

**VILLAGE OF HASTINGS-ON-HUDSON, NEW YORK**  
**PLANNING BOARD**  
**REGULAR MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARING**  
**JUNE 21, 2007**

A **Regular Meeting and Public Hearing** was held by the Planning Board on **Thursday, June 21, 2007 at 8:15 p.m.** in the Municipal Building Meeting Room, 7 Maple Avenue, Hastings-on-Hudson, New York, 10706.

**PRESENT:** Chairperson Patricia Speranza, Boardmembers Fred Wertz, David Hutson, Jamie Cameron, Eva Alligood, Bruce Dale, Alternate Rhoda Barr, Village Attorney Marianne Stecich, and Village Planner Angela Witkowski.

**ABSENT:** Boardmember Bill Logan

**I. Roll Call**

**II. Approval of Minutes**

**1. May 17, 2007 meeting**

**Chairperson Speranza:** Does anyone have any changes or modifications to those minutes?

**Boardmember Alligood:** I have one very short one this time, if I can find it.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Actually, when I was reading it -- Jamie and Bruce can tell me whether I'm right -- but I believe the exchange on the bottom of page 52, that was you, Jamie, right?

**Boardmember Cameron:** Well, the first exchange -- but the first change of the minutes was not me. Maybe it's been corrected now.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** I'm talking about the comparable units -- I thought that was your issue, Jamie.

**Boardmember Dale:** The last comment?

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Yes. Maybe I'm wrong, but I remember Jamie raising that.

**Boardmember Cameron:** Yes, that's true. There's also a sentence here, I can't remember where it is, in which we're asking about how high the water level is. I make the comment that you could have taken a canoe down, and it should have been Saw Mill River Parkway. It was written Saw Mill River Road.

**Boardmember Dale:** I have three little ones. On page 26, towards the bottom: "...the access to that area would be from the bank instead of to use..." It makes more sense to say the access to that area would be from the bank. It's "...the access to that use..." is what I said, I think.

Then on page 43, she didn't understand the last word. It's correct: "mechanical ventilation," middle of the page. She put it in brackets, and it's correct.

**Boardmember Cameron:** My change is on page 45, three-quarters of the way down: "...you could have paddled a canoe down the Saw Mill River 'Parkway'..."

**Boardmember Alligood:** I found mine. It's on page 21, fourth paragraph down. Just take out the second sentence where I'm speaking ... take out "It's not clear..."

**Boardmember Cameron:** Then on page 51, top of the page: "Will that be negotiable 'with' the equipment that's necessary." The word "with" is missing.

**Chairperson Speranza:** I just had two things and one substantive thing. Page 10, Angie, Mr. Halko is speaking. I don't know why there is bold and underline in his comments on page 10. Just take that out because there's no reason for any specific emphasis there.

**Village Planner Witkowski:** I may have meant to go back and check it or something.

**Chairperson Speranza:** And then page 49. Since Mr. Normoyle can't correct the minutes, I will correct a statement that is attributed to him. Again, it's page 49, it's the second to the last comment that he makes. The second to the last sentence says: "So I'm not exactly sure how that was made a condition..." it reads, "...when all the 'stairway' analysis," and that should be "storm water" analysis. Is that it?

**On MOTION of Boardmember Dale, SECONDED by Boardmember Alligood with a voice vote of all in favor, the Minutes of the Meeting of May 17, 2007 were approved as amended.**

### **III. No New Business**

### **IV. Old Business**

- 1. Public Hearing (Continued). Site Plan Approval. Restaurant Renovation. Thomas Devlin, 555 Warburton Avenue. Sheet 12/Block 630/Lot 28. Establishment of expanded restaurant in the former Hastings House Restaurant. Variance will be requested of ZBA for off-street parking.**

**Chairperson Speranza:** This is an application that we saw last month come before us for the first time. There were some issues that were brought up, most notably the fact that there are some concerns with respect to the provision of parking, circulation, deliveries, garbage, location of garbage, etc. So we are going to hear more about this. Now, Marianne, do you want to talk about the provisions under the zoning code with respect to parking in the CC?

**Village Attorney Stecich:** This will probably be the first time the Board is being asked to apply a new section of the code that was part of the CC amendments, and the section is 295-24B. Christina had quoted most of it on her parking analysis page on the top. But just to understand, I know it's a little confusing because the notice indicated that they need a variance for the parking. At this point they don't. If the Planning Board gives them the waiver they're requesting, which I'll explain in a minute, then they wouldn't need a variance. If they don't get the waiver from the Planning Board they still then could apply to the Zoning Board for a variance.

The second thing that, based on the submission last month could have everybody a little confused, is, originally the applicant came in and was going to use the substitution of parking provision in the code: if you can provide parking within 750 square feet of how you walk. That's not the section they're coming in under anymore. Not that I'm making their case for them, but so you understand what law they're seeking the Board to apply, it's the section of the Zoning Code that provides that ... and, again, this is only in the CC district and it's only for buildings more than 2,500 square feet in gross area. Under 2,500 square feet in gross floor area, you don't need to provide any parking. If it's over 2,500, and there's an expansion, the Planning Board may reduce or waive the requirements for off-street parking that are set forth in the code where it determines that change of the use or expansion of the use within an existing building -- again, more than 2,500 square feet -- will not generate a significant increase in parking demand. So if you decide that either the business wouldn't generate the increase or that the parking is going to be provided for elsewhere, then there wouldn't be an increase in parking demand.

So that's the section they're coming in with. What the Planning Board has to decide is whether to waive the requirements of any additional parking they'll need by this expansion. Now, there's a certain amount of parking that kind of goes with the building that was there all the time. There was a restaurant before. So if it needed 40 parking spaces before, and now it needs 75 parking spaces -- Christina will go through the numbers for you -- then they have to provide the 35 parking spaces and that would be the requirement that you could waive. Of course, you're going to look at the big picture in deciding. Maybe you're looking at actually who the 75 are when you're deciding whether there's going to be an increase in parking demand. Is that clear?

**Chairperson Speranza:** Thank you. And Christina, I know you were at the Board of Trustees meeting to discuss some options with them also. If you wouldn't mind, just briefly go through it? You talked to us about what the proposed renovations would be. If you just briefly talk about the basement level, the first floor, second floor.

**Christina Griffin, architect - Hastings House:** Yes. We're planning to completely renovate the building. Actually, the floor plan's over here. This is a prospectus of the future building. We're planning to clean the façade, put all new windows in, a new cornice, bring back the full arched windows, and actually restore it to the original design on each floor level. We plan to renovate the basement level, which was used as a catering hall/meeting area. We found a capacity of 100 people for seating down here. There was, I'm not sure, some prep kitchen and a toilet down here. We're planning to convert that into the kitchen and the toilet areas for the new restaurant. We're also going to have code-compliant staircases and an ADA-compliant elevator. On the first floor we're actually going to maintain the status of a restaurant, bar, and dining area; again, upgrading the staircases and putting in handicapped access and an ADA-compliant elevator. On the second floor there are two apartments here. We're planning to cut back this floor so there is an open two-story space. About two-thirds of the floor area will be dining staircases and elevator.

The restaurant will consist of the basement, the first, and the second floor. On the third floor ... and by the way, just to compare with the old Hastings Restaurant, the seating capacity of the lowest level was 100. The first-floor level, based on a count of the chairs that are in there, was 70. I'm sorry, this is important for our parking space computation -- 70, a total of 170 seats. The future restaurant, which has dining on the first floor and the mezzanine level, will be 170 seats. So they're very similar. Now, on the third floor ...

**Chairperson Speranza:** Christina, you just said 170 in both instances?

**Ms. Griffin:** You know what? I'd like to hand this out so you can take a look at it. I think I need to look at these figures. The restaurant, the current capacity, total seats, is 170 existing; 173 as proposed. Very similar in seating capacity. There is more square footage, but because we have to put in toilets according to state code, and elevators and those kinds of facilities, it takes away from the floor area that you have for dining.

Now, on the third floor, this is a space that has a magnificent ceiling height, 14 foot high, and it was actually designed as a ballroom. Historically, this was the banquet hall for this area. I have actually done some research on the history of this during the Roaring '20s. It was an important space for dancing, and then later on in the Hastings House -- based on a history that the previous owner, Gail Hoffman, told me about -- this was the place where people had their wedding receptions. She worked in the restaurant. They owned the restaurant for, I think, about 30 years. It has been very quiet, though, in the last 10 years. So this will also be a catering facility. You'll have a prep kitchen and an elevator, a few handicapped toilets. This will have a capacity of 120 seats.

I passed out our new parking analysis. We took another look at this and did a comparison of what the use was for the building and the amount of spaces for the existing, or just former, use of the building compared to the proposed use. Actually, in your packets, we submitted simply the use based on the area. But on this chart that I handed out, I added another column for requirements based on seats. That's because you'll see that when you base it on area you get a much higher number, even though the amount of seats is very similar. When you base it on area you get a higher parking requirement simply because the new restaurant has a much bigger kitchen and much bigger toilets ... code compliance -- you know, upgrading it. But I would like to take this through very slowly just so we make sure we understand this.

The parking requirements for the existing use, it was not too long ago when it was used as a restaurant, based on the area, the Hastings zoning code requires one space per 100 square feet and one space for employees. We're making the assumption they had around 15 employees. But based on square footage, we have a total for the restaurant -- that's the basement and the first floor -- of 67 spaces, based on area. Based on seats, with 170 seats we need 58 parking spaces.

On the proposed restaurant, based on the square footage, we need 88 parking spaces; based on the seats we need only 65. So based on seats, the difference between the proposed and existing restaurant is only four spaces.

Now, the total for the existing use, which is the restaurant. The two apartments, you need two spaces per apartment, which is four; and the karate studio, which has a much lower requirement than a banquet facility. We add that all up and, based on area, the parking requirement for existing use is 76; based on seats is 67. Now, proposed, the total for the building, based on square footage -- and if you look on the third floor, we do need one space for 100 square feet, we have 37 -- the total for the building is 125. The difference between 125 and existing is a parking deficiency of 49. But based on seats, we have a total of 103. The difference between the requirement based on seats as existing and proposed is 36. So I want to point that out because when you look at the number of seats, the parking required beyond what you can say was for the existing use, is more like 36 spaces instead of 49.

Now, we looked at lots of options for how we can get this parking. We went to the Board of Trustees. We had a proposal that we consider having valet parking going down to the Zinsser parking lot. We have a chart down here that shows from 5 o'clock until 8 o'clock. This is a survey we did in a space of two weeks. It shows that as you go towards the evening that the parking spaces in the town open up, and especially at Zinsser. By the time you get to 8 o'clock it gets very empty, especially on the weekends. We made the proposal and their response was simply they are interested, but they want your feedback. They feel, I think, that they're not sure if the overflow should all go down to Zinsser.

So we actually went in another direction since Tuesday. We've been trying to contact Chase Manhattan because we actually found, on speaking to Gail Hoffman, that they had an agreement to use their parking lot. I also included in your package a site plan showing the neighboring properties. This is the Chase Manhattan Bank, this is the funeral home. Right now they have a lease agreement with the owner of this property so that they can use these parking spaces. There are six parking spaces, one is a handicapped space. The only way they have access is into their property, of course. That lease agreement is up in August, and there's a negotiation going on to see if there could be a trade so that when the bank is closed -- it closes at 6 o'clock every day and 1 o'clock on Saturday, and is closed all day Sunday -- that the new restaurant could use that for parking and even valet. If you just add the parking of 17, plus the valet that we're showing in this diagram, it adds up to 39 spaces. Those 39 spaces are very close to that deficiency of parking if you compare proposed existing 36 by seats, and I think I have the number of 47 by area.

So based on this waiver, this description of a waiver in the code for having an insignificant increase in parking, we are asking for approval based on the idea that we will get this agreement and we will be able to use this parking lot when the bank is closed. All these calculations that I've given you are based on full capacity. That is if the restaurant and the banquet facilities all happen at the same time. But the upper floor is just for weekends.

We have Paul Walter here who is planning to be the general manager. Those functions usually occur in late afternoon, and they don't always coincide with when the restaurant is quiet. And also I don't think they're during the week. They're just on the weekends.

I'd like to also describe to you how we would like to handle waste and delivery. We have discovered that historically the delivery entrance was off of Spring. We would like to just maintain that as the delivery entrance because we know it's worked. So they would bring everything in through the staircase down into the kitchen -- which is in the basement, which is what they were doing in the past -- well, they have a kitchen on the first floor, but they would store all their goods in the basement. The main entrance, we're planning to maintain. The waste area is a very narrow space right now. We were planning to have a blowup of this. Just increase it slightly so that we can maintain these parking spaces. And put a 3 by 6 dumpster in here with disposal barrels all around a screening barrier similar to what's there but, of course, all upgraded and new.

The restaurant, after this is filled up and they need to actually go into a valet type of arrangement, the idea is that the drop-off would be here and the cars would be taken by the valet service people and the car would be parked in that parking lot. I also have for you tonight a traffic survey that we did. I'd like to pass this out because we had submitted to you what exists and did not indicate the increase. I think we just couldn't get that information so quickly. But I do have it tonight. It simply is the survey that you have with the projected increase filled out. Paul Walter is here to go through that with you.

**Chairperson Speranza:** I just want to make sure. We have something dated June 11th. This is something that's more?

**Ms. Griffin:** June 21st. That is missing the projected numbers. I know you need time to review it, but at least Paul could take you through it and you could pass that out to the Board.

