence. Please look into that.

School bus stops. Here's something I'm a pro in. Expert in school buses. Got to make them with the kids. Every once in awhile he misses one. Quick, get it down there. And he's running right past what soon could be an access drive. Makes me nervous just coming out of there. That's one of my things. That's personal to me. Please look into the safety of the kids. One school bus stops down by the corner at Amjo's. The other one stops up by me.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Did you read the subdivision regulations? I just mention that because school bus stops is one of the things that's included.

**Mr. Hayden:** I read everything up through 138 ... but that wasn't what made me put this down. This really came from my heart. I didn't want to ...while I was a layman, I didn't want to come to this uneducated. I don't want to waste your time, I don't want to waste mine. I did, of course, read everything. But that's not my motivation of putting this down. Actually, it was something that I thought about later as I see my kids. Please look into that.

Lastly, and this wasn't wholeheartedly to me, but somebody brought it up and it makes good sense: garbage collection. Look into garbage collection. How are they going to get this garbage truck up this 300-foot drive? Are they going to be able to back it in there? Is it going to cause more problems? Look, you've been stuck behind a garbage truck. I'm not going on about this one. You know, you can figure that out, I'm sure.

So those are the things that I initially thought of. I'm sure there may be some other people that can bring stuff to the table. I hope I've given you some homework to look into. Not that I'm looking to give you a lot of homework, but I just wanted to give you some thoughts and ideas, things that we were jostling around in our minds as residents of that area. I started this by saying I appreciate all your dedication and help; I'm also depending on it. Thank you.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Thank you. Does anyone else wish to speak about this?

**Dave Vaillencourt:** I live across the street from Valero's. My question is, has there been an Environmental Impact Statement? Because right now you have the gas station that emits gases, and you have a lot of cars that pull in and pull out of that gas station all emitting gases. What you have surrounding the gas station right now, which is very nice, is a whole host of trees. What you're planning on doing is replacing those trees with more cars. So I would imagine that's going to have some type of environmental impact.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Let me address that. First of all, we're not planning to do anything. I just want to make sure that that's on the record. Because you said "what you're planning to do." We're not planning to do anything. It's an application before us. SEQRA is one of the things. It's a subdivision, so the SEQRA process will have to be followed.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** You must have submitted an EAF, because it was part of the subdivision application.

**Mr. Weinstein:** Sure, an Environmental Assessment Form.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** What did you say, short one?

**Mr. Weinstein:** Short form.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Yes, we would probably want a long form.

**Chairperson Speranza:** And we have not seen it.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** I don't think we got it, but it has to be part of the subdivision application.

**Chairperson Speranza:** No, we did not see it.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** SEQRA will be done.

**Chairperson Speranza:** The state Environmental Quality Review Act will be followed in this, for sure.

**Mr. Vaillencourt:** Okay, that was my question. Thank you.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Anyone else?

**Mr. Gondor:** The other thing that I'm concerned about the access -- everything that Mr. Hayden said was true -- I'm concerned that it would be a private road there. I think it should be a Village road because of access to Pulvers Woods. That whole property line is adjacent to Pulvers Woods, and it should be another access. Because you only have a very few accesses to it now; one off Rose, one off James and one off High, and nothing for Farragut Avenue. I think the road should be minimum size of Green or Rose or James Street, and parking on one side possibly so fire trucks could get in there. I think you also need storm drains put in. The only other thing I would say is it would be better if he could come in through Green Street or Rose Street or Saunders Street...rather than off of Farragut Avenue.

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

**Mr. Foley:** I think that's a very reasonable and good suggestion. It dawned on me that maybe we should put a yellow brick road so that people are taking the kids out and want to go to Pulvers Woods would go along the pathway to Pulvers Woods and they would have access from Farragut. I like that idea very much. As far as turning around a fire truck, we tried to place the buildings so that we could maintain the maximum amount of green and that nice back yard area would stay unspoiled. Hopefully, those three houses would be at peace with each other and share it, and it would work out. I'm cognizant of the fact that we want to keep as much area as possible green. We don't want to blacktop the back yard, or greentop it or whatever.

We could, very consistent with your suggestion, which I like, bring Belgian block, the cobblestones. If we had grass growing between the cobblestones, appropriate placing of the stones, and maybe a 5-inch or 3-inch bed of concrete, then topsoiled over the top of it, I think we could see the knobs of all of the cobblestone, which is somewhat pretty. But also it would provide an emergency cul-de-sac where you didn't have to worry about the fire truck getting all muddy or the like.

The first gentleman that spoke has a very legitimate concern, and it's our concern also, of how we get access from Farragut without exacerbating the gas station situation. Our solution to that situation is to have an easement given by the actual house that is known as 270 Farragut now. Have it come in and, once it gets onto the property, have an arc where it turns to the left and S's to the right; parking provided according to the drawings.

The last thing I probably forgot, something that needs to be addressed. I invite the gentleman that spoke, or any of the other neighbors who want, please, you have my explicit permission to come up over that knoll, which is a driveway now, and see the layout of the acre-plus that is quite pretty and would be, I think, the most intelligent use of the property; to give over to the location of the two houses that we proposed. There was also a reference to 1972 or '76, '75 drawings of a proposed use of the property. They have no value whatsoever because we're talking about single-family houses here. That was a hope that we could get in low-cost housing. It was the first effort for Hastings to try to figure out a way to do low-cost housing. That was a proposal for six townhouse units, and common areas.

Also ... the last lot in the 350-foot piece of land that goes back up into the woods is only 53 feet wide, so it's not appropriate for building. The only thing it could possibly be used for is maybe a squash court or something like that. I don't know that we want to do that right next to the park. So one of my proposals was to cut the tail off that piece of property and have it go to increase the size of the park. No one seems to have any interest in that, and I asked a number of people in the town government.... It amazes me because I think that's a substantial number of square feet. It would still leave me 40,000 square feet or so for the three properties. If the tail went to the Village, I think it would be a good idea.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Is that part of the proposal?

**Mr. Foley:** It's not currently part of the proposal, but something that I intended, assuming we get permission to use our property in a reasonable manner. I would definitely consider it.

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

**Laura Hill, 241 Farragut:** Farragut Avenue or Parkway; our mortgage says one thing, our deed says another...Currently on Farragut, on the property in question in between the sidewalk and the road itself, there's a strip of bricked-out area that the garage uses to park cars. That space is often filled. When it is, we have cars parked in front of our house.

I don't think there's a day that I've lived in my house, for six-and-a-half years, that there hasn't been a garage car in front of my house. We've made our peace with the garage. They don't park large vans in front of our house anymore, [as we asked]. But my concern is if that parking area, that the garage needs and uses, is gone I will never have space in front of my house because it'll always be used by those cars. That's a big concern of mine.

Also, to my neighbor's point, it is a dangerous street. There was a garage car parked in front of our house about two years ago that was hit by a car. There was a car [parked] on the opposite side of our street that was also hit. Because cars, when they come off of the parkway, as I'm sure you all know, are easily going in excess of 40 miles an hour. We see it happen all the time. So if there's a street that's added to that mix, it's just going to be more dangerous. In order for the cars to get into that driveway, I don't know how they would do it without taking away from that parking area from the garage. So that's a big concern of mine.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Okay, thank you. Boardmembers? Go ahead, and I have a number of things. But maybe you'll all cover them.

**Boardmember Hutson:** I just want to clarify, if the applicant or Ed could comment, given the proposal you have now, are there variances that would be involved?

**Mr. Weinstein:** We have a zoning analysis that we've done for each of the parcels. We believe that should the subdivision be approved and allow the private way that we do not need any variances.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** I just reviewed it this afternoon and I don't think that's correct. I called Deven, and Deven has never reviewed these yet. I just called him to see whether he'd look over them, and he's the best one to look at them. But I know that your lot 3 is not 100 feet wide. A lot has to be 100 feet wide, so that one isn't even close to 100 feet wide. Lot width is defined a little oddly in our code, but it's the lesser of what you would ordinarily think of with the smaller dimension, or the line across and parallel to the front lot line. So in this case, lot 2 has 100 feet across the front lot line, the front lot line being defined as the one along the street. There is a problem, though, with lot 3. It's not even close to the width.

**Mr. Weinstein:** We've gone through the analysis. We believe we can comply. I'd be happy to sit down with the Building Inspector and look at that.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Well, okay. But I'm just addressing Mr. Hutson's question, and that's why I don't think he has the lot width for lot 3. It's not close. That was one variance I noted he would need. Then another one, if I'm reading the plans correctly -- and they're a little bit hard -- the street is 22 feet wide?

**Mr. Weinstein:** Yes, the private way.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** If it's a private way and not a street, then the whole thing's not allowable. Because under the code you can only approve lots that have frontage on a street.

**Chairperson Speranza:** But it can be a private street.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** It can be a private street, but it has to be a street approved to Village standards. And then your Village standards say a standard street is 50 feet, but you can reduce it. But it does say that the minimum is 24 feet. So the street's not wide enough. Now, I think once you take that square footage off...so let's say you've got to widen it to 24 feet at a minimum. You may decide that's not wide enough for gas trucks, garbage trucks, ... If you make the street 24 feet it's going to subtract from the square footage of each of these lots, which is very close to the 10,000 square feet. I don't know that you would meet...

**Mr. Weinstein:** Keep in mind we have 9,000 square feet that we're not using. So we could make that adjustment.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Maybe so. Then you've got to make a wider street. But in any event, it's not drawn in such a way that it does not require variances. We would require, actually, pretty substantial variances, even putting aside whether the Board thought that a 24-foot street was sufficient. And then the other thing just variance-wise is that I think somebody would -- because the numbers here are really close and you've got steep slope deductions and stuff -- I think they really need to be verified. But even without verifying them, I know that those two...I'm not even sure...well, I think a variance is 24 feet. I don't see how you give a variance if you've got a minimum street width of 24 feet.

