

**VILLAGE OF HASTINGS-ON-HUDSON, NEW YORK
PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARING
FEBRUARY 21, 2008**

A **Regular Meeting and Public Hearing** was held by the Planning Board on **Thursday, February 21, 2008 at 8:15 p.m.** in the Municipal Building Meeting Room, 7 Maple Avenue, Hastings-on-Hudson, New York, 10706.

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

ABSENT: Boardmember Dale

PLEASE NOTE: THE PUBLIC HEARING TO BE HELD FOR 115 WASHINGTON AVE. REGARDING VIEW PRESERVATION WAS CANCELED, AS IT WAS DETERMINED AFTER NOTICE THAT IT IS OUTSIDE OF THE VIEW PRESERVATION DISTRICT.

I. Roll Call

Chairperson Speranza: The first order of business is a reminder to everyone to please speak into your microphones and be very clear. And to anybody who's going to come up to the mic, please use the mic and state your names. There's been some difficulty with transcribing the minutes from the tapes.

II. Approval of Minutes: January 17, 2008 meeting

Chairperson Speranza: Questions, comments?

Boardmember Logan: I have one. Page 10, about 3 inches up from the bottom, the last paragraph, Boardmember Logan: "...so it's a comfortable bit, apparently." I said "fit," Not the last comment from me on the page; the next to the last comment from me on the page, about 3 inches up from the bottom.

Chairperson Speranza: You know what? I can show it to you, Angie, when it's over.

Boardmember Logan: Page 10.

Chairperson Speranza: Anything else?

Boardmember Alligood: There's two on page 8. Actually, just one. Where I'm speaking, towards the bottom of the page where it says, "Yes, right now we don't have buses." Just add "'on Spring,' as far as I know."

Chairperson Speranza: Anything else?

Boardmember Cameron: I have a very small one. It's on page 32, about two-thirds of the way down, where I'm speaking. The third line of when I'm speaking says: "...walked

around and got in a taxi and just rode it straight down the river.” Actually I got into a water taxi.

Boardmember Hutson: If that’s what you said.

Chairperson Speranza: And we want a whole bunch of them for deployment on the river.

Village Planner Witkowski: I think we should just leave it that way.

On MOTION of Boardmember Wertz, SECONDED by Boardmember Cameron with a voice vote of all in favor, the Minutes of the Meeting of January 17, 2008 were approved as amended.

- 1. Public Hearing. Site Plan Approval. 555-565 Broadway; Coolidge Hastings LLC. Additional parking spaces for apartment complex (Sheet 11 / Parcels 100A and 100C).**

NOTE: HEARING FOR 555 BROADWAY TO BE OPENED BUT CONTINUED TO REGULAR MARCH MEETING, AS APPLICANT IS UNABLE TO ATTEND FEBRUARY 21, 2008 MEETING.

Chairperson Speranza: My understanding is, we are opening a public hearing for the construction of additional parking spaces at 555 Broadway. That is officially now open, and it will remain open. Evidently the notice went out and the applicant realized that they could not be here tonight. So let me ask if there’s anyone here to speak about the application for additional parking spaces at the 555-565 complex. No?

Okay, so then we will keep the public hearing open and resume it in March.

- 2. Public Hearing. Renewal of Accessory Apartment Approval. Margaret Riggs -112 Lefurgy Avenue (Sheet 24/Block 691/Lots 18 - 21). Waiver required for square footage.**

Chairperson Speranza: Angie, do you want to talk to us about this?

Village Planner Witkowski: This is at 112 Lefurgy. The property’s on the east side of Lefurgy Avenue in the R-10 zoning district. The applicant is requesting renewal of accessory apartment approval. The 964-square-foot apartment occupies 31.75% of the 3,036-square-foot residence. Therefore, the apartment exceeds the 25% of floor area limitation by 6.75%. The residence has a two-car garage and spaces available in the driveway for parking. There have been no changes to the property, and no complaints during the last three years. Actions required are renewal of the accessory apartment approval and the waiver for the excess of the floor area limitation.

Chairperson Speranza: Is there anyone here to speak about this application? This is a public hearing on the renewal. No? We'll handle the next one also.

3. Public Hearing. Renewal of Accessory Apartment Approval. Ruth Grill-10 Kent Avenue (Sheet 35/Block 714/Lots 56 and 57).

Village Planner Witkowski: This property is located on the east side of Kent Avenue in the R-10 zoning district. The applicant's requesting renewal of accessory apartment approval. The 485-square-foot apartment occupies 17.5% of the 2,772 square foot residence, therefore the apartment meets the 25% of floor area limitation. There have been no changes to the property and no complaints during the last three years. Parking remains the same as originally approved, and renewal of the waiver allowing parking on the street will be required along with the renewal of the accessory apartment approval.

Both of these, the mailings were in order.

Chairperson Speranza: Is there anyone here from the public who wishes to speak about this application?

I just want to make one comment. The way this is filled out, it says "needs a waiver for parking on the public street." I don't think that's quite right, according to code. I think previously it has been "needs a waiver from the provisions requiring on-site, off-street parking. This is worded very strangely, so I think it would be good for the record to show the application be modified to show that it's a waiver from the requirements of off-street parking.

Village Planner Witkowski: Just say "waiver?"

Boardmember Cameron: I couldn't understand the map attached to it, either. I couldn't see a house.