**Paul Walter, general manager – proposed 555 Warburton Avenue restaurant:** I'm the consultant and general manager. I sat there outside the Hastings House and actually counted cars, as you can see, between 4 and 4:30. The hours basically are hours of operation. Then I did a schedule of the people coming to my restaurant. Based on the 4 to 4:30 that you see, the estimated cars that will be coming in to the Village are six cars for the employees that will be arriving at 4 o'clock, since we're not open until 5. Well, at 4 o'clock we're open, but if you start on Monday through Saturday we're open at 5 o'clock. So those six cars between 4 and 4:30 are my employees coming to work. Then between 4:30 and 5 there are two more employees coming. At 5 o'clock I anticipate, at the most, having eight tables come in on Monday through, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday. There's not going to be that many cars coming, I'm guessing. It's an estimate.

The max that would come per half-hour would be eight tables. If you assume that there's four people at each table, that's 32 people. And if each couple came by itself that would be 16 cars. Now, as a businessman, I'm not going to take all 32 tables at 8 o'clock because I could only seat at 6 and I could only seat at 10. That defeats the purpose of having a restaurant that's busy. So if you take eight tables at 6 o'clock, eight at 6:30, eight at 7, and eight at 7:30, and you max out, the maximum is 16 cars coming for those reservations. My 6 o'clock reservations would be leaving at 8 o'clock, my 6:30s at 8:30 -- and be replaced.

This is saying maximum that we would have a full restaurant by 8 o'clock with every table seated, and the 6 o'clock's just finishing desserts for the 8 o'clock reservations. So I gave you basically the maximum, meaning 16 cars coming every half an hour. Then on the right you see the increase in traffic as compared to what's going by on Warburton. I didn't do it on Spring, I did it based on Warburton. If you do it by Spring it's slightly higher, but it never goes over a 20% increase in traffic. Of course, Friday and Saturday are busier, so you do see an increase. Monday through Thursday aren't as busy as Friday and Saturday, so I don't project 16 cars at 6 o'clock.

That's basically my estimate. It would be great if I could fill my restaurant at 5 o'clock, but I have a doubt. I've been here and I've seen Maud's fairly busy at 5 o'clock on a Saturday. The last couple of Saturdays every table outside is full, you know, and that's great. But also it's a new restaurant, and in my past the only restaurant that I opened up that took off right away was the Parsippany Ruth's Chris Steakhouse. Even when I opened in Manhattan I took six months to really get packed. And then, of course, it was packed like any city restaurant at 5 o'clock. I opened Weehawken, it took us two-and-a-half years. I opened up an Austin's Steakhouse in Brooklyn three years ago, and they're just getting busy all the time now, three years later. Do I want to wait three years to have a busy restaurant? No. Because Brooklyn was Brooklyn, and we're charging New York prices and that area really couldn't support New York prices. I spoke to Faye, and he's not willing to come in and say, "Well, we're a New York restaurant and we're going to charge New York prices." He's willing to take the New York product, bring it to Hastings, and not make as much money.

Eventually, you go in any restaurant and first year it's this much. Next year ... it goes with the economy, and you do raise prices. But he wants to come in and make it affordable and keep it friendly. Already on my list are three high chairs and two booster seats because people have kids and they want to come to dinner. You know, people that have money and have kids, and want to come to a nice place, expect that kind of thing. Any questions?

**Chairperson Speranza:** Christina, do you have anything else before we have a discussion?

**Ms. Griffin:** I know that Paul discussed the operation of the restaurant, other than the traffic study. I know last time we touched on a little bit of the hours of operation. Do you want to review that, because it does affect traffic. I'm afraid I need to defer to Paul for that.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Certainly there may be things that, as we proceed, any approval by this board or any other board may, in fact, require certain restrictions with respect to hours of operation -- for instance no lunch, 5 to 11, catering hall, weekends only. Some of the things that you have mentioned in passing may, in fact, have to be included in any kind of resolution that this board may pass.

So I think that's something that you as the applicant, and the restaurant owner, have to be aware of and would certainly have to know that would be an issue and would have to agree to operate under those terms until such time as you could make the case for getting them changed at any time.

**Ms. Griffin:** No, we have discussed that. I think they understand that. If there are certain conditions and schedules that have to be adhered to, I guess the understanding or agreement would be they cannot be changed without coming back in the future to the Planning Board.

**Chairperson Speranza:** And maybe if you want to just go through what it was you were thinking. I heard the other night dinner is 5 to 11.

**Mr. Walter:** Yes, dinner is 5 to 10 Monday through Thursday, 5 to 11 Friday and Saturday, and 4 to 9 on Sundays. And private functions would be from 1 to 5 basically, maybe 6.

**Chairperson Speranza:** On Saturdays and Sundays 1 to 5? That's it?

**Mr. Walter:** 1 to 5 is normal. Normally a four-hour party usually breaks up after four hours. Some people do like to have a five-hour party, but then also that starts interfering with my à la carte operation.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Your dinner. Okay.

**Mr. Walter:** So basically it would have to be a special occasion to let them go to five. Because basically I need my staff to finish upstairs and get ready for downstairs.

**Chairperson Speranza:** I just want to make sure I'm hearing this correctly. You are not anticipating that the entire building would be occupied with restaurant and catering?

**Mr. Walter:** I can't see it ever happening, at least in the first couple years. I could see a party of 35 businessmen wanting to use the upstairs during a Thursday night. I can tell you that will come up every once in awhile. But these kinds of parties where you're going to book 100 people -- or 120 people if we could -- I mean, I'm not going to get 120. It just couldn't be done on an operational basis while having a full restaurant. You can't do it, it's too much. You just couldn't do it. There's too many people in the restaurant for one, trying to come to a restaurant and a function. On a Saturday night, to your objections, how am I going to handle 50 or 60 cars coming to a function at 7 o'clock on a Saturday night. You can't do it -- you can't as well as having regular à la carte business. You'd have to have an army of valets out there, which just is not going to work. So I don't even anticipate that. Like I said, 35, 40 businessmen say, "Hey, we want to use your banquet hall on Thursday night at 8 o'clock for 40 guys." I can see that happening. I'm not denying that might happen. But these big functions, no.

**Ms. Griffin:** I didn't know if I'd made it clear that the bank, Chase Manhattan, closes at 1 on Saturday. So that's when Paul's planning to start any activities up in the banquet room.

**Chairperson Speranza:** And you said you are having discussions with them?

**Mr. Walter:** The owner's lawyer contacted the Chase lawyer in Manhattan. They talked, I think, this afternoon. We'd have to get into the whole issue about the lease that is expiring and us using this as a tradeoff. As soon as that does happen we will submit that to you -- an agreement with Chase. Basically, that lot is for those parties on Saturdays and Sundays so it's not disorganized. You have a valet sign and it has the name of the guests' party or whatever, and it points into the bank. The valets just grab the cars and the people just walk through.



**Boardmember Dale:** You said that would provide 17 additional spots, plus the six that are on the property, so that would be 23 spots?

**Mr. Walter:** No, it would be more than that. There are 11 spots along the back, there's enough room to put 11 valet spaces. A normal spot is like this, and in two spots they put three cars. So basically in those spots, you put 11 behind it. You still have enough room for almost two cars to drive past that second row. You have worse spots right along the firehouse, which people use all the time anyway. It has spots. You have the six spots there and then, if we needed, they would pull in and then pull right to the exit and then start packing cars behind it. So you can fit 39. In fact, I think I could fit 42.

**Ms. Griffin:** This drawing shows 39. This shows how the cars could be laid out if you did valet parking.

**Boardmember Cameron:** You have this comparison of one space/four seats. What's the basis on four people coming in one car?

**Ms. Griffin:** It's the zoning code. One parking space per four seats.

**Boardmember Cameron:** Well, that would be a transportation engineer's dream that four people would ride in a car. It would solve New York's congestion problem immediately.

**Chairperson Speranza:** That's what is required under our code. I'd like to open it for questions, comments from members of the public. Does anybody want to come up to speak?

**Bill Calderbank, 47 James Street:** I'm a 24-year resident and three-year business owner. I think the idea of opening a catering house in the middle of Hastings is absolutely ludicrous. It's going to kill every business in Hastings. The parking at 6 o'clock at night it terrible now, let alone on a Friday and Saturday. The traffic going through the town would be so congested. It's already congested Hastings. On a Saturday, you try to drive through it. Valet parking? If you want to experience valet parking, try and get to the Boat Club past Harvest on Hudson when they have an event. A 20-second trip takes you 10 minutes when they're getting through. And you talk about the parking lot behind the bank? That's where our volunteer firemen park. Parking is a bad thing. Ask Mimosa of Dobbs Ferry. They closed -- no parking. You're going to kill every restaurant in this town.

**Mr. Walter:** Which is your business?

**Mr. Calderbank:** My business is the River Roadhouse.

**James Clark, 2 Amherst Drive:** I'm the owner of Bloom Restaurant. I understand they're doing valet parking in Boulanger Plaza. I'm not sure if that's correct.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Excuse me. You understand who is doing valet parking?

**Mr. Clark:** They plan on doing valet parking.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Okay, that's not part of this application.

**Mr. Clark:** It's not part of that application? Okay.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Oh, that was it? That was an easy one.

**Donny Reese, 524 Warburton Avenue:** I own Tony's Steak & Seafood. He's doing a lot of guessing. I've been in this town for 22 years. You cannot find a parking space over the weekend. I have people who go around for a half-hour or 45 minutes telling me there's no parking. That's the problem. It's okay if he wants to come in and do a steakhouse. They say the more restaurants you have in town, the more people come in. But he should get the same seatings as he has because that's what I did. When I went up to build, they never let me build because there's no parking. I haven't seen any new parking being built so you're going to have a bigger problem. Catering? Everybody comes in in 10 minutes -- 50, 60 cars -- where are you going to put them? There's going to be a double line all the way down to Warburton Avenue. We don't want this in this little town. Then what are you going to do if I sell out? My property will be worth nothing because I also own the building. Who are you going to sell it to when they can't pay the rent? There's no parking.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Thank you.

**Maud Franse, Maud's Tavern:** I'm delighted that somebody's going to do something in the Hastings House. That's fantastic. It's a beautiful old building. I wasn't even going to say anything, but it scares me when a restaurateur downplays the capacity of their restaurant. Every restaurant that I know, that I ever worked at and my own, wants to pack every seat, wants to do as much as they possibly can, full capacity. If you have a party that wants to be booked the same night that you have your restaurant full, that is a joy. So it just scares me when you underplay the fact that it's going to be two or three years that the restaurant might take off, or you'll never do a party at the same time the restaurant's full. No, it's the goal of the restaurant to be full and it's the goal to do as much as you can. So to anticipate a lot of people is what I would hope for another restaurant, and base decisions on that fact. Thanks.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Thank you.

**Rosie, manager - Bloom Restaurant:** I also wanted to say that it is a little bit of a downplay, the parking situation. All of our patrons park at Boulanger Plaza, and that is right next to our restaurant. I'm assuming that all of their patrons, if there was going to be a catering situation or a packed house situation, would be parking there. That would significantly be a disturbance to our patrons that need a place to park on a Friday or Saturday night. It's going to be very hard for them. It would definitely take away from our business.

We are a new restaurant as well. We're just starting out, and it's hard right now. So this would just be an insult right now, just starting it up. That's what I say. Thank you.

**Isaac Garson, owner - Slices:** One thing I've noticed in this town on Friday, Saturday, holiday weekends, the traffic flow is very heavy. They're talking about going into the Chase Bank. One of the issues that I see is -- a bank -- why would they want that exposure of additional parking. If anybody got in a bit of an accident they have insurance, but they could be additionally insured with the bank being at fault. I just see that it could be a big issue with the way the town is at this point.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Thank you.

**Nina Cangione, president - Chamber of Commerce:** We also would like to welcome Hastings House to the community, first off, and we're delighted that someone is going to renovate that beautiful old building. But we have grave concerns about the parking issues, not only for the restaurateurs in our town, but for all of the merchants. A Saturday afternoon event at 1 o'clock -- with a restaurant that seats 170 and a banquet hall that seats 120, with the Farmers' Market going on, and employees to service that, with our businesses downtown that are already parking challenged -- is going to be an utter nightmare. We've heard that there were surveys done on traffic and parking by the architect and the owner. We would really urge this board to require real surveys, professional surveys, done by outside independent people that don't have a stake in the process.

That assumption about Chase's parking lot, it's a crazy assumption. First of all, what if Chase decides in two years to move out of Hastings and someone else comes in and says, "Sorry, can't have the lot." What if Chase decides to stay and give them the lease, but extends its hours on Saturday because Washington Mutual is doing it and to be more competitive they need to be open on Saturday until 4? Then what happens?

There's too many assumptions in this proposal, and we really urge this board to take a deep, hard look at a town that's already parking challenged, with merchants that are hanging on by a thread. And part of the problem is the fact that there is no adequate available parking.

The other issue is the actual renovation of the building. We've learned from the renovations going on on Main Street that when construction happens in a two-block commercial district it wreaks havoc. If they're going to have cranes, and big trucks making deliveries, and workers ... workers, think about the construction workers. Where are they parking? That's a big issue. We need to look at those issues as well as the operational issues.