**Mr. Weinstein:** I should point out, we did have the meeting with Jim Drumm, as was suggested by this board, as far as safety was concerned and access and code. I'm talking about a state code now for fire apparatus access. We're in full compliance.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Okay. And I'm glad to hear that you've done a zoning analysis because that's one of the things that I was going to request. I was surprised to see these plans with no environmental, with no zoning, analysis. If you can provide us with the work that was done with respect to the steep slopes, the way that you did..

**Mr. Weinstein:** It's on the drawing, drawing number S-1.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Yes, I see it. So you've got the square footages noted.

**Mr. Weinstein:** That showed the gross square footage and the net square footage after deducts for the slopes. Any questions on that, Mr. Anderson would be happy to answer.

**Chairperson Speranza:** It's got the gross square footage, and then the square footage after the deductions? That's on here?

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Yes, it says lot area, gross area, and area on each of the lots.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Okay, I was looking at the page where you have the slope analysis.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** But see, there's a good example. It's 1,066 feet. Now, if you had to mark the street 2 feet wider, then you're taking away 2 feet times 100, is 200 feet. And then you're down under 10,000.

**Boardmember Dale:** I had a lot of the same concerns that the public has actually raised, one having to do with the garage. I find the drawings inadequate to describe the project. The little site plan in the corner is incorrect. The street doesn't connect to High Street.

**Mr. Weinstein:** Which drawing are you referring to, Mr. Dale?

**Boardmember Dale:** Green Street doesn't connect to High Street.

**Chairperson Speranza:** It's the first page.

**Boardmember Dale:** The site plan in the corner is incorrect.

**Boardmember Hutson:** On B-1.

**Boardmember Dale:** Green Street doesn't connect to High Street.

**Chairperson Speranza:** It's just the little location map.

**Mr. Weinstein:** I believe it's mapped in that way. It may not be physically connected.

**Boardmember Dale:** It doesn't exist. I live on High Street.

**Mr. Weinstein:** Yes, I understand. But that's the Village map. It's correct based on the Village map.

**Boardmember Dale:** The drawings don't reflect the reality. I find that the connection to the gas station is totally unclear by the drawings. You don't understand where the gas station is, what functions on that site, and how closely this road comes. There's seems to be a lot of concern about the relationship of the gas station to this property and to this road particularly. I sat across the street and couldn't discern where the road was, where the existing passageways were. So I'm significantly concerned about that.

There seems to be somewhat of an issue where the road bends in terms of the steep slopes, and that becomes the access to the third property. So I'm not sure exactly, I think that needs to be reviewed, or at least made more clear to us.

**Boardmember Hutson:** You mean as to what the grade is?

**Boardmember Dale:** Yes, and what that road would actually look like.

**Mr. Weinstein:** You're thinking a profile of the roadway might help you?

**Boardmember Dale:** Probably, yes.

**Chairperson Speranza:** And as Bruce said also, give a little more context to the area with the gas station information. I also found it very hard to see what was existing or proposed. There's a utility easement shown, but I'm not sure if that's something that exists already.

**Mr. Weinstein:** I believe what you're looking at is a proposed utility easement so that the two homes would share an easement for electric and water.

**Chairperson Speranza:** But yes, I think they could be refined to make things more clear.

**Boardmember Dale:** There is a tremendous amount of information all mixed together on this map and this drawing and it's illegible as it is, and I'm trained as an architect. The fact that I had trouble, I think a lot of people will have trouble.

**Mr. Weinstein:** That's why we're here. There's always two aspects. One is what the Village regulations say you need, and the other is what you really need to provide so the Boardmembers can understand what we're proposing. Obviously we need you to understand what we're proposing.

**Boardmember Logan:** I have some of the same concerns. I'm having a lot of trouble reading the drawings... Mr. Foley referred to an easement. I believe it was for access to the property as a pedestrian easement. I'm not sure I understand. Could you elaborate on that?

**Chairperson Speranza:** It's not shown.

**Mr. Weinstein:** It was suggested that access to Pulvers Woods from this property might be a desirable thing. Mr. Foley was saying the thought was a good idea, and if we could work pedestrian access to Pulvers Woods into the plan that might work.

**Boardmember Logan:** I thought it had to do with the way you entered the property as opposed to the access.

**Mr. Weinstein:** It would mean that pedestrians could access Pulvers Woods through this private road. Right now there is a trail through Pulvers Woods as part of the Village trailway that actually does encroach on Mr. Foley's property to some extent. You can see that in that aerial photograph that I showed which has the trailway going onto the rear portion of the Foley property.

**Boardmember Wertz:** I think most of my concerns have been expressed. I guess the traffic issues around the area coming up and down Farragut Parkway/Avenue, also with the road and variances that'll be needed. I think I could also use some better visual presentations of what's really happening so we can translate that into what it would really be in relation to all the surrounding structures and properties. Then, of course, the water table and drainage issues were raised, and I'm sure you'll be addressing them. But we'll be carefully listening to all that. I think those are the main issues.

**Boardmember Alligood:** I echo those concerns. One thing to add is, I'd like to see where the underground storage tanks are.

**Mr. Weinstein:** The gas station's tanks.

**Boardmember Alligood:** For the gas station. I'd like to see that.

**Chairperson Speranza:** If this is a separate property from the gas station I would imagine it's got to be on the gas station property.

**Mr. Weinstein:** It is, but the properties are under the same ownership.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Okay, steep slopes deduction. How were you planning to meet the frontage requirements? You know there's feeling on the road.

**Mr. Weinstein:** Some time ago, it was about a year ago, I had a meeting with the Village Planner and the Village Attorney, and this was the approach that I thought I heard as an acceptable approach. We'll certainly look at it again.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Okay, but your idea was that it was categorized as a private street.

**Mr. Weinstein:** Access was off the private road, yes; the private street, way. I believe the Village code allows for that. I will certainly look into it myself.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Okay. And you've met with Mr. Drumm. That's good.

**Mr. Weinstein:** We did, yes.

**Chairperson Speranza:** So that's okay. Tanks, accidents, okay. And am I reading this plan wrong, or are you showing, in effect, a bit of a turnaround?

**Mr. Weinstein:** No, that was what we had to go through to get the frontage. We had to create a curve to get sufficient length for frontage.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Oh, okay. For lot 3.

**Mr. Weinstein:** For length.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Got it. Okay.

**Mr. Weinstein:** I mean, the property is what it is. It's somewhat long and narrow. It's, in theory, large enough -- four times 10,000 square feet -- but we can't do that. In fact, the private homes located in the 2-R zone -- actually they're accessed from Green Street -- are flag lots. These two homes have a very narrow street. I think at some point there was a plan to extend Rose Street through to this parcel but that, again, never happened either. So what you have is two very narrow driveways that access these two two-family homes which abut our property. Again, what's going on in this little corner of Hastings, you know, is a little unusual because you have grandfathered commercial uses in the 2-R zone; you have a two-family zone. We think that putting two homes here would not have a major impact, but we'll give you the environmental assessment and look up the maximum hourly traffic generation for two homes. I mean, it's not a big deal.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Okay. Any other questions?



**Village Attorney Stecich:** Patty, actually I had a couple of additional things. You may not get to right now but, certainly, if it looks like this subdivision is going to go forward, and Bill Logan touched on it when he asked about the easements. You're going to have a very complicated set of easements here for each of those property owners. Who owns the street or? If they own the street, why does property 3 have the right to use it?

**Mr. Weinstein:** There will be a homeowners association that would work on that.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Difficult easement issues for the utilities, for maintenance. And the Board couldn't approve the subdivision without making sure that these easements are going to work. There was one other thing...if this is going to go forward, I would recommend that the Board require a deposit for professional fees on this because it's going to require your own engineer to look at it. It could require a lot of legal time. And then I assume the applicant's aware of the recreation fee requirement. Angie, what is it?

**Village Planner Witkowski:** For dwellings with two bedrooms or less it's \$7,500 per unit. For subdivision lots or apartments with three or more bedrooms it's \$10,000.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** So for each lot it would be a \$10,000 rec fee. One other thing, quite apart from the safety issues. I'm not sure this was an issue raised, although somebody touched on it. Generally, when you permit new lots, they're supposed to be pretty much rectangular. Side lot lines are supposed to be perpendicular to the street. It's so hard to read these drawings; it's hard to tell what the lot lines actually look at. So if you have to go back to the drawing board to make the lot width right, I suggest that you try to do that as well.

**Mr. Weinstein:** What we'll do, in addition to the engineering drawing, is take another drawing and put a marker to it so you can see everything clearly, and little color might help.

**Boardmember Dale:** I would like some drawing that showed the context including the other houses on both sides of the development.

**Mr. Weinstein:** More than this?

**Boardmember Dale:** Even that would be useful. We don't have that.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Yes, we'll take that one.

**Mr. Weinstein:** I can include that as well so that you all have it.

**Chairperson Speranza:** That would be very helpful. Also, I want to make sure that people ... your neighbors, are up-to-date with what is being proposed. Maybe when you've reached that point, so that they're not working off of 1977 plans you know, we can notice it that they're available at Village Hall to come in and take a look to see what the latest is. Because that always goes a long way. When people understand things it's much easier to relate to.

**Mr. Weinstein:** We like that.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Okay, thank you. No other comments or questions from the public? So the public hearing is still open. The mailing will be done at our expense.

#### **IV. Old Business**

**Public Hearing. View Preservation and Site Plan Review. Christina Griffin and Peter Wolf. 433 Warburton Avenue (Sheet 7/ Block 618/ Lots 23 and 31) for proposed expansion of two-family residence and parking spaces on Ridge Street.**

**Chairperson Speranza:** The next item on our agenda is for view preservation and site plan review for property at 433 Warburton Avenue. We've seen this project in various stages. And we're going to hear the latest, is that correct?