The other problem is the deliveries. If they're going to have deliveries on Spring Street and there's a big truck there when the 5:39 from Grand Central gets in, what's going to happen to that little two-lane, the main hub of our downtown? These issues need to seriously be looked at, and we urge you to take that into consideration. And to also publicly notify the community when these hearings are going to take place so that everyone can have a voice and people can be heard.

**Chairperson Speranza:** These are publicly ...

**Ms. Cangione:** I understand that, but you'd be surprised how many people don't get it.

**Fonda Lefrak, VP - Chamber of Commerce:** Many of the merchants do not live in Hastings, so they do not get HoH.

**Chairperson Speranza:** That's why we rely on you

**Ms. Cangione:** We try, and we did a good job tonight.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Even those people who don't live in Hastings can get the e-mails.

**Ms. Cangione:** That's a very good point. Thank you for listening.

**Chairperson Speranza:** And I think this is very good because by bringing people here tonight, the restaurateurs of this village, it's also a resource for us, the Planning Board. So thank you.

**Ms. Lefrak:** Just a couple of other points. Even if we did give this restaurant whatever variances or waivers or whatever you want to call them, I was wondering what kind of outs the Village would have if we find out in a year or six months that it's not working or they're not living up to their part; how are we going to enforce these things. I think that we really very seriously have to look at what kind of out clause we have if everything on paper looks good but everything in reality doesn't work.

**Chairperson Speranza:** I think that's a very good point, and I think it's something people should be aware of. When we issue site plan approval and waivers we can put conditions on them. That's why I was mentioning the hours of operation, days of week, etc. Those things become conditions of the approval. If, for instance, we were to find out that there was something going on -- an event going on, say, on a Saturday night when the restaurant was full -- that is something that is noticed to the building owner. What's the appropriate term, Marianne, a cease and desist, or we pull the CO? We can stop it. There is recourse.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** If it's a condition of the site plan approval. Like let's say, for instance, Chase won't let them use the parking spaces anymore, although you would want to see some kind of a long-term lease before you approved it. But just say something happened and they didn't have those parking spaces, and one of the conditions of the site plan approval was you maintain those 41 spaces in the Chase lot. They couldn't operate anymore until they had their C of O, it wouldn't be any good because there's a violation of a condition. Then they'd have to come back before the Board and convince you that they don't really need those spaces or tell you some other spaces they have or something like that. But this board would have control over whether you let them continue if there is a violation of the site plan condition.

**Chairperson Speranza:** So there is recourse should any of the conditions change, if we find out that the operation is not going the way that we were assured it would.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** You'd be careful how you word the site plan approval. I know on more recent approvals the Board's done we've anticipated what could go wrong and sort of made continuing review of the site plan approval necessary.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Any other comments?

**Steve Topilnycky, 18 Maple Avenue:** First, the clarification from Christina where she's going to put this dumpster exactly, the garbage dumpster.

**Ms. Griffin:** There's a fence now, but [OFF-MIC]

**Mr. Topilnycky:** So you're going to take the guardrail up?

**Chairperson Speranza:** Why don't you show them on the map.

**Ms. Griffin:** Yes, we're going to move the guardrail about 18 inches, just so we can make it a little wider so we can get a 3 foot by 6 foot dumpster there. We are going to maintain the parking space, which is longer than it needs to be.

**Mr. Topilnycky:** Okay. And I see on your diagram there you've got cars against the firehouse. Just for edification, that's a fire lane and usually the cars that are parked there are the firemen. And also, in front of the drive-through window you've got six cars and you can only fit four back there without getting through that driveway. I live right behind there. I am a lifelong resident. I know just about every square inch of that back parking lot.

**Ms. Griffin:** That's a valet situation.

**Mr. Topilnycky:** And what about any other residents that decide to pull into that parking lot, which does happen quite often? What does that do to your game plan? Are you going to have the parking lot sealed off?

**Ms. Griffin:** Actually, right now it's not a public parking lot.

**Mr. Topilnycky:** It's not public, but people still park there and Chase still allows it.

**Ms. Griffin:** I understand.

**Kelly Topilnycky, 18 Maple Avenue:** I was at the Board of Trustees meeting, and they mentioned a couple things that they didn't mention tonight. They were requesting about purchasing commuter permits for the commuter lot. I have a major issue with that.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Excuse me. I don't think that's on the table anymore, or is it?

**Ms. Topilnycky:** They took it out? But they're still planning on using the commuter lot to try to valet park.

**Chairperson Speranza:** No, they've said now it's Chase.

**Ms. Topilnycky:** But this is assuming that Chase is going to go for this.

**Chairperson Speranza:** That's right. So since we are no longer speaking about the commuter lot ...

**Ms. Topilnycky:** Okay, so then I'll direct my comments to this.

**Chairperson Speranza:** That's perfect.

**Ms. Topilnycky:** They made a comment about the previous owner having an agreement with the bank lot. That was Bank of New York. Chase Bank is a completely different animal. They've actually had cars towed out of there, and you hear villagers screaming. I mean, the bank manager's taken a lot of flak because he's the one who has to enforce their law or their rules or whatever.

And also, you say that your hours of operation are until 11 p.m. But you also told the Board of Trustees that you're actually open until 2 a.m. You're talking about valet parking into a parking lot where you have residents directly behind you. You know, cars coming in and out of that parking lot at 2 a.m., you have houses right there, right against the parking lot. Our fence is right against the parking lot. I really can't see the valet fitting in that many cars.

You do have a fire access issue, and not just for the parking lot but also, again, for the houses behind it. Next door to us we had a fire and the firemen came over the wall. And the volunteer firemen do park in that parking lot, so you're going to displace people who are already parking in that lot. Chase doesn't have a problem, I don't believe, with the volunteer firemen parking there.

I just have a lot of concerns about, again, the traffic study that was done. I mean, again, he's got a vested interest in the building itself in getting the variances for everything. So I really think that an independent study needs to be done on the traffic. I could do a traffic study myself and tell you there's 197 parking spaces down the hill and there were only 23 empty. When we drove around here at 6 o'clock, all the parking spaces were full. We live here on Maple Avenue. The commuters, commercial district, everybody parks on our street. So you're not going to have your employees where you're going to have valet parking or you're asking the restaurants to park. So again it becomes where do your employees park. You're going to displace the people that are struggling to find spots in the Village already? I mean, the Village is already packed. You're either going to displace them or you're going to displace us, the residents who own houses. Not all of us have driveways to park in.

So I have a real concern about the parking issue, and I think that it needs to be addressed in a little fuller detail. Also, again, I can't foresee him not having a restaurant and a party at the same time. I mean, how do you run a business and turn away a customer that's looking to have a bar mitzvah or a wedding or just even a Christmas party up in a banquet hall, and then having a restaurant. You still have other people having smaller parties downstairs in the restaurant. He says one thing right now, but you're sort of downplaying how a restaurant works. I mean, I go to restaurants they only valet park when they have their own parking lots to do it in. Hastings is already crowded.

I don't have a problem with the renovation if it were done tastefully. Christina did a wonderful job on everything, the outside of the building and the inside of the building. I just think that if you took the catering or banquet hall off the table for this point and then came back at a later date maybe that would work out a little better. I realize that they are grandfathered-in spaces from the Hastings House. However, Hastings House did not do the kind of business that I think a busy restaurant in the Village could do. I saw most people in there drinking at the bar. I didn't see a lot of people in there for the restaurant, although my husband says he used to eat in the basement. I never went into the basement.

I'm just concerned about the flow of traffic. The deliveries, yes -- when Hastings House was open we did deal with the deliveries. As long as they stay away from the corner I don't foresee a major problem. They did bring up about the construction. You know construction workers. You're going to park where you can get close to. And also, if they're doing a major renovation they're going to have a dumpster. Where are you going to put it? I know you own the seven spaces in the parking lot, but is that a convenient place to put it? Are you going to ask to put it on Spring Street? There are just a lot of questions that don't seem to be answered and I think it just requires a little bit more study. Thank you.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Thank you. Anyone else? Boardmembers. Comments, questions? I'm going to try to do something a little different here, maybe a little on the unorthodox side. The Hastings House building is such a key component to the downtown where it is -- architecturally, socially -- since that building has been vacant, and living down here I'm in the Village a lot, I have found it eerie to walk into town in the evening because nothing's lit, and now the windows are boarded. Everyone who has come up and said, "Well, you know, I really want there to be a business here. I want there to be a business here. I welcome the additional restaurant, and I eat at your restaurants all the time and I would love to have another restaurant, too, just to have another place to go and not go to Dobbs Ferry.

So I have a question. Obviously times are different, and we can say whatever we want to say about the number of parking spaces that are required under the zoning code, the number that are allowed and go with the building because it's an existing building and therefore it's assumed that there is parking that goes with the building just because it exists now. And if there is a shortfall of 49 spaces technically -- whether it's 49, whether it's 75, whether it's 39 -- my view is you have limited options given where this building is on the corner and in the Village. There has been a solution proposed for the possibility of using the Chase parking lot for some of this. There was discussion at the Board of Trustees meeting to run service -- do some sort of valet -- down to the commuter parking lot. There is no easy solution for this, particularly if we look at the standards and the things that we're talking about now.

Construction workers. Well, any renovation, any construction, that you're going to do in the Village you're going to have people, you're going to have construction workers, you're going to have a dumpster. That goes without saying, and I don't think that makes any difference whether or not you're renovating all three floors and the basement or just two floors and the basement. You have to live with the inconvenience for a bit if we want to have some viable business in this building.

So I guess I'm saying, What are the solutions? We've heard the problems, we've heard the issues. We can study it, we can get our own independent traffic consultant, our own independent parking consultant, and we just may do that. But I don't know that there are very many options for this. Leave the third floor vacant? Completely vacant, it's empty, it stays empty. Suggestions, comments? My Boardmembers are very quiet tonight. That's surprising. Rhoda, you've been here a long time.

**Boardmember Hutson:** If we had a good idea we would probably have said it by now, but I don't think it's up to us to really come up with a solution. But I do agree that there is a problem that has not been adequately mitigated or addressed in regard to a catering hall. I think in order for it to make any sense, just at first blush, it would have to be limited in hours of operation to after 7 Monday through Saturday. That doesn't make any sense as it's proposed. I think the issue for the merchants is a real issue, as well as for the residents -- but particularly the merchants. Frankly, in all my years here I've always been able to find a parking space but it's often not where I want it.

Some people are not willing to look that far or walk that far. It does discourage business even if theoretically there is a parking place somewhere. I think at this point my only suggestion would be -- and someone mentioned it here -- that in order to move forward with this realistically, based on what we know right now, is to simply proceed with the proposal on the restaurant and not the catering hall. What might be done with the third floor I don't know, if it's not a catering hall or a ballroom sort of a thing. But I couldn't go forward with any confidence that this was a reasonable thing to do based on the ideas that have been put forward now, including the Chase parking lot thing which I think is probably a good idea to try and negotiate even if you're just having the restaurant. But I don't think it in and of itself would solve the problems with the catering hall. If you want my overall reaction to the thing, that's it.

**Boardmember Cameron:** I find it interesting. I've been here eight years. I've never had trouble parking at any time going to a restaurant, and I've been to pretty much every restaurant that spoke tonight. I've never had trouble parking in the afternoon except occasionally when Boulanger was closed for renovation. There was some difficulty. Perhaps we need a professional counter to see where traffic is. I think it's one of these issues that is very personal. As you said, some people don't want to walk an extra block in order to find a spot, so they feel there's congestion. I have not experienced congestion in Hastings.

I truly welcome a nighttime activity, having another restaurant. We ate dinner in Dobbs the other night. We're sitting out at a table outside. The street was busy, there were cars moving around. But it was alive, it felt good, it was exciting. You come to Hastings at night, it's dead. I think there is a magnetism about having another restaurant that will bring more people. I think that's been the experience certainly in Manhattan with restaurants. There's a fear of competition, but then another restaurant opens up and then you have more people coming. And if your restaurant's filled, they spill over into the one next door or the one across the street. So I think there's a real value to developing a certain amount of activity within the downtown area, since most of this will be at nighttime.

The issue of the banquet hall. When we lived here, after we were here two years, we had to go to Yonkers to find a space to have a party to celebrate a personal family event where we could have more than 50 people. I think having a resource of something like that in Hastings would be very valuable. I sort of disagree with the manager who feels that you're not going to have people wanting to do it on a Saturday night or a Sunday. I think there is a need, or a desire, to have family events where you're inviting a number of people. We had 50 people for a celebration.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Well, I think he was making the point that the restaurant would not want to do that.

**Boardmember Cameron:** Right -- the capacity of the restaurant. I think it's right that they're going to develop the capacity of the businesses there because that would make sense for their business plan to increase the number of employees to handle that kind of an event, if you hired people for the weekend who came in on Saturday or Sunday just because of that.



I find the proposal has great value to Hastings. The idea of renovating that building and restoring it is excellent, and I don't fear the parking. I think if we need to verify how real that experience is, then we can hire a consultant who'll take away the personal interpretation of the experience and find out what the real count is. But I would support the proposal as is, subject, of course, to Chase agreeing. I think that helps.

**Boardmember Barr:** To start with, a point that you made, Patty. I think we don't want this building sitting there as an empty, ghostly wreck. If we had all the choice in the world, what would we choose to have there? Would we choose to have a hotel, turn it into apartments? I don't know what the possibilities are, but at this point we have somebody who's come through with an idea and a use for the building. The question is, is this a manageable use.