**Peter Wolf, 433 Warburton Avenue:** Absolutely.

**Chairperson Speranza:** So now we're on Warburton Avenue.

**Boardmember Hutson:** Another lovely area.

**Chairperson Speranza:** You've done some more work on it.

**Mr. Wolf:** We're here again to hopefully get site plan review and discuss view preservation issues. To give you a little history, we lived at 433 Warburton about five years ago and said to the owner if he was ever interested in selling we would be interested. So we purchased the property in September 2006. The building is a glorified two-story railroad shack that literally vibrated when the train went by. We had decided to probably renovate the building and to bring it up to code. The building is, I think, 92 years old at this point.

So we came here in November for a preliminary meeting, and then we were here again in December. One of the main issues had to do with the parking. Specifically, what we had intended to do, there are two units there to begin with. There are still two units under our proposal, but what we wanted to do is to take the bottom of the lot, which is on Ridge Street, and to create a separate entrance for one of the units from there. So the property itself is approximately 25 by 150 feet. It runs from Warburton Avenue right down to Ridge Street. That portion of Ridge Street, however, is at this point not a public street. So we had to make an application for it to become a public street. It was determined that that application would have to be made before the Board of Trustees. We have been to the Board of Trustees. We've already been to the Zoning Board once. The Board of Trustees wanted us to meet with the Safety Council. We met with the Safety Council last month, and I understand in the latest-breaking news each of those units that presently existed would be entitled to two parking spaces. They were parking on Warburton Avenue. What we proposed, and still propose, is to have a curb cut taking out one, and then having two cars be able to park for the unit facing Warburton. Now, there's a change from the last time in that we're going to have these done in tandem so that it addresses this issue of the driveway. There are also two spaces that come in from Warburton.

Now, in our initial presentation we omitted to tell you that if this plan is approved, where you have a turnaround on Ridge Street there'll not only be a net gain of three spaces on Warburton, but there will be a net gain of four spaces on Ridge Street; three which are opposite the current, much smaller, turnaround, plus one into the extension. Christina will now take over and give the entire presentation in detail.

**Christina Griffin, 433 Warburton Avenue:** Good evening. We've resubmitted the plans with a few changes, and these changes were made in response to concerns of the neighbors for view preservation. We actually did a little demonstration; went up on the roof to find out where the upper level would be in relation to the neighbors' properties.

Our original submission, even though we took photographs, we actually went a little further than that and put cones and string and demonstrated to the neighbor at 431 Warburton where the building would be. In response to his concerns, we've actually moved the third-floor wall back, and we're going to align the wall of the third-floor with his wall and the deck with his deck. This is our new site plan, which shows the alignment of the building at the top floor and the deck. We just met with the neighbor. We found that he would prefer the deck even cut back this way just to avoid a privacy problem because they're so close together.

Our site plan also has been changed to show that instead of having a driveway two cars wide we would have a single driveway with cars parking in tandem. This is to try to give some space in front of a window here, the neighbor's property, and to have a privacy screen of evergreen. One thing, even though this is shown on our site plan, we're going to go through a process of review with Westchester County in order to get a curb cut here. This approval has to be made by them before we could ever go forward with this. The idea of putting the curb cut here is so that we would eliminate one spot on the street, and give potentially two spots in tandem off-street parking.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Christina, did you go to the ZBA on this yet for the interpretation? I know it was on their agenda once.

**Ms. Griffin:** We have, and we're going there March 1st. We haven't, but this has actually been determined to be a variance.

**Chairperson Speranza:** It's a variance?

**Ms. Griffin:** It's on the noticing as a variance for parking in the front yard. Although there's a lot of question about that because the code doesn't prevent you from putting a driveway in the front yard. We want to provide parking if we can.

**Chairperson Speranza:** So you're not going for an interpretation as to whether...

**Ms. Griffin:** I think when we had the notices sent out there was a decision made.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** After Christina and I spoke about it, Christina's thinking was that it actually was a parking area. I said why don't you just go for a variance for the driveway. So they're not going to do an interpretation. The variance is for parking in a required yard.

**Chairperson Speranza:** And tandem's okay?

**Village Attorney Stecich:** No, this is the first I've heard it. See, I'm a little confused because the zoning compliance chart you had said that there were three parking spaces.

**Ms. Griffin:** Because I don't think this could be a legitimate space.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** That's right. So you could have it, you just can't count it because it has to be accessible. You can't count it as your parking space. So they would need to get a variance, I guess, for one parking space.

**Ms. Griffin:** Now we have to get a variance for not having enough parking. But, you know, this building has no parking at all, of course, now. So we were trying to do the best we can and still make sure that the cars are not right on top of the neighbors' buildings. At least this property has a greenspace and a driveway. So we reduced the width of the driveway to a single so that there'd be more greenspace here. Even though our idea for doing the driveway is to use grass block -- this is just a photograph -- we really want it to look as green as possible. So that's one change that we've made. There's a window over here, so by doing this the cars would no longer be on top of that.

Then we're also showing further development of Ridge Street. We spent more time examining this. We have a civil and structural engineer who provided details, which we've included in this set. We developed this even though we know that there's no authority here to approve this. This is not our property. But now we are going to the Board of Trustees to ask them if they would consider extending this, and they would like to know your opinion.

I just wanted to show you what we have done here. We're showing that the street is extending 66 feet 4 inches, and we're aligning the street with existing...we're extending the retaining wall, adding a guardrail. We're also going to add four parking spaces on the street because this is a no-parking zone that was made no parking so that you could have this turnaround. We also looked carefully -- you asked us to -- the Ridge Street report. One of the recommendations was to do a hammerhead turnaround, and add parking on the street.

**Mr. Wolf:** I'd like to address some of these questions before we leave the subject. That is, first of all, in my reading of the code there are actually three different points. One is -- we had discussed, or I had asked -- what a driveway is, and I said I couldn't find it in the code. So I took another look and I still couldn't find it. I couldn't find a definition in the code for Dobbs Ferry, Ardsley, Irvington, or Greenburgh either. The question of what a driveway is is a good question. According to the Merriam-Webster dictionary, it's a private road giving access from a public way to a building or abutting grounds. So we think it's a driveway.

**Boardmember Hutson:** That's water under the bridge. It's not a driveway.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Peter, Christina and I had this discussion and I thought the determination was it's a parking area. You had a choice... either convince the Zoning Board that it's a driveway, or ask the Zoning Board for a variance to permit parking. It's six of one, half-dozen of the other. So whether it's a driveway or not, it's kind of...

**Mr. Wolf:** ...moot. Because what we were trying to do was...

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Well, not that it's moot. It's tautological.

**Mr. Wolf:** But what we were trying to do is, that also in the code we found a section where it says required parking shall be provided for a lot when you're doing a renovation or a new structure. So that was another reason why we were trying to provide parking.

**Boardmember Hutson:** Just one second. I want a clarification. It must be that there has to be some magnitude of renovation before you're required to provide parking, right?

**Mr. Wolf:** ...off-street parking.

**Boardmember Hutson:** ...off-street parking, yes. I mean, what is it that triggers in an existing situation this requirement?

**Chairperson Speranza:** That's related to the question that I have. Because for the first time, in terms of making the property more marketable, you're looking to provide parking when you do the renovation. This is the first time that I've seen it on the plans, and this is something that I have a question about, to replace the existing two-and-a-half story building, the existing foundation to remain. Does that mean you're taking down the building?

**Ms. Griffin:** We're going to save as much as we can, but we know that so much of it is poorly built. There's a ceiling height in the second-floor of 6 feet 10. I think they're actually 2 by 4 joists. There's so much that doesn't comply with code: insulation values; there are zero lot line windows. There's going to be a lot. I'm not sure right now, but I'd like to keep much of the foundation and maybe some of the structure on the front part of the building.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Because what it triggered in my mind seeing this is, at what point when so much of the building is gone do you need to rebuild in compliance with current zoning. Maybe you just can't do two-families here -- it's just too much for the property.

**Ms. Griffin:** I did a comparative analysis of the 30 properties, and I did this really more or less for the Zoning Board. But I did this because it's very interesting to look at the bigger picture to see what is maybe the average number of parking spaces and setbacks in the area. What's interesting is that the average lot size of 30 properties is even less than what we have, and yet the average number of units is four.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Right, but if you're taking down a building I think you have to replace it with something which complies.

**Ms. Griffin:** We're trying to come as close as we can, I know, but I just wanted to demonstrate that even the average amount of parking spaces is 0.5.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Oh, I'm [not] talking about parking.

**Mr. Wolf:** Well, that whole area on one side of us there's three units, on the other side of us I think there's six units.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Right, all preexisting. But now you're taking down the building.

**Mr. Wolf:** Well, we don't intend to take down the whole building. We intend to use what was there on the foundation, as much of the building as we can. The question is whether it's going to be more, or less, than 50%.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Actually, I think it would be governed by a different section of the code, Patty. I know this section, but there's a section that says a one- or two-family dwelling that's conforming with respect to use, but not conforming with respect to one or more requirements -- which clearly this is -- may be enlarged or altered in such a way as not to increase the nonconformity. So what it's saying is you could rebuild it just as long as you don't increase the nonconformity.

**Boardmember Hutson:** But the proposal seems to increase the nonconformity.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** And I'm not sure if you are. Are you going higher up?

**Boardmember Hutson:** Yes.

**Ms. Griffin:** Than the building is.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** You're going higher up than the current building.

**Mr. Wolf:** We have to because the ceiling height is 6 foot 10 inches on the top floor.

**Chairperson Speranza:** But again, because you're getting two units in here.

**Ms. Griffin:** No, there are two now.

**Chairperson Speranza:** There are, right.

**Boardmember Hutson:** No, but because you're adding the part that's the new story. That's why the height is more nonconforming.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** So it would be increasing the nonconformity.

**Boardmember Hutson:** That part definitely, according to what they propose. Also in regard to footprint, you're changing footprint, right?

**Ms. Griffin:** Yes.

**Boardmember Hutson:** So there are two major areas of nonconformity. That's why I raised the whole question. I think before you go too far we better kind of resolve some of these fundamental issues here.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** That's right.

**Ms. Griffin:** It's very interesting to look at how does zoning affect development in general. Because if the zoning is so difficult -- you see so many properties, every property, nonconforming in many ways -- that it's very difficult to develop, especially when the building is so old and it is a railroad flat, it does not comply with New York State code.

**Mr. Wolf:** It's a fire trap.

**Ms. Griffin:** Fire trap means when you don't have safe egress, and you have to go through one room to get to another. Because the only way to...

**Boardmember Hutson:** Right. Christina, just to interrupt, I think the point is, resolving those issues does not inherently require taller and wider.

**Ms. Griffin:** I think it does. Because once you put a hallway in, then the rooms become so narrow. Even if you want the same number of rooms, the same units, you have to increase square footage to get the hallway in and a staircase in that meets the code. Not a 2 foot 6...

**Boardmember Hutson:** Well, that's an interpretation that I don't know that we have the authority to make, or concur with. Maybe we do, and we have to talk about it.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Well, yes, you wouldn't. It's not to say that it couldn't be done, but you would need a variance because you're increasing the nonconformity. They would need variances for increasing the nonconformity.

**Ms. Griffin:** The building is only 18 feet wide, and we want to keep that width because we know it's just a very narrow lot to begin with.

**Boardmember Hutson:** So it's the length of the building that's increasing as far as the footprint?

**Ms. Griffin:** Yes.

**Chairperson Speranza:** One of the things, we know this about Hastings and we know this about all the Village buildings that were constructed before zoning kicked in, they were built in a different time. They were built when people didn't necessarily need cars in order to walk down the hill to get to work. So this understanding that this structure does not now meet current New York State building codes -- you're trying to enhance it as is with two units in it, putting two units in there and meeting current code -- may just be more than this property can do. I don't know what would be the difference in terms of the work, in terms of what would be required, if you just had it as a one-family residence.

**Mr. Wolf:** That's why we did the comparative zoning analysis of those 30 buildings. Because you can see that they're all multi-family buildings, and the proposal that we have, on average, takes less of a footprint than the other buildings surrounding it. If you leave it the way it is, you'll just have a fire trap that is totally dilapidated. We lived in it, that's how we know how dilapidated it is. There are so many code violations there that it is almost impossible to take the structure as it is and make it conform with current code.

**Chairperson Speranza:** As a two-family unit.

**Mr. Wolf:** Correct.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Two dwelling units.

**Mr. Wolf:** So what we are allowed to do is to leave it that way, okay? It's grandfathered the way it is, and you can leave two fire traps there and you can do that for generations to come.

One of the reasons that we got excited about this project was that because having lived in that neighborhood we felt that this neighborhood is in transition. To one side -- and this is the neighbor that we had all these discussions with -- he renovated his property and put a swimming pool in. Across the street they're putting 14 new units in. We're not asking to have more. We're asking just to be able to bring it into the 21st Century. What we're trying to do is to find a way that has a tradeoff, that brings something to the whole community that enhances it. This is why we've gone so deeply into this parking issue. What we're trying to do is to enhance the neighborhood, put in something that's really attractive. Take the two units there that are nonconforming in very serious ways. They are really safety hazards.

**Boardmember Hutson:** I think even before we get to that we have to be sure that we are in a position, and have the authority, to grant such as an enhancement, as well-intentioned and as fine as it may be. This has to be something that we can actually do. No sense in going through a lot of work and effort and time unless it's something that, in fact, we have the authority -- or somebody else in the Village along with us has the authority -- to approve. That's where I'm coming from. Not to say that somehow we're going to be...

**Boardmember Logan:** I got a question on the basic mechanism. It seems like you need some variances from the Zoning Board, right? Is the Zoning Board going to look to us for a recommendation? Is that how this sequence works? Because I think you could make a very compelling case that this is a hardship and that the variances should be granted based on the nature of the neighborhood and the community and safety issues. So if you say there is a good case, but it's their responsibility to present it to the Zoning Board, we're looking at this for site plan review, right? If they don't get the zoning variances, it's not our responsibility.

**Boardmember Hutson:** It seems to me there is some overlap in terms of when you're talking about the footprint increase, given what the code says, and so on. And I don't think we can do it without them going for the variances. So I guess you're right; a lot of it really depends on what the ZBA would have to say about it.



**Boardmember Logan:** The ZBA will take into consideration: is this increase a nonconformity and so forth, and maybe it is. But if there's a compelling reason because of egress and fire safety, that's very good grounds to grant that.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** There have been situations where the Planning Board has made a recommendation to the Zoning Board about variances. You did it on the big Warburton project. Doesn't happen a lot, but there are cases where it makes sense and this might be one of those cases. Technically, under the code, all applications for variances are supposed to go to the Planning Board first for recommendation before it goes to the Zoning Board. In fact, you've never done it that way and most of the time it's not necessary. The only thing is, the applicant has to recognize that they may spend time before the Planning Board, the Planning Board makes it's recommendation for the variances, approves the site plan dependent on getting the variances, and then you go for the variances and don't get them.

Then you're back to square one. But on the other hand, I know what Bill's saying, and it makes some sense. If the Board felt that this was the kind of case they would like to make a recommendation because they recognize that it's unusual and maybe there would be some benefits to this development, then you could. But it would be the Board's choice.

**Ms. Griffin:** You know, I want to say that when I lived here -- and I knew a lot of neighbors -- I feel like the development is almost stalled in this area because people feel it's impossible to get all the variances they need. The buildings are very old, and there are a lot of railroad flats. When I did this analysis I looked at the property cards. I also feel there's a lot of work that is not shown in the property cards because I think people are afraid to get the variances they need. I know in other neighborhoods in Westchester, when you have no parking in a neighborhood like this, they find ways for funding to create little parking pockets. The one exception that this property has -- almost all these properties except for one or two -- it goes from Warburton to Ridge, and the building is in the middle of the lot. The building has a big setback in the front and back, so I have an opportunity to get some parking on the property.

I took on this challenge because I felt that it's not easy for most people to develop these properties. How many times are you going to have a Division Street property, where somebody buys all these lots, a big piece of land? Would you really want that? What about the individual property owners? There are many individuals that have serious problems with the buildings. What if they would need to do a major upgrade? Our building, the windows, you can't...they don't fit in the opening, the storm windows pop out. The code says if you have to replace more than 50% of a building component you have to replace everything up to code. All the windows on the zero lot line have to come out because you're not allowed to have windows on the property line because of the fire passes. Then you need to put in, of course, a fire corridor. It actually will mean that you have to have a slightly bigger house, even if you don't want it slightly bigger. Well, I don't know, you have to add a certain percentage to the square footage just to meet the code even if you want to have the same

number of bedrooms and units there. I think a lot of this is in the hands of the Zoning Board, deciding on the footprint and the variances that we need.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Is that included in the notice?

**Ms. Griffin:** Which one?

**Village Attorney Stecich:** The variances for, I guess, the side yard.

**Mr. Wolf:** I believe the side yard variances and the floor variances.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** The height was because it was the number of stories, right?

**Mr. Wolf:** Yes, because the height is not nonconforming. It's only the number of stories.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** I know that's before them. The side yards were also?

**Ms. Griffin:** Yes.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** They're already scheduled to meet on it on March 1st, right?

**Ms. Griffin:** To meet the side yard setbacks you would end up with a 9-foot wide building.

**Mr. Wolf:** And if you wanted to put a driveway in which was 12-foot wide, you'd owe the Village 3 feet. You have to look at the reality of this neighborhood. This is one of the things that attracted us was the fact that this looked to be a neighborhood that was in need of a transition. If any building needs to be taken and strongly renovated it is this building, which we personally know why it needs this renovation.

**Boardmember Hutson:** We don't necessarily doubt that. We take your word for it. It just doesn't necessarily have to be renovated this way, I'm sure, from what Patty's saying; and the second thing is we have to make sure of is that as we proceed there's no use in spinning your wheels or ours in terms of how we go about this. Just trying to clarify what your question is. For example, adding the story may be the easier thing to okay as far as a variance. I don't know because, as you say, it's within the height limit. On the other hand, it's probably not necessary in order to make the building safer. When you get into this I think it really has to be thought through. The fact that many of the other structures in the area also require attention and so on, I don't think you can use that as the basis for what you do in this project and ignore the zoning.

**Ms. Griffin:** One thing I'm not sure, but I think I disagree. Because I've been to other towns that have this problem, and I know they're increasingly going in this direction where they want a comparison. So at least if they do grant the variances you're within the scale of the houses in the neighborhood. So when you show the averages, the averages...

**Boardmember Hutson:** Scale is an important issue. No, I'm not saying it's not an issue.

**Ms. Griffin:** That if the average lot coverage is 43 and the maximum is at 50, and we're at 39, we're still under, in most ways, an average number of units. And a lot of the lots are only 25 feet wide like this one. And average number of units in 30 properties is four; we want two. And even the average lot size is less, 3,100; we're at 3,007. The advantage of this lot is, it goes all the way back. A lot of these don't. So they're not as big. Actually, there's greater density on the street than is on this particular lot.

So I hope this will be a basis for their consideration of variances because it's very difficult. If you told every property owner, "Well, your building should be only 9 feet wide, we can't grant it, it's just unreasonable. I don't know if you've read about zoning." Zoning is so inappropriate, and so many houses are nonconforming in many ways. It actually had kind of a negative impact on development. Because people, when they come to town, they won't invest. They'll go somewhere else where they know they can get...

**Boardmember Hutson:** Right. But if you'll remember, this area was reviewed as part of the downtown review on zoning. And one of the issues that was talked about then was that we wanted to preserve the neighborhood character. And if you opened it up too much, one of the concerns was that properties would be bought up and that there would be huge developments and so on. So we can't have it both ways. I'm not saying you're trying to have it both ways, but I mean we as a Village can't have it both ways.

**Mr. Wolf:** Yet there's 14 units going up across the street.

**Boardmember Hutson:** With a larger social purpose.

**Mr. Wolf:** All right, but next door to us when we were there, there was one elderly gentleman living there. Now there are three units there that were approved and it's relatively the same size. We're not even asking for any type of an increase. All we're asking is to make the two uninhabitable units, according to state code, habitable and sellable.