Now, I missed something. There was a reference made to the fact that the use of the Zinsser lot was sort of put aside. It strikes me that the times when parking is needed for this facility is just when the pressure on Zinsser ... I mean, I park in the Zinsser lot every day, and by the end of the day there are spaces open up there. Employees could go there. Could something be worked out that certain spaces would be available to the employees after a certain hour, which would take those people out of the way? Could we possibly have an arrangement where there was approval given to the restaurant with the approval for the catering house to be a subsequent approval, assuming that everything works out?

I think it's a question of being a little bit ingenious. Two things. We don't want the building to be sitting there as a wreck. And unless somebody has got another viable use for it we ought to see if there's some way we can make this workable.

**Boardmember Wertz:** Well, I'm not sure I have too much to add. I see the same conflict that everyone else has pointed to. I think it's a kind of anchor business in Hastings that would provide another restaurant, which would be a great thing. I think the historical renovation is fantastic. It'll add to the character of the downtown area. I think what you mentioned, Patty, about the lack of life -- and a couple of people have mentioned -- downtown, particularly in the evenings, is something that ... I think what's happened in Dobbs Ferry, the vibrancy of all the activity with the restaurants and all that's going on there is wonderful. If Hastings could pick up that way I think it would be great.

The problem is the parking, and I'm not too worried about the traffic actually. I think a little traffic is probably not such a bad thing. It's people there, and that's okay actually. It's the parking, and I'm afraid we don't have a crystal ball. I think if we wanted to go forward we probably would, with good conscience, want to have an objective assessment of the whole thing and rely on those numbers. But I think we need a crystal ball -- we don't have it. It's partly a question of lifestyle, as someone pointed out, people like to park right where they're going to go. Even if they have to drive around town a few times they're going to be bellyaching about parking, and that creates an atmosphere, too, that's not good. I agree with David that we may not be in a position to suggest the solution, but we would be open to any creativity that anyone could provide and I'd love to see the project move forward.

But I'd like a little more assurance that it's not going to be a nightmare. I appreciate that some of the parameters we could put on the approval might prevent some really bad things from happening, or at least have some recourse if they do. I like the idea of a restaurant without the catering business and then see how that works. And if that works, well, maybe then move forward without the catering business. But I don't know if the whole thing is viable as a business without the catering; just as a restaurant with the third floor vacant or used for something else. If the business owner would think of something for the third floor that would take the catering business out of the picture, then maybe the whole thing would look better to us and we'd have a little more confidence in taking slightly less risk on the restaurant alone. So I'm thinking out loud. I don't think I have a solution either.

**Boardmember Alligood:** I would like to see this project work. I do think we need to find a viable use for this building. It is in the center of our town, and to have it beautifully renovated is, I think, a worthy goal. I do think more creative solutions need to be brought to the table. You know, we need to hear more about whether the negotiations with Chase Bank will be successful. I think there are other negotiations perhaps that could be initiated, for instance talking to the funeral home. That lot right next door is not used on a regular basis; at least in terms of fixing the problem of staging for construction, that sort of thing, in terms of alleviating our concerns about that traffic generation.

And also one of my main concerns really is the deliveries. I know that right now the deliveries take place on site plan review where you have the arrow there, but the magnitude is really going to be greater. And that is a bottleneck there during commuting hours. Deliveries are going to take place during the time of day when our town is the most congested. I'm not so worried about after 6 o'clock. I mean, I agree with some of the comments of others that I'd like to see a little bit more activity in the downtown in the evenings. I think that would be a good thing. We're all kind of looking at what's happening to Dobbs Ferry. I think that sort of vibrancy should be a goal of ours for our downtown. But during the day, how do you get all the deliveries into that building without making it a nightmare for people just trying to get to the train or to school or whatever. So we need to find a way to have trucks parked that's going to work, and also in terms of garbage pickup.

So I guess my concern is more about traffic during the day than the parking in the evening. I agree that we should have an outside consultant look at that issue and really back up the analysis that's been presented to us in terms of what's available, how many spaces are available at certain times of the day. I think we should have that looked at by a traffic consultant. I think that's pretty much it.

**Boardmember Cameron:** I'd love to see that building become used again. The last few years it hasn't been used very much, even though it's been there. I have a problem with basing a waiver on it as if the restaurant had been going full bore for the last bunch of years and all we're doing is adding a few more seats compared to what we have. Because that's not what's happening.

When you provide a waiver, you do it on the basis, in my mind, of reality and what you're actually adding to it by giving the waiver rather than pretending that what's not happening has been happening and then handing a waiver on top of that. I would urge them to look back again at setting an agreement with the town.

The other comment I have is, maybe this facility, with all the floors working as a restaurant, is just too big for Hastings and maybe we just can't actually have that big of a place in downtown Hastings. I keep looking at it saying well, gee, if they actually also owned the funeral home then that would probably work. They could have parking in the back and what have you. That seemed to be reasonable, but just that facility itself and having that many people coming in would be really, really tough. And I think the concern on parking -- to go to one point one of my colleagues here made -- isn't that you can't find a place in the parking lot. It's that a lot of people are here because they don't park in the parking lot, they've parked on the street because they live here. The idea that they're going to turn around and go down Maple Avenue and find all the spots filled is absolutely true, I think. I live all the way down Maple Avenue and I actually can park on my own property. But tons of merchants and other people, post office workers, are all parking up and down our street, just filling it up chockablock. The idea that these 19, or however many employees they're going to have, aren't going to go and do that I think is avoiding the truth, quite frankly.

So I'd love to see something happen there. I just don't see it happening allowing people the freedom to park where they want to park because I think it's just going to take too much of the space in town.

**Boardmember Hutson:** The other thing, Patty, I'd say about a parking study, you know, we've done so many over the years for various projects and they always come out basically the same: that there are plenty of spots, but they aren't where people want them. So we can do another one; it's going to come out that way.

I think the real issue on this is the Saturday, if they plan to use that on Saturday. That's so key for the life of the merchants in the Village when it comes to the catering hall. Because I think everybody feels that having that place refurbished and renovated and made into a really nice restaurant is a plus. You can't really argue against it. But the idea of a catering hall, even if it is not that many times during the year, on a Saturday ... and I think the 5 o'clock thing -- because people start to come before 5 o'clock -- is an issue, too, because that's where people coming home aren't looking for a parking place. I'm talking about the residents now, and so on. I think that is a real issue even during the week. But I think with the restaurant's capacity, the tradeoff is worth doing. If you're talking about something with the potential of more major happenings in the catering hall then that's too much, based on what we know, for where it's located. It is a key spot, but it's a key spot from a lot of points of view. It's a key spot in terms of things being too much also, as well as it being aesthetically important and socially important.

**Boardmember Barr:** The thing about having a traffic study, I don't think we need another traffic study taking counts. What we need is someone to creatively look and see is there a way to accommodate the flow of people in and out and what that might be. And that might even say also to the applicant is there potentially another viable use -- and it has to be use of this third floor -- that wouldn't create such a demand. This is a wonderful site, which challenges everybody to be just a little bit thoughtful. And not to find out what you can't do, but what might work.

**Boardmember Dale:** There's a proposal by Angie: the possibility of using the Zinsser parking lot only for the catering force.

**Chairperson Speranza:** That was actually from, I think, Fonda. This may be something. All the Planning Board members received an e-mail today with the suggestion having to do with, again, the Zinsser lot.

**Ms. Lefrak:** I was at the Trustees meeting on Tuesday night when this was brought up. When I went home and was thinking about it, I thought what if -- and it's just a possibility -- the restaurateur would have two to three shuttle buses at Zinsser lot. When they did an event, in the direction card they were never directed to the restaurant, they were directed to go to Zinsser lot. There would be, let's say, two buses there -- one to be always traveling when the weather's bad, like tonight. People could get out of their car, wait in the bus 'til it's ready to go. It was a suggestion. Trying to make it work because we do want to have a restaurant. It would be great. The catering hall is really the problem.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Anyone else?

**Rosie, manager of Bloom:** I just also wanted to agree with her that I think the main problem that everyone is feeling is that the catering hall is a little too much. And it would be nice to think of Hastings as a prime location when you want to go out and think where can we go. People think, oh, downtown White Plains. People think, oh, Dobbs Ferry, that's a nice area where you have your choice: Italian, Mexican, a sports bar, a local pub. You think of White Plains, lots of local places to go. When you come to Hastings you have not too much to choose from so it's not really in the top of your head.

So it would be nice as a businessperson here to have one more restaurant to give more people an idea of Hastings as a restaurant town. I think it would bring lots of business. It would make it very fun. But a catering hall, I think that would be strange in such a downtown location. I live in Dobbs Ferry. If they suddenly opened a catering hall in Dobbs Ferry I think it would be funny to see people dressed up in their fine clothes, maybe sometimes having a limo -- small bar mitzvahs, small little receptions for special occasions -- in a downtown area where local people are going out just to eat. I think it's also a clash of the nightlife as well. So I just wanted to bring that to your attention. Thank you.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Okay, you've heard a lot today. One more?

**Ms. Topilnycky:** The buses. Financially I'm not sure if that would be beneficial for them to use shuttle buses. I know they proposed valet parking down Spring and into the Zinsser lot if they could answer the questions about the valets not speeding down Spring, because you know they do. They live on tips. The comment was, in order to get them down to Zinsser they'd have to speed down to Zinsser and then speed back up. And where would they drop the cars if you use Spring as the valet. A shuttle bus for that short of a distance, I'm not sure if that's a great idea, if it would work.

But as a person who goes to restaurants, how many of you actually valet your car even if you're going for a wedding? I feel more secure if I park it myself. I don't really like people in the car even if I'm going for an event. This is a local restaurant, this is a small town. It's not like you can't find out where the restaurant is. It's probably easier to find the restaurant than it is to find Zinsser parking lot. So for me, I would say that probably half the people that are coming to a banquet hall or catering probably would not want to valet their cars. Some would, if you're involved in a wedding or whatever. They're talking about small parties. But you know, there's a lot of weddings. People find it cheaper to do it on weeknights to have a wedding. You're addressing now the commuter lot.

**Chairperson Speranza:** And I think we've heard a lot. I think it's time to turn it back to the applicant. There's a couple of things here. Certainly there's an idea to deal with Chase. The outreach has been made, and I think that's fine. Obviously, this board is not ready to make any kind of action at this point. I think we need to hear some more from you with respect to do you think that's really going to happen, is there an agreement pending, in the offing. Is it proceeding, or the outreach has been made and do you say now they said no or they said yes.

What would the implications be of having the restaurant open -- and it's something certainly for you to think of operationally -- and then you come back for the catering hall. We had a similar situation at our last meeting. Someone wanted to renovate a building, open up the building. They wanted outdoor seating. That created too many problems at the time. They pulled it. Is that something you would be willing to do now? Open the restaurant, we see how things go, then consider a catering hall -- or some other use of that third floor, which still would be subject to parking requirements.

I'm hearing, I think -- the sense of the Board -- that maybe the Village should have someone come in and take a quick look at traffic patterns and parking. And guide us a little bit also in terms of a restaurant and what could be the reality of additional ... the use of the catering versus the use of restaurant space. The Hastings House was a very special place. Many people walked there, walked home from there. This is going to be ... I'm hearing it as it's a destination restaurant. You're also going to be having people from outside the Village who are going to be coming, so we have to deal with the parking in a different way.

**Boardmember Dale:** Patty, planning -- the transportation plan -- the people who have done that have already done most of the research necessary, I would think, to...

**Chairperson Speranza:** Well, we can talk about it, and I'm not exactly sure of the process in terms of getting someone on board. We also have someone who's engaged with the Village in other work now who has been doing a very good job for us.

**Boardmember Alligood:** I just want to agree with Rhoda that I don't think we need traffic counts. That's sort of useless without an analysis of what that says to us. So I would be very careful about what we actually get out of this study.

**Chairperson Speranza:** And I'm not thinking so much of traffic counts. I mean, there's base information, and anybody that we would hire as for a traffic and parking study, the biggest thing they're going to give us is the traffic generation related to the restaurant business and catering; and looking at this block, and is there the possibility that someone else could come up with another idea, or mitigate. So if there is a sense that we could use a little outside assistance, then we can certainly do that.

**Boardmember Barr:** Maybe the applicant should be responsible for this.

**Chairperson Speranza:** That's where I was going because there are some things with respect to the application. We do have a professional fees law, and I am hearing that we may want to request the applicant to develop an escrow, put in money, for us to do some work on behalf of the Village. And again for everybody, the way that works is the Village hires the individual, it's paid for by the applicant. So the firm is our choice, and they report to us. I'm hearing the traffic and parking and circulation and, potentially, legal fees.

**Boardmember Cameron:** I agree on that. I think one of the things we need to know is, based on a restaurant of this size and the additional expected traffic, how many additional cars will we get. And then get a feel where without some sort of restrictions they're all going to park. Because actually the issue ... we all can point there at Zinsser and say, well, gee, it's empty, they can go down there. But what they're going to do is start the closest thing to that and just fill in all the parking around there. That's one of my concerns about this. There's really no way of forcing, or offering them the opportunity, they can refuse going to a facility to park the car. I mean, I would jokingly say they should offer people \$5 off their bill if they can present their ticket from the bus or something just so that people have an incentive to take the bloody thing and go there. Because otherwise, my concern is people -- just use Maple Avenue for the moment -- will be coming back from a movie on Saturday night and they won't have a place to park their car.