**Boardmember Hutson:** No, you're asking for an increase ... which is reasonable.

**Ms. Griffin:** He means in number of units.

**Mr. Wolf:** We're not asking for an increase in the number of units, as was done. We are just asking to take the two units that are, according to law, uninhabitable and making them habitable, attractive to the community, and sellable.

**Boardmember Dale:** The issue in part is what was the intent of the zoning, since the zoning was imposed on an existing structure. I know a number of examples from New York City where they created a large number of nonconforming uses when they passed the zoning in 1960, which was the original zoning act. What was the intent? If the zoning that you were imposing on this neighborhood was intended to preserve it, but all it will allow this owner to do is build a one-family house, are you, in fact, preserving, when it's been demonstrated that the context is different than that. The context is two- and three-family houses. So it's really the bulk of the house that you're concerned with and those are variances.

It would seem to me a reasonable variance being requested, since they're not trying to create something that's out of scale for the neighborhood as demonstrated by the context. So it's a question of what is the intent of the zoning, and is this in compliance with the intent. I think they make a reasonable argument to have zoning grant these variances. I have no problem from a planning perspective accepting what they want to do here.

**Boardmember Alligood:** I want to talk from a planning perspective, too, in that I would be concerned if the outcome of our decision was to force this property to lower its density. I think that ... this proposal, from the standpoint of density, is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood. Now, with respect to the issue, what kind of variances should be granted. It sounds like there's some question as to whether that needs to be referred to the Zoning Board and what our position is. But I do just want to state, from a planning perspective, that it troubles me to think that in order to renovate a property we have to force it to downsize in terms of density.

**Mr. Wolf:** It very well may not happen then. Then you have this uninhabitable building.

**Boardmember Dale:** Well, it's a valuable property. Somebody might very well buy it from you to make a one-family house out of it.

**Mr. Wolf:** Maybe they would.

**Ms. Griffin:** Actually, further down on Warburton you have four new townhouses. They're individual houses, and they've got, I think, 500 square feet. I think there's a market for these luxury townhouses.

**Boardmember Dale:** It doesn't sound to me like that was the intent of the zoning.

**Mr. Wolf:** Yes, it changes the character of that multi-family area. You know, if there are more questions on this I'll be glad to talk about it. Otherwise, I just wanted to address one other point that you had raised last time.

You asked us whether this proposal for Ridge Street actually conformed with the Ridge Street report, so we went back and got the Ridge Street report. On page one of the Ridge Street report, I'm quoting from the last paragraph, second sentence. "In particular, the Village should remain vigilant with respect to opportunities for additional parking and other uses possible for the Village." Toward the back in the Ridge Street report, one of the things that was suggested was what is called the hammerhead turn, which is exactly what we are proposing for Ridge Street.

**Ms. Griffin:** Just to backtrack, we're going to give 9 feet of this as an easement so that 9 feet of this property could be used as a turnaround. Then still beyond that, of course, there would be two parking spaces for the lower unit on grass block. One thing I really like about this neighborhood is, even though there's all this density there are wonderful little pockets of greenspace. There's little terraces and little orchard trees. So as much as possible we want to put sort of a greenspace here.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Christina, do you know -- what you show as the end of the to-be-improved -- does that take it to the end of the right-of-way?

**Mr. Wolf:** No, it continues further. It's just that if you remember last time there were a number of the abutting property owners to the paper street and they all had different ideas. What we concluded was, we're making application for this, and if they feel that they want to have extensions they can make their own applications. But we're just making an application for the 66 feet.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Yes, was that the Board of Trustees meeting?

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Yes.

**Mr. Wolf:** I'm sorry, I think it was. I think you're right. You're right, it was the Board of Trustees.

**Ms. Griffin:** This is the map, there's a copy of the tax map. You see what's in pink is 433. There are, I think, three properties that go from Warburton to Ridge. The one next to us already has parking on-site, accessible from Warburton. There's one more property to the south. So our turnaround would end just beyond the property line.

**Boardmember Hutson:** In regard to the parking, I think the Ridge Street part of it is far and away the best part of it. And I guess that you really prefer -- let's assume you weren't required to do something on Warburton -- you still would prefer to do something on Warburton. Is that accurate or not, in regard to parking?

**Ms. Griffin:** Instead? I'm sorry.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Could you forget about parking on Warburton?

**Boardmember Hutson:** If you weren't required to do it.

**Chairperson Speranza:** And have your parking in the back on Ridge so you're not parking in the front yard.

**Mr. Wolf:** We think, because of the width, only the unit that would be facing Ridge would be able to park on Ridge. If we were not permitted to have the driveway, then those two cars would end up on Warburton Avenue.

**Ms. Griffin:** No, I didn't think it was possible to have any more than two. It's a very narrow lot; you can only put two. Plus, actually I'm very familiar with Ridge. I designed the four townhouses. I feel like there should be a real turnaround here. It, of course, benefits this property to give access. But also it just seems like a terrible bottleneck, this street. So there's a benefit for the street as well as this property only giving two cars. You can't actually go too far in -- it's too steep here -- if you wanted to do four in tandem.

**Boardmember Hutson:** I guess what I'm saying is, let's assume that they would have to park on Warburton. To me, when you do a curb cut it doesn't always work that you take out the exact one parking space. Everything is not so symmetrical, the way people park. So very often you end up interfering with more than just that one parking space. Plus, when you're doing tandem there's always a good chance that only one car's going to be in here anyway. So you may actually end up, at a practical level, with a net loss as far as parking in that area. So when you consider the traffic coming across the sidewalk, the danger of pulling from a yard -- especially backing into a street, like when you've got cars parked there -- and when you think about the neighbors and having cars parked in the front yard, it just seems to me that there's a chance that from a public point of view there's a net gain by leaving it like it is on Warburton so you only have two spots. Now, that may not be the requirement, but I'm saying you'd probably prefer to have that as an attraction to the unit.

**Mr. Wolf:** Theoretically that's true, except that we actually measured it.

**Boardmember Hutson:** Yes, I say if everybody parked neat, fine.

**Mr. Wolf:** No, there's another driveway for the next lot.

**Boardmember Hutson:** To the north.

**Mr. Wolf:** Right. So there would be one parking place there, then there would be the curb cut, then it would be existing. Now, there are at least two other spaces there, maybe three. You don't sacrifice any spaces other than the one from the curb cut. So if you argue that perhaps only one car would fit there, then that would be a wash.

**Boardmember Hutson:** That's what I'm saying. It probably is a wash, and you still have the crossing of sidewalk and all that. I'm just raising it as a consideration. I think the Ridge Street part is great when it comes to the parking. The front yard is not as much a plus, I think, as the Ridge Street.

**Ms. Griffin:** You know, I've spoken to some of the neighbors. There's actually quite a few driveways on Warburton Avenue.

**Boardmember Hutson:** Yes, I know.

**Ms. Griffin:** At least this building is set back, and there's always grade space here. So you have better sight lines coming out of this drive than some of them because you're not right in between two buildings.

I still think there's benefit getting the cars off the street, and doing it in a way that it doesn't look like a driveway. We'd like to make the opening as narrow as possible, too, to give more flexibility. It's only tandem to make sure that we give some more greenspace between the cars and the building here, which has a few windows on it. I just might like to finish the changes that we made, just to go through the whole set of drawings to show you that we modified the view preservation sketches so that we could show the change.

We want to align the new railing above with the neighbor's railing, and the western wall with that western wall. We are bringing up the building slightly just so we have an 8-foot ceiling height in here. And we're going to keep all the floor levels at the same level; minimum 8-foot ceiling height. We just spoke to the neighbor and he's just asked if we could bring this railing in even more -- like 8 feet more -- and we've agreed to that. Make sure that they're not that close to each other so it wouldn't be such a privacy issue. We've also included all the steep slopes details, the drainage calculations that are needed for steep slopes. We met with Deven, and he still needs to do his review. According to the code, the Building Inspector does a review to see where we've complied with the requirements for steep slopes and then he refers it to your board. So we don't need to talk about that tonight.

This is our third floor, just showing that the western walls align, the decks align, and now we're going to push the deck back a little. The slight extension to the footprint is in the front. You know, it is one of the tiniest houses on the street. And we felt that it could handle a partial upper floor which, of course, takes in this incredible view of the river. Also, we wanted to make sure that this is no higher than the building next to us. Because the grade slopes down, actually the neighbor has asked another request. That we have some kind of a benchmark just to show that this building is not going to be any higher. But his building next door, the first floor of this building lines up with his level. And we have 8-foot ceiling heights, and he has 8, 9, and 9. So I'm sure that we'll be under the height of his building. This just shows how we cut back the upper level, and also this section is shown the same way. I just wanted you to know.

**Mr. Wolf:** In summary, what we're asking for is a positive ruling from you with regard to the view preservation, the site plan, and, because the Board of Trustees also has requested that, the extension of Ridge Street for 66 feet to make it a public road, public street.

**Chairperson Speranza:** To have it improved as part of this.

**Mr. Wolf:** Right. In other words, what they had wanted us to do is to get a recommendation from the Planning Board and a recommendation from the Safety Council.

**Chairperson Speranza:** This is a public hearing, is there anybody who wishes to speak?

**John Ciborowski, 443 Warburton Avenue:** Again I'm here. Mr. Hutson stole most of my thunder, but I don't feel that that parking area off Warburton is a necessity. There's a number of reasons why. Sure, there's other driveways there, but most of them are on 50-foot lots, not 25-foot lots. Property is there for a reason. You can only do so much with a piece of property. You can't make more on it than what it is. The plans I saw show one car now. It says one car for the parking there. Now, if you're going to put two tandem there's going to be car shuffling going on. The biggest thing is the safety issue. You have to understand, this is the most densely populated area of the Village. We have young families with carriages, we have senior citizens. Most of them walk into the Village back and forth, going up there, crossing the sidewalk.

Even, as Mr. Hutson said, cars don't park that way, I cannot believe we're only going to lose one space. Just take a look now with the snow and they'll show you on Warburton Avenue the way it is right now. But ... the house to the south of it is right on the sidewalk, it's blind. If here's the roadway, people are going to park to here, to here. They're going to have to go out into the opposite way of traffic to move these cars.

It's going to be terribly dangerous for the individuals in the area, and I don't think that's a solution to a problem. It may be nicer for them to have it for their tenants, because it looks as though this is quite the project now it's becoming for this piece of property. But safety-wise, and for the town itself, you're going to start a precedent with this parking. There's going to be more of it now, and it's going to be terrible with all these cutouts on Warburton Avenue. So we have to stop it, and I don't feel that it should be permitted. Thank you.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Thank you. Does anyone else wish to comment on this?

**Jim Metzger, 427 Warburton Avenue:** I have to say, in general, I'm in favor of this project. The house that sits there, we all know, is very substandard. We have homeowners now who are looking to make significant improvement to that.

I also have issues about parking in the front yard. If the parking was not allowed on Ridge Street I would be in favor of not allowing the parking in the front yard. The reason for that is, right now they're taking two potential cars off of Warburton Avenue by being able to park them in the back of the building and providing additional spaces on Ridge. I believe there are people here from Ridge Street that will speak to whether that's a plus or a minus for the people that live on Ridge Street. If they're taking two cars off of Warburton to put in the back of the building, then I'm willing to give up a parking space on Warburton that I would potentially need to use to give them parking in their front yard. I see that as a good tradeoff. If they don't have the two parking spots on Ridge Street, all of a sudden now there are the additional cars on Warburton and this curb cut would basically be just for the use of whoever is occupying the top two floors of this unit.

I like the fact that the building, in terms of its height, is keeping in character with the neighborhood, unlike the building across the street that was approved. There's a little sideways move I'm making here: those of you that are unhappy with 45 Main, I think you're going to be unhappy with the size of the buildings that are going in at 422. This building is specifically trying to avoid that issue by staying within the character of the neighborhood. In terms of the zoning issue that you've discussed, there are some real zoning issues. And there's some real issues about how this neighborhood is going to grow as people move in.

One issue that has never been addressed in the Village, and I think we can address it tonight very quickly, a lot of people that live on Warburton Avenue in that area live in rentals. I spoke to somebody who lives in that neighborhood. She's third-generation Hastings. Every time a building gets improved on Warburton Avenue the landlords -- the landlords who are not living in their own buildings -- decide to raise their rents because the area's getting nicer.



We're starting to lose affordability even in the buildings that are not being improved. I'm not asking these applicants to reduce the quality of their building, but it's something as a community we need to start thinking about. As we raise the level of our community, it makes it less affordable for the people that have been living here that are renting. That's a general issue for the community to start to discuss.

Aside from that I think it's a very handsome project. It may be a little bigger than I would like to see. The building that's there now is just two stories; they're now looking at ostensibly four stories. I know technically it's three-and-a-half. But they're looking to put six bedrooms into this building and I know there are not six bedrooms now. Six bedrooms, to me, means there are going to be kids and possibly more than two cars per unit. So that's something that I think we need to look at as we move forward. Thank you.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Thank you.

**Bill Kennedy, 431 Warburton Avenue:** I'm the house on the south border. I had spoken with Christina and Peter about certain issues that I didn't like, and they agreed to move everything behind my house. I didn't like the third floor going up on the Warburton side, but it's going to be behind my building. I'm not going to have a big problem with that as long as I'm not going to have strangers right next to my deck looking into my bedroom.

One issue that I have that I didn't get to speak with them about is, in bringing the building out I thought it was coming about 6 feet. I just before the meeting found out that part of the building's actually coming out 10 feet. I have bathroom windows there, and I'd rather they didn't have these two windows right catty-corner with my bathroom because it seems like a privacy issue for me. I just realized that now as I was looking through the plans. So I have an issue with that, and I hope they could adjust that.

Those are my main issues. It was just my view because I have a spectacular view and I don't want barbecues and all things like that on the other side of where they're going to put the fences to conceal their deck. Because I'm also concerned that the future owners if they sell it after it's improved, might want to extend the deck on the roof because it's, you know, a long roof. It's probably another 40 feet out. That would be in front of my deck, blocking my view. . That's all I can think of right now. Thank you.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Thank you. Boardmembers, the application's here for site plan approval and view preservation. For view preservation we make a recommendation to the Zoning Board of Appeals. Questions, comments? Are we ready to move on anything?

**Boardmember Hutson:** I guess the one is involved with the other. View preservation, I think, is the easiest one in this case. There doesn't seem to be, now with the relocation...that upper floor, I'm not sure that expansion of the space makes sense. But on the other hand, I don't think it seems to have much of an impact on the view. So that's the easiest part for me. The other part, ill would have to give some consideration to this larger footprint and also the front yard parking. If we're involved in those two issues, those are my primary concerns.

**Boardmember Dale:** I think that a number of the issues that remain are really zoning issues. I repeat what I said earlier, that it's the intent of the zoning that has to be respected. Certainly the Zoning Board could decide whether they're willing to grant the variances, but I think it's clear the project has tried to stay within the character of the neighborhood, improve the property, and I'm in favor of the project going forward. I had a bit of a problem with that top floor. It was like pasted up on top, and extra height that wasn't really necessary for the development. But I think the architect has done extraordinarily well to pull this together to make it into a very solid project, a well-designed project, which I think I would support subject to the zoning review. I think it stays within the character of the neighborhood.

The issue of the front parking and whether it's a driveway or a parking space I think is...I think it would be preferable not to have a car in the front yard. Under any normal circumstances, without the steep slope between Warburton and Ridge, parking in the back of the house would not be a problem. They could walk around to the front of the house. That's somewhat precluded here by the height. So I think I would consider the variance of parking in the one spot and parking in the driveway. I think they've accommodated the neighborhood. If I remember the discussion about who's bedroom window was in the basement and would be looking out at a parking garage, I think they've done very well to adjust that. So I think I would even support the one spot in the driveway.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Okay, just in terms of process, site plan, right now it's site plan for us. If we were to approve the site plan as proposed with that parking area in the front, then it's not one space or two spaces. The tandem would have to be something that ends up being something that the Zoning Board of Appeals...

**Boardmember Dale:** It's a zoning issue.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Right.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** You know, as I'm thinking about it, it may not even. Because if they're not reducing the number of parking spaces they had before and they're not changing the use, they may be grandfathered in for the number of parking spaces. I think somebody had asked that. David asked that question before. So if you've got a one-family house that doesn't have enough parking spaces and you renovate it ... I'd have to talk to Deven about it.

**Boardmember Hutson:** That's what I'm saying. At what point does it require that part of the code apply.

**Chairperson Speranza:** I don't think the parking is being proposed simply to meet the zoning code.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** No. That's a separate issue. But your question was whether they have to decide on the tandem parking. The only issue with the tandem parking is whether it counts as a parking space. You can do it, but does it count as your parking space.

**Boardmember Dale:** But I think parking in tandem will reduce the safety of allowing one car to park and use it as a driveway. I think the point is there could be shuffling of cars. That is a safety issue.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Well, then, that would be a site plan issue.

**Boardmember Dale:** Right. So as a site plan issue, I would allow one car and not in tandem.

**Boardmember Hutson:** Up here, Christina, may I ask one other question? In regard to the change in footprint from 925 to 1,501, how much of that is patio? Do you know off-hand? Is there a patio there now?

**Ms. Griffin:** There is a patio in front.

**Boardmember Hutson:** I guess what I'm asking is, of this 575 square foot increase in footprint, how much of it is structure for this patio, or is it all structure?

**Ms. Griffin:** This patio is probably about...

**Boardmember Hutson:** Because it's like a 60% increase in square footage, that's what I'm saying. And if it's all structure, and I'm trying to judge from the drawing, it's a lot.

**Ms. Griffin:** Three-hundred-sixty square feet which includes the patio...

**Boardmember Hutson:** But how much of it is represented in the increase is what I'm trying to figure out.

**Mr. Wolf:** While Christina's looking that up...

**Ms. Griffin:** It's very complicated.

**Mr. Wolf:** I just wanted to go back to this parking issue. I think I can add some light to it because I've talked to the county. First of all, although we initially decided to move that parking place, or driveway, whatever you want to call it, over. And to do tandem was in respect to a request that was made by our neighbor. But in looking at it, and looking at the safety aspect of it, we thought that that was a much more appropriate place because you have sight lines on both sides. The building that Mr. Kennedy occupies is near the sidewalk, so by putting it on the other side you get the sight line of the street. On the other side is another driveway, so you get a sight line of that street. But in talking to the county in terms of the application for the curb cut, the main thing they look at is safety. They actually have four engineers review it, so the safety consideration, I think, is tantamount in their consideration.

**Chairperson Speranza:** So that's pending, right? That application?

**Mr. Wolf:** Yes.

**Ms. Griffin:** The footprint of the existing building is 881. And the increase includes the new patio, which is 240 square feet. So the total increase...

**Boardmember Hutson:** Yes, 12 versus 8, 400 and something.

**Ms. Griffin:** The new footprint of just the building is 1,152. The original is 881. The increase is 271 square feet, which is this piece.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** 1,152, but you said the patio was 2-something. That comes to more than 1,500 something.

**Ms. Griffin:** We include the patio in the footprint.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Right, but you said the patio was 200 and some, so if you add 1,152 to 200-some you get 1,300-some.

**Ms. Griffin:** Yes, and the footprint proposed is 1,392.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** No, mine say 1,501.

**Boardmember Dale:** Yes, mine says 1,501 also.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** No, it's 1,501, Christina.

**Ms. Griffin:** I'm sorry, it is 1,500. This is different because we did not add the patio space. The building and patio originally is 925. The increase of the building and the patio is 1,501.