**Boardmember Dale:** Or you could do like Mayor Bloomberg and charge traffic congestion fees.

**Boardmember Cameron:** We can also do something else which we have trouble doing, and that is provide resident stickers for everybody. But you need the state legislature's approval to do that.

**Boardmember Hutson:** I think all we have to do is look at our own behavior and what 99.9% of us would do in this room.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Jamie, would you drive your car down there?

**Boardmember Cameron:** No, I wouldn't.

**Chairperson Speranza:** I would not, so there's a percentage.

**Boardmember Alligood:** I wouldn't.

**Boardmember Hutson:** But you may not be invited to the function.

**Chairperson Speranza:** And it's the function as opposed to the restaurant.

Okay, do you have what you need from us for this evening?

**Ms. Griffin:** I want to thank the Board for so many wonderful ideas. I think we need to take some time to think about the suggestions you've made. We might revisit the place using the Zinsser parking lot. We may take a look at how the building is used, look at the banquet hall. You've made a lot of suggestions that we just need some time to consider, and then come back to you. We may modify the proposal or may ... well, modifying the parking obviously needs to be done. We need to look at can we really get an agreement, what will be the agreement, with Chase; shall we consider; are there any other options. Yes, we have to be ingenious.

But I think this is a project I'm really committed to because I think it's a beautiful building. And I also believe in the concept of having more restaurants and businesses that draw people from outside the area. I was once on a downtown improvement committee when I was in the Chamber years ago. We became members of the Historic Trust Main Street organization. They gave us lots of information, and it was very interesting how they made suggestions as to how you revitalize a downtown by simply having a lot of restaurants that bring people in, and even having certain businesses that draw from the outside because it will help the other businesses. I remember when I came to Hastings 25 years ago counting 11 bars and restaurants. It's very quiet now. At that time Dobbs Ferry had very little activity, and you see how Dobbs Ferry's changed because of all the restaurants.

But we're going to have to take a look and talk amongst ourselves, find out what other options we can present to you. Consider perhaps going back to the Board of Trustees if we want to use Zinsser. We're going to have to do that. Thank you so much. I don't know if Paul has any comments.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Okay. That's not the end of our meeting tonight. Two hours, that's not bad.

2. **Public Hearing (Continued). Saw Mill Lofts. Site Plan Approval for proposed mixed-use development with 54 live/work condominium units and 6 affordable residential condominium units on 7.45 acre parcel on Route 9A (Sheet 22, Parcels P4 and P4A) zoned MUPPD. Concept plan was approved by Village Board of Trustees on 6-20-06.**

**Chairperson Speranza:** The next item on our agenda is site plan approval for the proposed Saw Mill Lofts on Route 9-A. It does feel like we should be done, doesn't it? Yes, John, I'm sure you feel that way.

**Boardmember Dale:** Especially when you have a somewhat insoluble problem.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Yes. We spend so much time thinking about ways. And if anybody has any suggestions, anybody who's watching at home, please don't hesitate to get in touch with somebody.

**Boardmember Hutson:** What about these guys from 9-A?

**Chairperson Speranza:** That's true -- weigh in on this.

To pick up the pieces where we are on this, there had been Board of Trustees approval of a concept plan. We received at our last meeting some initial submissions for site plan approval. There are a couple of actions to be undertaken, there are some things that we are expecting from the applicant, and there was some work that our own Village staff was doing with respect to steep slopes that our Building Inspector was going to take a look at. And I have some questions based on some items that came up recently in the news. Mr. Normoyle, go ahead.

**Patrick Normoyle, Ginsburg Development Companies:** I said at the last meeting it was the last time I was going to say this, but there are a few members who were not here last meeting. I grew up in Hastings. My parents still have a house at 9 Clarence Avenue, which is actually not far from the project site. So I hope that's the last time -- or I promised Angie I wouldn't say that too many more times -- but it seems I keep mentioning it.

I do want to introduce Tony Castillo -- he's with our engineer, SESI Consulting Engineers -- and our architect, Vivy Lee, who's with Do Chung and Partners. I'm basically going to give a brief overview of what we included in the June submission. I know a few Boardmembers were not able to make the May meeting. Our May meeting was quite substantial, so if there are any issues that you guys have questions about or would like us to review, we're happy to do that. I'd like to give a brief overview, then there's a few engineering issues I know were noted at the May meeting we could dig into first. And then, hopefully, deal with architectural, I don't think we'll spend as much time on the architectural. We can cover that towards the end.

So in terms of your June submission, we did note in the transmittal letter some changes that were made to the grading plan. Just to briefly touch on them, we did make some revisions to our storm water management plan. Tony, after I'm done, will go into a little more detail on that if you would like.

Another issue that did come up at the last meeting was the berm along Saw Mill River Road. We actually have some new visuals that were not completed in time for the submission, which we'd like to show you.



Then, in addition, we made some changes to the slopes at the rear of the buildings. Actually, Bruce had made the comment about there were some steep slopes that might have made it difficult for some of the fire and emergency personnel to get some equipment to the rear flat area that we're proposing so we actually changed it. That made it a little bit more of a gradual increase, to address that concern. We also have a cross-section of the bioretention areas. That was in your packet. It's pretty detailed, but just so you guys saw it.

In addition, from the time of our May meeting we did go back to the Affordable Housing Committee. I have resubmitted plans that I think will satisfy their requirements, which we can also discuss in detail. We did make a submission to the Architectural Review Board, so Vivy and myself are going to attend their July 2nd meeting. Later in the meeting Vivy can present some of the materials for it and some other things that we're going to present to them. I know James had mentioned at the May meeting some questions about what the elevations and things like that would be.

So if you want, we could actually have Tony touch on essentially the storm water changes and the berm. The other big issue mentioned at the May meeting was the fill between buildings A and B. So if we could start there, and then take any questions.

**Tony Castillo, SESI Consulting Engineers:** As Patrick mentioned, there were a couple of engineering changes that we have done to the plans. The first has to do with some modifications to the proposed storm water bioretention areas. One of the things that we have done is provide some additional information as far as under-drain details. This information was given to your storm water consultant from the review. Also there are some very minor dimension changes. Those were due to recent DEC modifications to their storm water regulations. So in order to keep current and consistent we adjusted our plans and calculations likewise, and also provided that information to Robert Pape as well.

All in all, what we have done is looked at each drainage area that discharges runoff towards these proposed basins. I started to mention this at the previous meeting, but I would just like to reiterate that we are further reducing the amount of impervious coverage that is conveying storm water to each of these areas. And, in turn, what we're further reducing is, in all storm events, not only the peak runoff rate but also the runoff volume as well -- even further than what we had testified to in front of the Board. We've provided this information, in the form of a new report, over to your storm water consultant.

Another change that we have done -- Patrick also mentioned this -- was we addressed the berm in the front parallel to Saw Mill River Road. What I provide here are two ... let me show you this first here. There are two alternative grading options here. The first provides approximately a 6-inch berm, if you will, parallel to Saw Mill River Road, and provides a cross-section. Basically, these views are taken if you're standing here facing north, vis-à-vis the dashed line here is existing grade. The top line is the proposed grade. Again, we don't have a lot of topography to utilize here so we're rather limited as far as ...

Did you say a 6-inch berm in this one alternative? Very mild slope, very mild cross-slope. Just to show you one alternative that we have along here, on this side here more towards the south in front of building B we have a 3:1 slope from the swale that discharges towards the bioretention basin. We have a 3:1 slope going up towards Saw Mill River Road. And again, that's an approximately 6- to 8-inch high berm in that location here. But that's one alternative.

A second alternative: a little more aggressive grading. Here we have a 2:1 slope. Existing grade, now we're looking at the same thing: a cross-section looking to the north. Existing grade, proposed grade. Using this alternative, again, more aggressive grade, 2:1 slope, we're looking at an approximately 2-1/2 foot high berm along this portion of this landscaped area. On the southern area here, same thing, a 2:1 slope going up from the bioretention area towards Saw Mill River Road. Here you're looking at about a 3- to 3-1/2 foot berm. So again, more aggressive grading, slightly higher berm. We provided these two options for you to review and comment.

**Boardmember Hutson:** Why would you do a 6-inch berm? That's something less than a baby berm, isn't it? Doesn't it have to be a little higher than that to be a berm even? Am I wrong on this?

**Boardmember Alligood:** We have a wide range of options.

**Mr. Normoyle:** One thing I will mention. He did review these plans with our landscape architect, David Ferris Miller, and you have a detailed planting plan from him in your most recent submission. The other thing we could consider doing ... this was discussed at the May meeting. And I actually came here for a clarification, given my recent involvement with the project. We did clarify, I think, at the last meeting that essentially the idea behind the berm was trying to create some visual screening. During the meeting I had mentioned could we do a wall, given these constraints -- a stone wall, something like that. I think Eva had mentioned that we already have a wall at the building; that would be a lot of wall. So we basically tried to take a closer look at some berm. And berm -- we looked it up, there's actually no minimum definition -- the conditions in the approval actually don't mention any specific dimensions. However, we did review this with David Ferris Miller, and in addition to the berm we could do some -- what he would recommend if we wanted some planting -- like a Red-Leaf Barberry hedge. But apparently he thought that would be a very nice look and kind of give you some reddish color along this line. So that was something that, if the Board wanted, we could add the hedge to either one of these options. Again, if the goal was to create some kind of visual screening, which I think was what we were told last month, that's another thing we could add.

**Boardmember Alligood:** Since I wasn't part of the process of inserting that into the site plan I was curious about the goal of the berm. I just want to confirm: that was meant to be screening so that we don't have to look at this project, or that we don't want to see the parking? What specifically was the concern?

**Boardmember Dale:** What's screened by the berm.

**Boardmember Alligood:** Yes, that's my question because we're struggling with the berm. But what are we trying to accomplish?

**Boardmember Hutson:** We were particularly looking at having as much green as we could, in part because we knew there would be parking in the front to soften that. It wasn't so much to hide the buildings, obviously, but it was the things that would be more at ground level and just to make a little more interesting topography in there because they are fairly large structures. So that was the thought.

**Boardmember Alligood:** That could be accomplished with plantings rather than a berm.

**Boardmember Hutson:** Yes, it could be. I guess we thought at the time the berm was a little more interesting than just more plantings. That it could be, again, a little softer, kind of in keeping with the terrain on the other side of Saw Mill River Road. But again, it's not that we were heavily invested. It just seemed like an important thing. Again, we're trying to deal with the transition to Hastings issue and so on, and the parkland that is south from there.

**Chairperson Speranza:** And as you mentioned, David, the parking -- to have parking in the front. We wanted to be able to soften it so that you didn't drive down the road and see, then, just a parking lot of asphalt.

**Mr. Normoyle:** We're here tonight to get some direction from you. We can go forward in any of the directions we've mentioned, or some other.

**Boardmember Hutson:** Did you resolve the question that came up at the last meeting in terms of the extent to which the holding basins might ...

**Chairperson Speranza:** That's what I was going to say. I was wondering about that. What are the implications if you have a larger berm versus a 6-inch berm with respect to the storm water?

**Mr. Castillo:** In either case, whether it be a 6-inch or another alternative, there would be no impact in terms of the size. The volume is not affected. So in either option the sizing remains the same.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Okay. So there's no benefit?

**Mr. Castillo:** None. No, it's just a choice of ...

**Chairperson Speranza:** You know, I'm looking at the one you have in the corner down there. It looks pretty significant in terms of water coming down the berm onto the property into the swale. Or is it just such a small difference that it really doesn't matter? The Village consultant is there shaking his head no, it doesn't matter. Okay, so it's up to us.

**Boardmember Hutson:** One of the things, too, we weren't necessarily thinking there wouldn't be plantings on the berm when we talked about this.

**Boardmember Cameron:** I think the berm's a nice idea. It gives a natural roll to the land. It's a very flat piece of property, so it'd be nice to have something there which adds a bit of character to it.

**Boardmember Alligood:** Especially if it had some plantings. Because my biggest concern is just driving down and seeing this huge parking lot. I would like to see that screened in a natural way, and that's why I wasn't so enthused about a stone wall. I thought that was just more building.

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

**Boardmember Alligood:** But something more natural-looking would be nice.

**Mr. Normoyle:** The hedge idea from our landscape architect, I think what we were telling him was like a continuous screen. But if you're open to some more intermittent plantings I think he would come up with something different than a continuous hedge. So if you tell us we can easily go back to him. David Ferris Miller's been with us for over 20 years. He's a fantastic professional, so I think he'd come up with something nice based on your direction.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Does anyone have a preference?

**Boardmember Dale:** I like the idea of doing something there that unifies the front with the back. And if there's some way of echoing the kind of wildlife milieu that we have along the trailway there and the Saw Mill River, if there's some way of integrating with the river -- something that would be kind of along the lines of the character of the wild growth that's already there -- I think that would be really great. You don't want something that looks pasted on a beautiful nature scene, and that's kind of what I'm afraid of here. So anything that could be done to mitigate that, I think, would really be great.

**Boardmember Alligood:** We want to avoid formality, which is what a hedge would do.

**Boardmember Dale:** That's the idea of the berm; to just flow here. To get something that's not just flat, pasted on a parking lot -- a big, long parking lot.