**Boardmember Hutson:** I guess visually, on S-1, the diagonal lines are all new footprint?

**Chairperson Speranza:** Fred, anything else?

**Boardmember Wertz:** Not really. I'm happy to see the change in view preservation, which makes it that much more workable to me. Sounds from the discussion like the main issue is the parking on Warburton, so I think that's the main thing to be dealt with both in terms of the safety issue and, I guess, secondarily the aesthetics.

**Boardmember Alligood:** I have concerns about the safety issue. I think having engineers looking at it would be very helpful because it is of concern. It's not necessary to the project. I could see it as a convenience that would improve the marketability, but other than that I think it's a lovely project. The fact that it's such a long property that goes from one street to another, I'm not as concerned about the increase in the footprint because I think you have the space there and it comes down the hill in an interesting way. Looking at it from the street on Warburton, it's certainly in keeping with the height of the other buildings. It's not hovering over anything next to it, and you've addressed some of the neighbor's concerns about obstructing the views. I think you've worked on that piece of it. So I guess I concur with my fellow Boardmembers that the remaining issue really is that front yard parking.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Okay, so what I'm hearing is that we may not be at a point right now, all of us anyway, to sign off on site plan.

**Boardmember Logan:** I would probably defer to the county in terms of the safety issue. I think it's basically a tossup whether from the Village's perspective it's better to have a curb cut and parking on the site as opposed to that car which would occupy the curb cut being on the street. I think there's some tradeoff. So I don't like it, but I can see how I think it's almost neutral. Maybe there's a net plus advantage if both spaces are used. I don't know whether we could formulate this recommendation because we don't have the Westchester County DOT recommendation yet. I think for view preservation it works fine... they've made a lot of concessions. I think the scale, having that third floor on the Warburton side, helps it. It's more in scale with the neighborhood. The footprint I have no problem with. I think it's a well-designed building. I think it's important that we address these security issues. I'm frankly ambivalent about the parking spot. I probably shouldn't be ambivalent, but I can see arguments both ways.

**Mr. Wolf:** I'd just like to offer one suggestion, and that is to break it into two proposals. Take out the parking for the time being, and have the approval not including the parking, and then have us return after the county has issued their report.

**Chairperson Speranza:** No, not for site plan. What I was going to suggest was that maybe at this point we could have a vote on the view preservation.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Because the site plan approval is dependent on the variances. If they don't get the variances there'll have to be another site plan approval.

**Boardmember Logan:** But only effectively making a recommendation to the Zoning Board here, are they going to be aware of what our deliberations are? Are we going to formulate something? Is it going to be transmitted for now? We've been to three or four meetings here, we've listened to public comments. That should be worth something. The Zoning Board should have access to that. This is a lot of hard-earned discussion, and it should be a valid input into the deliberations. Whether legally or not, I don't know whether that's true.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** No, that's fair. It wouldn't happen, though, unless you come to some agreement on it. They wouldn't just get your discussion. The Board would have to come to some agreement on it. You might want to make a recommendation on the variance.

**Boardmember Logan:** I think we could easily make a recommendation, I'm assuming, if the parking lot wasn't there. Now, in terms of mechanisms to come back later and try to get it reinstated, I don't know what the repercussions of that are. But if you want to say we'll take it off the plate, then it sounds like we could agree on it.

**Mr. Wolf:** I would be willing to do that because we don't have any assurance as to what the county's going to decide. So that if the county decided in a negative way, then it would have to come off anyway. So that if we separate the two, take out the tandem parking -- the driveway, get an approval on that -- and then come back and just have the narrow issue of the parking, then it would be satisfactory to us.

**Chairperson Speranza:** I don't know what that buys you.

**Boardmember Logan:** That's at their risk. If Peter is saying take it off the plate, then let's vote on that.

**Mr. Wolf:** Yes, we would take it off the plate with the understanding that if the county approved we would return. If they did not approve, it would be moot.

**Boardmember Logan:** But you may get a positive sentiment from us then, or not perhaps.

**Mr. Wolf:** That's correct.

**Boardmember Dale:** The county can very well say yes, and we'll say, no.

**Mr. Wolf:** I understand that.

**Chairperson Speranza:** So essentially -- let me make sure that I'm hearing this correctly -- what you would be doing would be submitting a revised site plan to us for approval which would not have parking on Warburton Avenue. Is that what I'm hearing?

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Yes, otherwise you're doing a hypothetical site plan. You can't do that.

**Ms. Griffin:** I think even if you approve it we'd still have to go to the county. They do such a study of this that maybe you'd rather even make your decision based on the information the county comes up with. If they deny it, then we wouldn't even be coming back.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Again, I just want to make sure.

**Mr. Wolf:** The answer to your question's yes.

**Ms. Griffin:** Yes.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Okay, so we would vote...if it was the sense of the Board, we would be voting to approve the project, the site plan for this project, with the elimination of the parking area in front of the house.

**Mr. Wolf:** Correct.

**Chairperson Speranza:** I have to sign these things, so what I signed would show that.

**Mr. Wolf:** Yes.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Does that do it?

**Boardmember Hutson:** Yes, I can live with the other change, I think. But I would want you to know, regardless of what the county says, I think that parking in the front yard is a bad idea and I would vote against it. That's neither here nor there for the moment, but so you know where I'm coming from.

**Boardmember Logan:** Right now that's not in front of us.

**Mr. Wolf:** So to review, we're asking for view preservation, the site plan, and the recommendation to the Board of Trustees on the 66-foot extension of Ridge Street. That's what we're requesting.

**Mr. Metzger:** I had a question. Do any of the decisions that you're making tonight impact upon the fact that the number of bedrooms in these two units is increasing significantly?

**Chairperson Speranza:** No.

**Mr. Metzger:** Okay, answered my question.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Okay, then I'll entertain a motion, first of all, for a recommendation to the Zoning Board of Appeals for view preservation.

**On MOTION of Boardmember Dale, SECONDED by Boardmember Alligood with a voice vote of all in favor, the Board resolved to recommend approval for view preservation to the Zoning Board.**

**On MOTION of Boardmember Dale, SECONDED by Boardmember Logan with a voice vote of all in favor, the Board resolved for site plan approval for proposal to be revised showing no parking on the Warburton Avenue side of this property.**

**Chairperson Speranza:** We will see those plans and get them signed. Marianne, you look like we're doing something really, really wrong.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** No, just be careful what you sign.

**Chairperson Speranza:** I'll be very careful what I sign.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Yes, I know you will. I'm just not comfortable with hypothetical site plans, but I think the understanding is very clear.

**Boardmember Logan:** It's on the drawings, whatever. It's easy.

**Boardmember Hutson:** And the shrubbery changes, and there's actual grass.

**On MOTION of Boardmember Logan, SECONDED by Boardmember Dale with a voice vote of all in favor, the Board resolved to recommend to the Board of Trustees that Ridge Street be extended as shown in these plans.**

**Chairperson Speranza:** That's it. Thank you.

**Mr. Wolf:** Thank you very much.

**Chairperson Speranza:** There are still a few agenda items. We won't be here long.

**V. Discussion Items.**

**1. Steep Slopes**

**Chairperson Speranza:** There were a number of items that came up at our last meeting with respect to steep slopes, the Steep Slope Ordinance, and where we thought there needed to be some items strengthened, changed, or reevaluated. We received from Marianne...

**Boardmember Hutson:** Very nice research.

**Boardmember Wertz:** Excellent research.

**Chairperson Speranza:** ...a good summary of what our points were that evening, and some ideas for how to address them in the vote. I also received from Jamie Cameron, who could not be here today -- he's bicycling in New Zealand -- what his thoughts were in a very nicely organized way. What I would like us to do, since the hour is late now, is for each of you to comment...and Bill and David, you might know -- you did this once before. ... what the responses were. The issues are there, we have a few new issues. That would have been a separate mailing even.

**Boardmember Wertz:** It was.

**Chairperson Speranza:** If you didn't, we'll catch up. Because it is something that we do need to devote some time to, and not at 11 o'clock at night. Now, I know prior to our last meeting when steep slopes was on the agenda we did receive correspondence from Mr. Piccone, who I see in the audience. And I can only imagine you've stayed here this long so that you could talk to us about this. Do you have something specific?

**John Piccone, 33 Maple Avenue:** The reason why I listened intently at the last meeting -- I wasn't here, but I did review it -- was, it seems to me that the steep slope issue always comes up when you have a larger project in front of you. But they're never a subject of steep slopes. So my thinking is, why don't you make them subject to steep slopes. Because the problem is that it's only on a subdivision, and the subdivisions are usually -- and I may be wrong, but correct me if I am -- but the subdivisions are usually for smaller, one- and two-lots. The largest one I know of is that three-lot on Ravensdale perhaps.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Right.

**Mr. Piccone:** But the problem is that you have a property on West Main Street which the whole community is not thrilled about, I guess is a good way to put it; some are, most aren't. But the problem is that if that property were subject to steep slopes you would have a lot of people a lot happier. But you're forced to go ahead with that steep slope issue without limiting someone to build up to 25%, or disturb 25%, of that property. So in other words, the existing footprint that was there that's flat would be fine, but they couldn't disturb more than 25% of the slope going down to the parking lot. So my thinking is, if you want control, take control. Make all of the steep slopes subject to steep slopes, not just the subdivisions.



Now, I have a product of a subdivision, which is a lot I bought probably about five years ago, maybe seven actually, to build a home on some day for myself whenever I get finished with whatever I'm doing next door over here some day, okay? So the problem is that that lot is 20,000 square feet. Only 25% of it is disturbable because it's mostly 25%, if not all. I think it all is. But the problem is that then two years later the methodology of measuring height was not straight up and down, perpendicular to the slope. And even worse, with the existing slope prior to any change to that slope. So now what you have is, I have to build down the slope, which was the reasoning that it was done. No one wanted to see platforming. But the reality of it is, you have to do platforming to get some kind of a front yard and some kind of a back yard. So you're going to have platforms, no matter where you build on steep slopes, most of the time to some degree. You have a minimal scenario.