**Mr. Castillo:** If I can add to that, I absolutely agree with you. To that end, these bioretention areas certainly would not be something just with turf grass and a break with a linear hedge. There would be plantings, certainly, within this area to break this up. Because they not only would serve as a visual aesthetic, but they also serve a purpose in terms of the storm water treatment and cleanup. So there certainly would be a look towards more of a nature-like setting, if you will, because there would be a lot of activity going on in that area of benefit.

**Mr. Normoyle:** But I think we get your message. And perhaps even just getting back to the slope, maybe than the 2:1 or 3:1, some combination to create the visual interest you were looking for along with the plantings that you had described as far more varied, similar to what's along the banks of the Saw Mill River. So I think I'm good. Are you good?

**Mr. Castillo :** I'm good. The third issue is with regard to the fill that we propose now behind Building B. One of the things that we had begun to mention at our previous meeting was, prior to this design we had come before the Board with a rather high wall, more along the lines of approximately 15-foot high. We understood that there were major concerns at that time from this board. Number one, there were aesthetic issues. Secondly, there were some concerns with regard to safety, and we understood those.

So what we did was, we came back with another alternative to basically provide a level area in the back behind Building B. And instead of just the vertical drop, provide an approximately 3:1 slope going back down towards the river. Of course, what that results in is some additional fill volume proposed in the area of the floodplain. But one of the things that we had mentioned previously is that we looked at what that impact was volume-wise, how it impacted the entire flood storage volume of the Saw Mill River on our property. We found that on this property itself we have about 11,700 cubic yards of flood storage during a 100-year storm on this property. With this alternative, we were looking to fill about 450 yards of that. What does that mean? It means it's approximately 3.5% of that number.

In my opinion as a professional, I think that the benefits of providing this graded slope versus a straight wall of 15 feet high significantly benefits and reduces the concerns for safety, especially when you're trying to provide access back here to do any sort of fighting a fire or any kind of activity going on back here. Having a slope is much more agreeable, I think, than having a vertical wall to contend with. Also, just looking at the numbers, we're still looking at, again, a 3.5% fill. What does it mean? To me, it's a de minimis number. And I think it still is consistent with the original SEQRA finding, where you're looking to fill just a very small area within this 100-year floodplain and it doesn't result in any measurable increase. That's an important concept: that it doesn't result in a measurable increase in that 100-year floodplain elevation on the property.

**Mr. Normoyle:** So if I could, Patty, you had mentioned at the last meeting about revisiting, or taking another look at, the SEQRA findings; with these little changes here and there, what happens. I did look at, and I think your consultants can also review, but just to read one comment on this point. Your SEQRA findings read: "The project would fill only a very small area of the 100-year floodplain, which would not result in any measurable increase in downstream flood elevation." So the previous plan proposed some fill, which I think was about 80 cubic yards. So we had proposed that, and that had been accepted previously. Now, to basically get around this wall issue for the reasons Tony mentioned, we're proposing a bit more fill -- 450 cubic yards versus that 80. So in our opinion it is a minimal increase. We'll go either way you guys want. We can put up the retaining wall. We don't think that's the best approach, in our opinion. But, again, we'll defer to you. We think what we've most recently proposed is the best way to basically balance all the different priorities.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Is that it for storm water?

**Mr. Castillo:** Actually, there was one additional comment Mr. Dale had mentioned. Towards the end of the meeting you were talking about concerns with groundwater. I know you had a minor comment there. One thing I did not mention at that meeting was we will propose foundation drains around each of these buildings as an additional preventive measure. What I didn't mention at the previous meeting was that we had elevated Building A, the garage floor, by 2 feet to now an elevation of 124 versus 122 previously. That was just to make sure that that garage floor was well above that 100-year flood elevation of 122.

But in addition to that, to address the groundwater issues we definitely will provide foundation drains around the perimeter of these buildings so that if groundwater happens to rise, that would be captured by these foundation drains, and intercepted and conveyed into the piping systems that exist today, and away from the buildings.

**Boardmember Cameron:** How would a foundation drain take the water away if the water's getting there? Because the entire water is rising, I don't understand where the drains are going to take it to.

**Mr. Castillo:** They would be hard-connected.

**Boardmember Cameron:** You'd pump it up to the level of Saw Mill River Road?

**Mr. Castillo:** No. Everything drains, by gravity, towards the river.

**Boardmember Cameron:** Okay, but the river's the problem. The river's coming up, the water's coming up. It's heading towards 124. How will a drain take it back? I don't understand that.

**Mr. Castillo:** Because the elevation of the pipes are at about elevation 116. They're low, so we're talking about two different things. We're talking about groundwater versus a flood event. You're asking about groundwater. What it'd be doing is capturing that groundwater, conveying it away from the building and getting it into these pipes and into the existing piping systems and into the river.

**Boardmember Dale:** In part, the issue has to do with the earth getting saturated. I have this question about the 100-year floodplain. Someone made the comment at the last meeting about 70-year floods seeming to happen every couple of months now. Global warming's real, and floodplains are old standards. There is saturation of the earth -- my house experienced it -- where water literally came up through the slab. Some of our neighbors had the same problem. This was only a month ago. The question really has to do with that. Proximity to the river is a source of water. And a heavy rain storm, after a couple of days there's a problem. I was curious about that.

**Boardmember Hutson:** As I understand it, the water is even in the soil running toward the river, slow though it may be. The idea of the drains is that it provides an easy route for it to follow.

**Boardmember Dale:** That collects the surface water.

**Boardmember Hutson:** No, no. This is not a surface drain.

**Boardmember Dale:** But then I think Jamie's question is a good one. Because if the groundwater has reached the level of the slab, and that's where the drain is, then the drains are flooded.

**Boardmember Cameron:** Yes, they're not going to take any water.

**Boardmember Dale:** They're not really taking the water away.

**Mr. Castillo:** Well, these drains would intercept that water before it gets into the slab, conveyed it into the piping system, and get it away from a possible leak into the slab.

**Boardmember Cameron:** But if the whole water level has risen, your pipes will take it nowhere because it'll be coming up the pipes as well.

**Mr. Castillo:** Timing.

**Boardmember Hutson:** It's always timing.

**Boardmember Dale:** Hopefully the storm will stop.

**Boardmember Hutson:** Reassure that the water runs downhill.

**Chairperson Speranza:** We do have the Village's consultant from the engineering firm Carpenter Environmental. Mr. Pape?

**Robert Pape, Carpenter Environmental:** I think there are two different issues right now. One is the water table itself, which is higher than the Saw Mill. So the water table drains to the Saw Mill. What I'm hearing is they're planning on building a piping system underneath the foundation slab that will, with the water table itself -- let's leave the Saw Mill out of it for now ... the water table rises for whatever reason, it will be caught by that drainage system and drain down to the Saw Mill. If the Saw Mill rises, as is being explained, it will not work.

**Boardmember Cameron:** That is what we're saying.

**Mr. Pape:** Right. Because if you were going to fill up to the point of the discharge of those pipes, of course you're going to fill back. But then again, you're also increasing the level of the Saw Mill onto the property line and you'd be into that 100-year flood zone. The 100-year flood zone, I believe, is at 122 elevation. So at this point, depending upon the elevation of those pipes underneath the floor, the basement's 126?

**Mr. Castillo:** The garage floor here at Building B is 126, and Building A is 124.

**Mr. Pape:** So you'd be down to about 123. You'd still have a positive drain.

**Mr. Castillo:** Right.

**Mr. Pape:** You need about a foot for the gravity in order to flow. If the Saw Mill rises even higher than that, then you're into your 1,000-year storm and ...

**Boardmember Barr:** ... you're going to get wet.

**Mr. Pape:** Did that clear that up?

**Boardmember Cameron:** Yes, we were clear about it, but you verified what we thought.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Now I have a question about this. As we went through the environmental process, this was a huge issue. Earlier this week County Executive Spano held a flooding summit for municipalities, planning board people, and municipal officials due to some of the horrible things that happened, primarily on the Sound shore -- Greenburgh and parts of Hastings also. You guys are the experts. So these are just things that I picked up there. A little bit of information could be dangerous. Representatives from FEMA were there; the new FEMA maps are there. I understand the Village has them. I want to make sure that this is based on those new FEMA floodplain maps.

**Mr. Castillo:** They are.

**Chairperson Speranza:** This elevation, plus 2?

**Mr. Castillo:** They are. I have been in contact with FEMA for at least a year, speaking to their consultants, getting an understanding of where the hydrology is, any changes, trying to get an anticipation and just thinking conservatively. That's why, just as a factor of safety, we raised the garage floor of Building A by 2 feet as a preventive measure. What I have found out from FEMA and their consultants is that the new flood elevations for Saw Mill River in this location, that 100-year flood of 22 elevation, has not changed. You'll see in your new flood profiles and your new mapping that does not change because that is still current.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Okay, good. I wanted to make sure.

And Mr. Pape, if you could just go through some of this. The applicant has mentioned some of the things, and you prepared a letter for us which we got today. If you wouldn't mind just going through the major points because it does address some of the things. I think it would be great to have your confirmation that, in fact, there will be no changes. There will remain no unmitigated negative impacts from this proposal, given the changes; given the 15-foot retaining wall is gone, which I think we're all very glad about.

**Mr. Pape:** Right. The two things that they keep doing is reducing the amount of impervious space. Every time I look at this it's shrunk a little bit more. But they're not changing the sizes of the permanent ponds and the bioretention areas, which is excellent. The fill that they did, again, becomes a minimal amount because your flood elevation is set at a particular height. You're squeezing a little more earth within the whole Saw Mill River, so it becomes a minimal impact on that.

Based on their final plans, no further comments on that. The comments that I did submit in the letter primarily focuses now on the sediment and erosion control plans that they had put together that I had just recently seen. Should I discuss that at this point, or wait until later?

**Boardmember Hutson:** Have we had any response from them on that? Have they seen those comments?

**Mr. Pape:** No, they haven't.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Do you want to get a copy of the letter, or do you want to hear them now?

**Mr. Castillo:** We'll hear them now. It's fine.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Okay, go ahead. And you get the letter, too, obviously.

**Mr. Pape:** Between Buildings A and B, on the side towards -- this is south, right? -- on the south side between Buildings A and B there are hay bales placed. It appears that the hay bales are placed just before the slopes. Those hay bales, I would imagine, were placed for added protection for the sediment and erosion control during construction.

**Mr. Castillo:** Yes.



**Mr. Pape:** That water, though, appears that because you're putting it before the steep slopes it has a chance of creating rills as the water runs off. It's a dam is basically what you're building. So you're going to build up the water level and steep that out. One of the things that you did do, which was interesting, was that you placed the hay bales on the south side.

**Mr. Castillo:** Placed on both sides of the proposed bioretention area behind Building B on the southern side, and another along the northern side here.

**Mr. Pape:** Okay, you placed those hay bales in front of the fence, so that's a double protection. As you move towards the north, however, you start getting a steeper slope or grade. My recommendation is now to continue those hay bales all the way across, bring the hay bales that you had between Buildings A and B down along the side of the silt fence. That should be adequate protection instead of placing that set right in the center.

**Mr. Castillo:** Sure, okay.

**Mr. Pape:** That covers two.

**Boardmember Hutson:** Can I ask a question in that regard? I was concerned about just the thing you're talking about as it relates to this fill issue. Doesn't that make this more of a challenge to control that erosion there with the amount of fill we're talking about now, or do you think the extension of it is enough?

**Mr. Pape:** With the hay bales, particularly around Building B -- if you focus on that, where they're going to add extra fill -- down off the steep slope you have a little area behind that. They left a flat spot for the water to build up and resettle, which will be fine.

What was noted also was that you plan on, as you grade or re-grade, to bring a swale across and discharge to sediment pond number one. Just on the drawings, if you could indicate, that will exist. And plus, as you start to grade it's going to move. So just indicate that it's going to be in this general area, but it will be moving during construction of the terrace.

**Mr. Castillo:** Sure, not a problem.

**Mr. Pape:** The two larger items are the sediment basins themselves. I didn't see any indication that they showed the regulation 3,600 cubic feet per acre of drainage. The old regulations were 1,800 cubic feet of disturbed area. That had changed to 3,600 cubic feet per acre, and that needs to be included.

**Mr. Castillo:** I'll send you calculations tomorrow. Basically what we have here is, each sediment basin -- for example this sediment basin -- will be placed generally in the area where the proposed bioretention area is going to be. There will be approximately 2 acres of area that are going to run towards it, and we have provided the volume that Mr. Pape is suggesting, and we'll provide him with those calculations.

Similarly behind Building B, there's a little less than 2 acres of area that will be running discharge and runoff towards it, and we also correspondingly provide that volume that he's looking for. We will provide him with those calculations. Not an issue.

**Mr. Pape:** Two other comments. Also note on the detailed drawings the level at which the basins will be cleaned from sediment, and also give the details on the outlet structures.

**Mr. Castillo:** Okay, very good.

**Mr. Pape:** They are pretty minor items, but they're very necessary going into construction.

**Chairperson Speranza:** With respect to storm water management -- and, again, it's because I went to this thing the other day -- the project is built ... GDC will hire someone to actually do the construction work. Obviously, you have a vested interest in making sure that the project comes out well. We the Village have, in my mind, even more of a responsibility to make sure that this storm water management plan functions, is constructed, in the way that it's being proposed to be constructed. What I want to do -- and I mention this tonight just so that you're not surprised -- is have a discussion with the Village Building Inspector to determine whether or not he feels the need to have someone assist him, particularly in making sure that this storm water system, when it's being put in, is being put in in a way that is being constructed, and will function the way that everyone is saying it will be designed to. Because we know things happen in the field.