But if you push a house down a slope, what you're doing is you're saying you have to go farther down the slope but you still have to stick with the 25% disturbance. So you're taking away square footage because you're not allowing people to go up; you're saying now you have to go down. But when you do down, you have to go farther down the slope. So now one could say, "Well, if you're going to make me go down the slope, then give me more disturbance area, like 35%." You would stop your platforming, but you would allow me to continue to build the same size house that I could have built, which is only disturbing 25% of the property. That theoretically includes a 5-foot print around the side of the foundation for disturbance, the driveway. You know, it's a lot. So 25% on that property would mean that you would do a 2,500 square foot footprint on a house, and then the driveway, the garage.

It all adds up. It's a large lot, it's double the size of most building lots, and it was the product of a subdivision and it does say that it's subject to steep slopes. So I'm acutely aware that I am, in theory, subject to steep slopes and it's a really tough lot to build. I'm also aware that one can come, and if there's a reasonable cause the steep slopes can be...certain other mitigations can be done and you can disturb more than 25% if it's practicable, or whatever the proper terminology is. But the problem is that you're discussing changes that really will affect mostly people with small scenarios, not big ones that really are concerning the people in this community. The gas station on 45 Main. It was flat, then it went up, and then there were slopes. That's huge. I don't know how many units it is. It's 30 units or something?

**Boardmember Hutson:** Twenty-seven.

**Mr. Piccone:** Yes, it's a lot of units, and the mass is probably bigger than anyone...well, I'm sure there's some architects here who knew how big it would be, but it's big. I don't know if you needed four stories, I don't even know if the project will ever make it off the ground and actually get sold out. I don't think so, but maybe it's a 40% reduction.

**Chairperson Speranza:** I'll hope you're wrong.

**Mr. Piccone:** Well, if it doesn't sell for him, it'll sell for someone else. It doesn't matter. It all will sell, but not for this developer necessarily.

**Chairperson Speranza:** We won't talk about specific projects.

**Mr. Piccone:** Right. So my concern is that you try to make...if you're going to make restrictions, make restrictions. But make it a level playing field. Don't just pick on the people that have one house, and say they have 20,000 square feet. They have all flat land. And then all of a sudden in the corner there's 2,500 square feet that is a steep slope. Now, that person can do a subdivision and comply with the steep slopes with doing very little disturbance. But if you take that person and you make them deduct that 25% of steep slopes, and you're going to render their subdivision useless, their property useless? That wouldn't be fair, and I don't think it's your intent.

**Chairperson Speranza:** That's what we've been grappling with. If you're going to apply it across the board, how do you apply it in such a way that it is fair to the person who doesn't have much land to begin with to build on.

**Mr. Piccone:** Right. They can get a variance. You have the authority to allow them. If you look at this property like Christina has here, okay, she's not really subject to steep slopes. All she has to do is mitigate 100%. That's easy, it can be done. The point is that if she has a property where she can only increase her footprint according to the 25% rule...in other words, her property, for argument's sake, disturbs 40% of the existing property right now, okay? She wants to add more on. Well, why shouldn't she be required to do a steep slope calculation and only disturb a certain amount of the property on her steep slope? You could have a different formula for existing homes, but everyone could conform. It's a lot of work for you, you'll have a lot of meetings, but maybe there'll be a whole other board for that.

But the point is that I'm just worried that when it comes time for me to build that lot I'll be begging for every variance I can get, right, left, and forward, and deserving of it, hopefully. But the point is that I would rather try to conform to the law without having it change every three years on me. And that's basically my concerns. Thank you.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Thank you.

**Boardmember Dale:** I think I'm having trouble with the definitions here.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Well, we're going to fix that, if nothing else.

**Boardmember Dale:** We keep coming back to the question of subdivision versus lot, and when does what apply in terms of steep slopes, and what has the greatest impact. What he said before was contrary to what I understood the difference to be. It seemed to me a subdivision was a larger piece of land that was being broken up ... I don't like the idea of having the lot and the subdivision having the same law because they're different circumstances. A lot, particularly a small lot, when you start to impose significant restrictions on that you want to prevent developments altogether; or two, interfere with a prior homeowner who already has a house who wants to make changes to his landscaping.

**Boardmember Hutson:** Well, that's why it was developed like it is. It just so happens that we've had a few examples -- not a lot, but probably two or three over the years -- where it's been an individual lot where they've taken some pretty egregious action and then impacted a neighbor pretty dramatically. That's why the concern comes up.

**Boardmember Logan:** That, we can address with language on retaining walls.

**Boardmember Hutson:** Okay.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Right, and that's one of the items that was brought up.

**Boardmember Hutson:** There was an option brought up, too, but we never quite got to what that should be.

**Boardmember Dale:** Right. I like what Marianne did, the whole lot, but it still leaves me with real difficulty physically trying to decide how to patch together these changes.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** No, don't think that I was trying to do that. You just asked me to say what were our issues and the different ways to address it.

**Boardmember Dale:** You're not saying that, but I think in effect that's what we're being asked to do is to take an existing wall, which for the most part works, and then sort of patch some changes to it to prevent certain circumstances. And I have an overriding concern that we're then beginning to interfere with development and imposing ourselves as an aesthetic jury on what can and cannot be built.

**Boardmember Hutson:** We've probably never stopped a house from being built as long as I can remember.

**Chairperson Speranza:** No, we never have.

**Boardmember Hutson:** We have had some people redo a wall a couple times. That's about as far...

**Chairperson Speranza:** And move things back.

**Boardmember Logan:** And wound up with smaller footprints.

**Chairperson Speranza:** We've moved walls back, yes.

**Boardmember Logan:** Because of the setbacks and so forth.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Just so people are aware of some of the things we are going to be looking at, I'm hoping that our March meeting we'll have time to really go into this. And if not, maybe we're going to do a separate meeting.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Yes, because in March you've got Ginsburg coming back.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Do we, for-sure?

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Yes and there's another big one coming back in March. .

**Boardmember Dale:** I had understood that the Holly Place people were going to come back.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Oh, Tarricone. Maybe we can poll, and see if we can do a second meeting to deal with steep slopes in March. I guarantee it won't be until 11 o'clock at night.

But some of the things that we had decided that we were going to look into, and Marianne sent some information to us about, we will be taking this up. So if people want to think about this, that the law should apply to situations to avoid creating a steep slope as well as disturbing a steep slope. What regular retaining walls, both the kinds of engineering that should be required for retaining walls as well as making sure that there are clearer standards that are developed with respect to the height and the distance between retaining walls. Whether or not we need to see every instance where there is a steep slopes application, right now we do see them all. And whether the development deductions -- what you were just saying, John -- should be made permanent and apply to lots.

So we've got some things in here. There was one other that I thought we talked about, but I can't remember at all what it is now. I have it written down someplace. So please, let's try to focus some attention on this over the next month. And Angie, if you wouldn't mind just seeing what dates would be available. The 22nd we don't have you, right?, because Zoning Board is the meeting after ours always.

**Village Planner Witkowski:** Right. The other thing is the Land Use Training Institute.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Yes, right. It's not going to be in March.

**Village Planner Witkowski:** Yes, the 15, the 21st, and the 29th.

**Chairperson Speranza:** We won't do steep slopes in March then.

**Boardmember Dale:** We are required to do these?

**Village Planner Witkowski:** They don't have to be those particular ones, but the Board of Trustees will have a resolution at their next meeting. You have to have four hours, but it doesn't have to be these four hours.

It just that this is convenient, but there will be others. I'm working on the American Planning Association's New York chapter annual meeting, which will be the end of the year. One of the things that we'll have at that annual meeting will be a training session. And then some of the state departments have training that's acceptable. It's just that these are so convenient because these are two-and-a-half hours each. So if you take two of them you've got your four hours, and you can carry over hours over four to the next year.

**Chairperson Speranza:** And one of them conflicts with our next Board meeting anyway. The 15th. So steep slopes in April.

Height of the buildings. That's the other thing that we needed to talk about, the definition. We have to talk about the definition of height. Jim, I saw you had something?

**Mr. Metzger:** Just a quick question. The issues with steep slopes, I couldn't make it to the previous meeting when you were discussing it. Are there issues that you're discussing that are not part of what's explicitly in the code? And if there are, is it possible for the public to be able to be part of that discussion? Could it be posted on the Village Website?

**Chairperson Speranza:** Sure.

**Mr. Metzger:** That'd be great because it's something that, obviously, I've been very interested in over the years and it's one of the bigger issues in the Village in terms of things that are happening. So that would be great, thank you.

## 2. Miscellaneous

**Chairperson Speranza:** Okay, yes. Anything else? Angie, anything?

**Village Planner Witkowski:** If anyone wants to attend any of these Land Use Training Institute sessions just e-mail me and I'll do a group RSVP for whoever is going to either of these two meetings, the 21st or the 29<sup>th</sup>.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Okay. You'll handle the payment voucher and everything else.

**Village Planner Witkowski:** I think these are free.

**Boardmember Wertz:** There is a charge.

**Village Planner Witkowski:** It's not much, though. But yes, I'll take care of that. Okay, here it is, the fees.

**Boardmember Wertz:** Fifty dollars for three nights.

**Village Planner Witkowski:** And I did talk to Lori Heithoff at the Department of State. She said that they'll probably be doing another one in the fall because of the law that's requiring everyone to take it. So I know that there'll be other opportunities.

Then I'm going to be scheduling a meeting for April 11th on the LWRP, a presentation and public comment on that.

**Chairperson Speranza:** On the LWRP? That's excellent.

**Village Planner Witkowski:** Yes, we had a meeting on what next steps should be. So we thought it would be time to get some more public comment. That date will probably be April 11<sup>th</sup> and I'm sure Planning Board members will want to be at that, also.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Okay, is that it? Anything else from anyone?

## VI. Adjournment

PLANNING BOARD  
REGULAR MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARING  
FEBRUARY 15, 2007  
Page - 46 -

**On MOTION of Boardmember Logan, SECONDED by Boardmember Hutson with a voice vote of all in favor, Chairperson Speranza adjourned the Regular Meeting at 11:15 p.m.**