**Boardmember Hutson:** And because of the proximity to the river, you're saying.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Yes.

**Mr. Castillo:** Absolutely. I would like to add to that. One of the responsibilities that GDC has, once construction begins -- regularly there has to be, by law, in terms of complying with the NOI, with the SWIP that would be appropriated by the DEC recording to ensure what the construction is -- number one, that erosion control practices are being provided. And also there is a tracking that takes place to make sure that during that process these facilities are being built in accordance with the plans. There is a reporting that takes place.

**Chairperson Speranza:** The DEC actually monitors that as well?

**Mr. Pape:** What ends up happening is that there's a very ingenious way that DEC installs these mechanisms. They give you a tool box of tools that you can put in. "If you do exactly what we say in our tool box you're fine, we'll allow you to start building in five days. But we'll come and inspect you when you're not looking. If you're not abiding by it, then you stop constructing at that moment in time." I don't know the word for it, but it's pretty neat.

**Mr. Castillo:** There's a lot of policing that's going on right now by the DEC. They are conducting spot inspections on these sites.

**Mr. Pape:** A lot, and I've been dealing with quite a few of them.

**Chairperson Speranza:** That's good to know.

**Mr. Pape:** The other aspect on this -- not to take up too much time -- is that they're required to perform an inspection weekly. In addition, they're also required to perform ...

**Chairperson Speranza:** "They" -- GDC?

**Mr. Pape:** Yes. And they're also required to perform an inspection within 24 hours after a rainfall event. And those records are also required to be available for anybody who wants to look at them.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Okay, good. Thank you.

**Mr. Castillo:** In terms of storm water changes, that's the extent of it.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Anybody have anything?

**Mr. Normoyle:** So I think at this point, before we go into some architectural issues, we'd like to just answer any other engineering or site questions you might have.

**Boardmember Alligood:** Looking back at what some of the stipulations were, I just wanted to raise the question about making sure that the landscaping along the Saw Mill River is done in a manner that installs plants and shrubs that will provide food, cover, and nests for songbirds and small mammals. The point is that that landscaping in the back really tries to mimic what *is* there. The landscape architect isn't here, but I'd like you to speak to that.

**Mr. Castillo:** I can answer part of that question. The landscaping areas around the proposed bioretention areas: there are prescribed species that the DEC indicates very clearly what you are allowed to put in. They have to be native, and they also provide not only an aesthetic but also a function. They provide a very extensive list, and Mr. Miller has a copy of that list and has created a species list, at least for the bioretention areas.

**Boardmember Alligood:** I was talking behind the buildings, right next to the river.

**Mr. Castillo:** Right. I only speak for those.

**Mr. Normoyle:** A couple things. One -- as far as along the banks of the river itself -- we were trying not to disturb the natural vegetation that was there. On the west side of the buildings you do see other plantings and trees that were proposed by David Ferris Miller. So I think for the next meeting we could get some report or comment back to you just addressing ... like that condition is mentioned in many different places, that desire to basically accommodate or achieve that result. So we could get a statement from him.

**Boardmember Alligood:** In other words, the next packet of information from him would just describe how it then achieves this goal.

**Mr. Normoyle:** Exactly. And his planting plan, which you do have and which is complete from our perspective, essentially was created with those requirements in mind. So we'll just have him somehow indicate how it does comply.

**Boardmember Cameron:** I want to ask a question about the stone wall you have in front of Buildings A and B, since it does affect the drainage, I guess. If you look at the one in front of B, and you start on the south side with it being 5 foot 10, as you get to the north end of the building it looks like it's going to be 10 feet tall because the land falls 4 feet. I'm just a little quizzical. Here's our main entryway into the place, and you've got a 10-foot stone wall in front of you. And actually I think that's more than we're allowed to have as walls. I'm just curious about what you're planning to do there.

**Mr. Normoyle:** You mean the stone wall on the east side of the buildings like running alongside the driveway, or to the south of Building B?

**Chairperson Speranza:** No, that's a good point.

**Boardmember Cameron:** Yes, you look at this diagram here. This is about 10 feet tall.

**Mr. Normoyle:** Yes, I don't think so, but let's comment on that.

**Boardmember Cameron:** It's 5 foot 10 at one end, and the property falls 4 feet or 5 feet from one end to the other, if you look at this map here. So that would add 5 feet to 5 foot 10 makes 10 feet 11.

**Mr. Normoyle:** Yes, it would make 10 feet.

**Mr. Castillo:** Yes, it would make 10.

**Mr. Normoyle:** We don't want the 10-foot wall on there, so let's clarify that if we can here.

**Boardmember Cameron:** And this drawing here depicts it going up and up and up and up.

**Mr. Normoyle:** Yes.

**Boardmember Cameron:** The contour lines indicate 129 at that end, and 134 at the other.

**Chairperson Speranza:** So you'll check into that.

**Mr. Castillo:** Yes, we'll check into it.

**Mr. Normoyle:** But I can guarantee you there's no way we want a 10-foot wall.

**Mr. Castillo:** Yes, absolutely not.

**Mr. Normoyle:** So we can easily respond to that. I think the visual you may have been looking at is small-scale and it may ...

**Boardmember Cameron:** Well, it has nothing to do with the visual. It has to do with the contour lines.

**Mr. Normoyle:** Yes, and we're looking at the contour lines here.

**Boardmember Cameron:** Your terraces are level at 133.50. You start with a fence at one end which is 5 foot 10, and the outside wall at the other end is 4-1/2 feet below that. If you add 4-1/2 feet to 5 foot 10 you end up with ...

**Mr. Normoyle:** Well, then let's talk through it.

**Mr. Castillo:** Yes, let's start from Building A, starting from the northern corner.

**Boardmember Cameron:** 129 feet right?

**Mr. Castillo:** Right. And there's a spot elevation of 133.5.

**Boardmember Cameron:** Right. And you have a 5'10" wall sitting right there. So look from 133.5.

**Mr. Castillo:** 5 foot 10 wall.

**Boardmember Cameron:** It's 3.10 stone and 2 feet of steel. So it's varying in size? So the person in the last patio down has a 1-foot high stone wall?

**Mr. Castillo:** Can I see your drawing?

**Boardmember Cameron:** It's the same as yours. Yours is colored and mine isn't. 129, 133.5, 133.5, 134. You've depicted this as 5 foot 10 high. If I carry 5 foot 10 high, looked at from the other side, I've picked up 4 or 5 feet. Look at it from this side. And that's what your drawing is showing me. It's going right across there, and you're picking up 5 feet.

**Mr. Castillo:** We'll come back.

**Mr. Normoyle:** We're coming back. I think we can create some sections at a few places along the wall.

**Mr. Castillo:** We'll clarify that for you.

**Mr. Normoyle:** I think it is a fact that the height of the stone wall will vary a bit. What was included in your packet from May showed a typical drawing. It showed essentially a 3 foot 10 inch high stone wall with a 2-foot-high ornamental railing. But I think the stone wall may vary in size as the grade changes. So why don't we come back with a few sections or something that shows it at different points. But in no way do we want a 10-foot wall.

**Boardmember Alligood:** I have one other question about something that was raised at the last meeting, which was saving any of the trees that are in the plan to be saved. One of the things to be looking out for is cutting away the vines that have grown on there and actually caused some of the problems with those trees. So we had asked if something could be done. Actually, a volunteer had come forward to say that they could cut those vines away for you. I think your response was, "We'll make sure to consult with our arborist to take care of that."

**Mr. Normoyle:** Sure. We got a proposal from Hawthorne Brothers, who are the arborists. We submitted their tree evaluation report last month. I specifically asked them for the two Spruce trees that will be saved. The third Spruce tree to the south we reported last month, their recommendation was that needs to come down. You had photos of that tree in the May submission. It's 70% dead, and really needs to go.

**Boardmember Cameron:** I went out and looked at it. I don't agree it's 70% dead. I think one of the things you should look at is the resolution by the Board of Trustees.

**Mr. Normoyle:** I did.

**Boardmember Cameron:** It says they will not be removed unless required because of disease. I couldn't see any disease. I'm not an arborist, but there was no disease on that tree.

**Mr. Normoyle:** Okay, well, we did submit the report from our arborists. I mean, we could have another arborist look at it, if you'd like.

**Boardmember Cameron:** He said it was diseased, or he said that it had a lot of vines on it?

**Mr. Normoyle:** We submitted a report from our arborist.

**Boardmember Cameron:** Well, we should look at that report because I don't see any disease on the tree. Admittedly, because it had been neglected for the whole year that we brought it up with Ginsburg one time after another ...

**Mr. Normoyle:** Well, I'm not sure about *that*.

**Boardmember Cameron:** You'd probably have to trim up about 35 feet or 30 feet, and take the branches off the bottom to save it. But funnily enough, it's in one of the conditions for your approval. Maybe you would have to go back to the Board of Trustees, I don't know.

**Mr. Normoyle:** It's also noted in the SEQRA documentation that that tree was potentially going to come down. So we'll revisit it.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Yes, let's take a look at the report. Maybe we could get our Village naturalist, Fred Hubbard, to go out and take a look and let him be the deciding ...

**Mr. Normoyle:** Yes, back to the two Spruce trees. We got a proposal from them to remove the lights that are on, still, one of the trees there, remove deadwood, remove the vines, and liquid fertilize the two Spruces. So we actually authorized that work, that's going to be done before the end of the month. I don't have a specific date, but they're going to be out there with a 75-foot bucket truck doing that work. We only asked them for the two Spruce trees. Obviously, there are other trees on site that once we get site plan approval, when we begin the site development work, we would prune the other trees as well.

**Boardmember Cameron:** The person who spoke -- who incidentally was one of our Trustees who spoke at the last meeting about that -- was talking about a third Spruce tree; the one that has the vines on it, which are killing the tree. That was what was being raised at the meeting, and your response was, "We'll get someone out there right away." You probably didn't realize there was a third tree, but the person really should look at cutting the vines on the third tree. I don't think it's that bad. I guess Fred Hubbard will have to look at that.

**Mr. Normoyle:** Yes, and I think if you take a look at the photos we included in the May submission ...

**Boardmember Cameron:** Well, you can go out there and look at them. I went there and looked at it today.

**Mr. Normoyle:** I know, but for convenience it's included in the May submission, too. Again, I did raise this at the last meeting. We'll do whatever you want but, again, I think it does represent a toppling hazard. We will be doing construction on-site. We're going to be taking precautionary measures to protect the trees that are healthy. Our arborist did say that that one definitely was a concern and a toppling hazard if it was not taken down affirmatively. So we should look at that.

**Chairperson Speranza:** And we'll be touch with you to have the Village naturalist go out and take a look too.

**Mr. Normoyle:** That's great.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Jamie, you had some other things also ... why don't we bring them up now because we know that there are things that we're going to come back for. So I think it's important to go through the documents, the conditions, that were put on the concept plan approval. And there are some things that we should just reconfirm.

**Boardmember Cameron:** One is the three Norway Spruces, which I've already brought up. The next one is the fact that the units are comparable. I think we need to somehow have a discussion about that and get a better feel of what we think comparable is. I know our Affordable Housing Committee has looked at it, but I think we probably have an obligation to make a decision if they are comparable or they aren't. That's an issue I think we need to look at. And we need probably some guidance -- at least I do -- on what comparable means.

**Chairperson Speranza:** That was our choice of words. Right, David -- Mr. Comparable?

**Boardmember Hutson:** I think that we compromised to the extent that we said that the comparability did not extend to the workspace, but it did extend to the living space. Now, as was discussed in the various memos, the question of the balcony came into play. You know, I feel comfortable with Affordable Housing's judgment on that; that they would rather not give up interior space in order to have a balcony. But it is something slightly less than, I think, what we had agreed to in terms of comparability between the units. In other words, the truth is the affordable unit, living space only, is slightly less than the market -- mainly the balcony space. But the issue of number of bedrooms and so on -- which they did come around on in terms of most of the apartments are two-bedroom apartments and these are two-bedroom apartments -- from my point of view, I'm satisfied with that. I think we did lose a little bit of ground, but the Affordable Housing Committee felt that ...

**Boardmember Dale:** Particularly since the balconies face the road rather than the river.

**Boardmember Hutson:** ... they weren't giving up that much, right.

**Boardmember Alligood:** The other thing that got added back in, my understanding is -- or it got added, I don't know if it was back -- was putting a shower in the second bathroom so it really is a second full bathroom.

**Mr. Normoyle:** Correct. If I could ask Angie, did they get the latest unit plans?

**Village Planner Witkowski:** Yes, that latest plan -- and Sue Smith had that memo attached - was based on the discussion that we had at the last affordable housing meeting. And they were able to flip the bathroom around. The Affordable Housing Committee liked that design much better. And the fact that the den was put in so that there is a little bit of workspace.

**Mr. Normoyle:** Right. I've been to four Affordable Housing Committee meetings. After the first meeting, the issue with one of their newer members came up about the workspace. I brought that feedback to Martin. We started sketching, and he said, "Well, why don't we provide a den?" to try to address the issues that that committee had mentioned as well as the Planning Board comments I've read from the September meeting.

So we did try to make changes within the footprint of the unit to essentially come up with two full baths -- now that we've been able to accomplish that -- a den space, which gives them either extra storage or some other flexible workspace, along with the two bathrooms. We did not provide the balcony. But, again, we had provided alternatives to the Affordable Housing Committee and essentially said, "You tell us what you would like." I think, in the end, it's a very nice unit.

**Boardmember Wertz:** I think the Affordable Housing Committee felt that the space that the balcony would take would be better used for the bathroom, basically. So they considered that, they weighed the two options, and they made the judgment that the bathroom would be preferable to the balcony. Is that their thinking, if I remember?

**Mr. Normoyle:** Yes, I think that's right.

**Boardmember Dale:** The fact is that the other unit has a workspace and a balcony. You have to pretend that the balcony is part of the workspace and not part of the living space, even though the entry to the balcony is from a bedroom and not from the ...

**Boardmember Hutson:** It's clearly more.

**Boardmember Dale:** It's clearly more, and also I think all the affordable ones face the road and all the other ones ... the affordable only face the road, is that right?

**Mr. Normoyle:** Yes, correct.

**Boardmember Dale:** That's right. So they also are the ones that face ... even though it's a nice berm out there, thank you.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Okay ... were you going to talk a little bit about the architecture knowing that you can come back, given the hour?

**Mr. Normoyle:** Well maybe we'll do this briefly, since we dragged Vivy here again. He loves coming to these meetings, but maybe if we get him to miss one that's all right by him. So if he could just briefly, Vivy -- and he has some things we're going to pass around as far as some of the material samples.

**Vivy Lee, Do Chung & Partners architects:** I'll start with the materials and start passing them around. This is the precast for the sills and headers -- white, smooth precast. This is the stucco finish and the approximate color shade that we're proposing for the stucco areas.

**Boardmember Dale:** This is the exterior stucco?

**Mr. Lee:** Or ephis, yes, on the third floor elevation. Those are the aluminum panels, the Alucobond panels that we're proposing for the exterior finish of the building. You've seen the elevations. What we're handing out is a proposal for the dumpster enclosure. It's a very simple enclosure. It's basically like a single-car garage that's clad in the aluminum cladding; a standing seam roof; and then a coiled garage door as the gate. We were going to add some stone bases on either side just to mimic the wall, but that's essentially it. This is the only change that we've added.

**Boardmember Dale:** No insulation.



**Mr. Lee:** The insulation's inside the wall. That's on the outside of the wall.

**Boardmember Dale:** This is on the outside of the insulation?

**Mr. Lee:** That's right.

**Boardmember Cameron:** What color is the standing seam roof?

**Mr. Lee:** We're proposing a copper-like brown basically. So in the gray areas are where we're proposing the aluminum panels. Up on the third floor we're proposing the ephis, which is the stucco board. And then the precast occurs at the ... we've got a large sill, and we're proposing them at the lintels as well.

**Boardmember Alligood:** So where is this material going?

**Mr. Lee:** That's occurring at the gray areas.

**Boardmember Hutson:** The dark area.

**Boardmember Alligood:** Oh, the dark areas, okay. These panels?

**Mr. Lee:** Those are the panels that actually fit in there. So the sample that they provided is simply for the construction, and then those are the color samples that we're proposing.

**Boardmember Dale:** You have two different tints of silver?

**Mr. Lee:** Well, it's right in between there. We're actually working that out.

**Boardmember Dale:** Where would they be?

**Mr. Lee:** We're in the process of working that out exactly.

**Boardmember Cameron:** It's just one of these two, or something in between.

**Mr. Lee:** That's right, in between. Those are the tones ...

**Boardmember Dale:** There's only one choice?

**Mr. Lee:** One choice of color, but it's right in between there. It's difficult to look at it in artificial light, so we're trying to see what looks right. And also there's going to be a lot of green around here, and it's going to reflect. The color of the building is going to change constantly, based on the material that we propose.

**Boardmember Dale:** So you're going to have silver, then the stucco, then the white for ...

**Mr. Lee:** Correct. And then in the foreground will be the stone wall. Any questions?

**Mr. Normoyle:** I have one. If you could comment on the roof mechanicals that were mentioned at, probably, the September meeting... whether or not you'll be able to see them.

**Mr. Lee:** The roof mechanicals will be located in the center of the roof, and the roof is approximately 60 ... or the width of the building is approximately 65 feet. So they're going to be located 30 feet in from the parapet. The parapet wall is approximately 2 feet high, and the condenser units are approximately 3 feet plus about 8 inches of dunnage off the surface of the roof. So you will not be able to see them at all from the road.

**Boardmember Hutson:** Or the trailway.

**Mr. Lee:** Or the trailway, yes.

**Mr. Normoyle:** Correct. So we're going to the July 2nd Architectural Review Board. We'll have these materials and our elevations. We submitted the application the beginning of the month, so we're on for that meeting.

**Mr. Lee:** Correct. Any other questions? Great, thank you.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Thank you. Patrick, was there anything else that you wanted to cover tonight, or anything else that you need input on? I would prefer to defer discussion on the lighting plan, Bill Logan is not here tonight -- our Planning Board member who has the most experience and passion for lighting -- to look at it and get his opinions on that.

**Mr. Normoyle:** No, I think at this point we've submitted essentially as much information as we can. I think our submission is complete. So at this point we'd like to hear what issues, questions the Planning Board has so we can respond. But that's basically it. I think we covered everything we wanted to tonight, so we'll come back again.

**Boardmember Cameron:** One of the conditions is that you'll contribute your fair share of the cost for installing a signal at the intersection. This is at Lawrence and Route 9. Do we have any idea what their fair share is -- legal language? Being a former lawyer, I can say that. Do we have any insight on that?

**Chairperson Speranza:** It's got to do with when the traffic analysis was done ... the condition prior to that.

**Boardmember Cameron:** We'll figure out how many cars are theirs?

**Chairperson Speranza:** Well, we certainly have what's expected to be the traffic generation as a result of this proposal. You have to do an analysis within a year after ...

**Mr. Normoyle:** Six months after completion.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Six months after it opens.

**Mr. Normoyle:** Correct.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Then there would have to be a discussion with the state DOT as far as whether or not it meets the requirements for a traffic signalization. Then -- my understanding of the process -- the fair share language has to do with the fact that there is general background growth on the parkway, there is additional traffic on the parkway. And Dobbs Ferry is also in the process of looking at potential development at the Akzo property on the other side. Potentially that could make the case for signalization of that intersection even more. And then there would have to be a discussion as to how much is from the Dobbs Ferry development and how much is from GDC, and how much is the general responsibility of the state department of transportation. So I think that's something that's yet to come.

**Boardmember Hutson:** Was there a phasing issue at the other intersection of 9-A?

**Boardmember Cameron:** Ravensdale there is.

**Chairperson Speranza:** So how is the signal timing for the state DOT?

**Mr. Normoyle:** Our consultant with John Collins Engineering, Phil Greely, has already been in touch with the DOT and has submitted preliminary plans. Essentially, I think one thing we would like to arrange is a meeting with our consultant, your consultant, and the DOT soon. I'm taking the lead from John Collins Engineering in terms of when that's appropriate, but we've already submitted preliminary plans for that to the DOT previously. That was in May. That was submitted prior to the May meeting.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Site plan approval is a step, but this would have to be fulfilled before there was any kind of C of O.

**Boardmember Hutson:** The Ravensdale one, right?

**Chairperson Speranza:** Yes, Ravensdale in particular.

**Boardmember Hutson:** The other one will wait until after, but the Ravensdale one has to be done in any case, right?

**Mr. Normoyle:** Yes, correct. That's part of our requirements.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** And Lawrence Street, too.

**Mr. Normoyle:** Yes.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Well, Lawrence Street is six months' analysis.

**Mr. Normoyle:** There are the site improvements.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Oh, the vegetation.

**Mr. Normoyle:** Exactly. The pruning.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** [The condition is] "The applicant shall undertake sight distance improvements at the Saw Mill River Road and Lawrence Street intersection, and signal time modifications at the Ravensdale/Jackson Avenue/9-A intersection intersections." [off-mic]

**Boardmember Hutson:** Yes, the six-month has to do with add-ins.

**Boardmember Cameron:** So when is the Village going to apply for the walkable/bikable trail connection between South County Trailway and Ravensdale bridge?

**Chairperson Speranza:** It was approved.

**Boardmember Cameron:** It was approved, okay. Sorry, I missed that.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Patty, just one other thing.

**Chairperson Speranza:** You're sitting behind the camera, but yes, as soon as we're finished.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** One other thing that you might ask your legal department to do is, there's several things that have to be included in the condominium association documents in the declaration of covenants restrictions ... to have their legal draft up those things.

**Chairperson Speranza:** So you can start that process.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** The Planning Board should be seeing them before you do the site plan approval.

**Mr. Normoyle:** Yes, I forwarded the approval documents to our legal back in February. We sat down and talked to him. I think the numbers are in the teens in your approval that have to be included in our condo -- like 15, 16, 17, numbers like that.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Well, it goes with the documents.

**Mr. Normoyle:** Yes, it's in there, so we've already ...

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Well, there's also a few other things ...

**Mr. Normoyle:** Yes. Mark Ginsburg ... we talked with him probably back in February. Just in terms of where we are with that, we're probably going to start in earnest the offering plan next month, July. Our target, pending approval here, is beginning sales in March, 2008. And usually the attorney general takes about six months to process, so I think beginning in July gives us actually a few extra months within that time frame.

**Chairperson Speranza:** You know what I think would be helpful for the next meeting, or when you're here next? Go through the document, the approval document, and just note how you have complied with it. Not volumes, just for instance anything that's got to go into the condominium agreement document.

**Mr. Normoyle:** So the conditions of approval for both the Planning Board, and the Village Board. Those are the two.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Right. Because nothing goes back to the Village Board. We're responsible for making sure that the Village Board's conditions are shown.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** [off-mic]

**Mr. Normoyle:** Exactly, correct. Yes, no problem. We'll do that briefly.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Okay. Yes, sir?

**Peter Porcino, Village Trustee - Ardsley:** Although I have a lot of concerns about this I'm not going to bring up, certainly at this hour. But the last couple of things that you mentioned I do happen to have some information and knowledge about, and I wanted to try to coordinate with everybody.

First of all, the 9-A/Lawrence Street intersection is in the Town of Greenburgh. We have some promised money from Forest City Ratner from the Ridge Hill project for various intersections along Jackson Avenue, including ... I'll add the Ravensdale intersection and Lawrence Street/9-A. Mark Stellato, the planning commissioner in the Town of Greenburgh, is sort of coordinating some of those projects, and he actually put out some bids for plans for, I think, about eight or nine intersections -- these two included. So it's even more complicated than it sounds. The DOT has already promised a signal at the Lawrence/9-A intersection, although I don't know what the timing is.

So it would be helpful if we coordinated all of this. As I said, I think Mark Stellato's probably the best person for the 9-A/Lawrence Street intersection. I'm not sure about the Ravensdale/Jackson Avenue/9-A intersection. It sounds like they've made some proposals. It would be helpful if we got information -- if that was supplied to the Village of Ardsley and to Mr. Stellato -- and we can try to coordinate on our end.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Okay. I know Mark. I'll call him. Do you think he's already put bids out for improvements?

**Mr. Porcino:** He put out bids for drawings and proposals, nothing for construction. We're a long way from that stage.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Okay, so it's for design services potentially.

**Mr. Porcino:** Right, correct. And he actually did get some responses to those bids.

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

**Boardmember Hutson:** Wouldn't Ravensdale also be Greenburgh?

**Mr. Porcino:** No, that's Hastings.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Well, it's both.

**Boardmember Hutson:** This side's in Hastings, but the other side is not. The question is -- because they're talking about Forest City Ratner, I mean in the initial thing ... at least had turning lanes added at Ravensdale. Now, I don't know whether that's still part of the thinking or not. So that is a much more major kind of change at that intersection if that went forward. Well, you'll ask the fellow and see what's ...

**Chairperson Speranza:** Yes.

**Boardmember Dale:** Isn't there an issue of space and land for this?

**Chairperson Speranza:** You'd think so. You have telephone poles all down one side of it.

**Boardmember Cameron:** But they really do need another lane there.

**Boardmember Dale:** No, it's clear that that would be a big help.

**Chairperson Speranza:** And I don't know what the timing of those improvements would be either. Are they going to wait until construction -- until Ridge Hill -- is substantially along? In the meantime, the traffic signal changes that are being proposed for this proposal may end up being an interim measure.

**Boardmember Hutson:** Oh, yes. We'd have to go ahead anyway.

**Boardmember Dale:** It sounded like their contribution was a requirement of getting Ridge Hill approved. So that was settlement on the lawsuit.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Anything else?

**Mr. Porcino:** No, thank you. I'm good.

**Chairperson Speranza:** And Mr. Porcino, Village of Ardsley, shall we contact you also about this? We'll keep you in the loop on it. Okay, thank you.

**V. Discussion Items.**

**Chairperson Speranza:** Just one other thing. Monday is the public meeting on the transportation plan.

**Village Planner Witkowski:** At 7:00, and it'll be right here.

**Chairperson Speranza:** Right here in this room. Anybody have anything else? I know, Rhoda. Your meetings never went this long.

**VI. Adjournment**

**On MOTION of Boardmember Dale, SECONDED by Boardmember Cameron with a voice vote of all in favor, Chairperson Speranza adjourned the Meeting at 11 PM.**