Chairperson Speranza: You know what? I think the Xerox copy of the survey is just updated because you don't see it, and this was just the floor plan.

Boardmember Cameron: Right. That was, and the next one was maybe there and I couldn't see it.

Chairperson Speranza: See, I think it's where these lines are, over here.

Boardmember Cameron: If they're going to modify it, they might in the future actually fill the lines in so you can see it.

Village Planner Witkowski: I think I meant to put an aerial in the packets when I sent out the additional information and I neglected to put it in.

Chairperson Speranza: I think when these things get renewed repeatedly, things get a little lax.

So those are the two accessory apartment applications. There is no public comment. The public hearing on both of them is closed. Do I have a motion for action on the accessory apartment at 112 Lefurgy Avenue, Riggs?

On MOTION of Boardmember Hutson, SECONDED by XXX with a voice vote of all in favor, the Board resolved the application be approved, with the waiver for square footage as indicated.

On MOTION of Boardmember Wertz, SECONDED by Boardmember Alligood with a voice vote of all in favor, the Board resolved the accessory apartment renewal be approved for 10 Kent Avenue, with the waiver for the requirement of off-street parking.

Chairperson Speranza: I should mention, just in case anyone is wondering or if anyone is here to talk about it, there was a property that was being considered for view preservation on Washington Avenue and it was later determined that it was not within the view preservation district. Again, the notice had gone out. This is property at 115 Washington Avenue, it is not going to be talked about tonight, and the findings were actually that it was not in the view preservation code and didn't require action.

IV. Old Business

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

Chairperson Speranza: We do have some correspondence from the public, which I will read into the record. Christina Griffin, the architect for the applicant, is here and is putting something up. You know you're going to have to hold the mic up there when you're speaking, right?

Christina Griffin, architect - 555 Warburton Restaurant: I'd like to respond to the study prepared by BFJ and also to the other comments voiced at the last Planning Board meeting. One item is the width of the street and the concern of deliveries on Spring Street. Angie, did BFJ give you that information on the width of the street?

Village Planner Witkowski: Yes.

Ms. Griffin: I haven't actually seen it. I think it was just sent by email. This is from George Jacquemart of BFJ, who presented the study last month. He measured the width of Spring Street after the meeting. It was 36 feet curb to curb: wide enough to have two large trucks parked on either side, two times 9 feet -- plus two cars passing, two times 7 feet. This

is coming from BFJ to confirm that you can still pass by even when their trucks are loading against the sidewalk.

Another concern, or actually a recommendation that was made by George Jacquemart, was to recommend that parties start at 6:30 or later on weekdays and 1:30 or later on Saturday. We'd like to agree to that and just make sure we comply with those timings because that will work better for all the activity that happens in the downtown on Saturday. He also recommended business parties to be limited to 80 guests; family parties to 120 guests. So we will agree to that requirement, or recommendation.

Another item that was actually a concern was the location of valet parking. George recommended that we move the valet parking to avoid a traffic buildup along Warburton Avenue. We have done that. Instead of starting the valet parking here, we'd like to have the valet parking entrance here -- but the first drop-off will be over here. As the evening goes on, the drop-off will get closer to here because they will need to be able to move the cars around to fill up the parking lot. So instead of cars lining up here, they'll actually come all the way into this end, all the way around the building. This will be the initial valet drop-off; second drop-off location; third drop-off location; and last. This is something we've worked out with Paul Walter, who understands how valet parking works. They have to have room to be able to pick up the car and then park it. Before, we had the initial drop-off right here. So early in the evening, if a lot of people arrive, they'll have to line up around the building. The first car will be picked up here.

Then another item that was discussed by George was recommending different parking management solutions, such as having the employees park in the commuter parking lot. We'd like to have a policy for the employees. One way of doing this is giving the employees a decal so we know that they're an employee, and they'll be required to park at Zinsser after 6. However, we did tell you that half the employees come at 4 and another half come at 6, roughly. We noticed in the minutes that George Jacquemart also recommended that in other towns they have used their commuter parking lots that open up after 3 to allow employees, especially restaurant employees, to use the commuter parking lot as it opens up. Now, we don't know if that could work in this Village yet, but we would like to look into that. Right now we can only say that for the employees coming at 6 o'clock or later they could be directed -- and as a requirement when they're employed they get an employee decal -- and we could find out if there's a way to enforce that.

Chairperson Speranza: The Zinsser lot and the train station.

Ms. Griffin: Yes, because we want to get the employees out of the downtown, away from a central location. So that is a minimum of what we could do to improve the situation, and I'd like to see if we could work with the Village to see if we could do even better than that.

Maybe there is a way to give a permit so that people can start parking after maybe 4 o'clock when the spaces become available.

I also would like to tell you the status of the lease with Chase Manhattan. We submitted a letter from Jerry Kiel. He is Fay Devlin's attorney. Last month there was a representative from Chase and they went out and they looked at the property and approved the valet agreement, but we are waiting for the final lease document. Today I received an email from Jerry Kiel to say that the lease should be ready next week. But I suggest, given the history of Chase, that it would be prudent to represent that the final product will be ready in about three weeks.

Given the fact that we have been here many times with the studies, I think at this point we would like to make you aware that we still have a long ways to go. We have to prepare to go to the Architectural Review Board, do a color scheme. We're going to replace the windows and renovate the façade. We need to develop the construction drawings, and we have a restaurant designer. So we'd like to ask the Board if you might consider rendering a decision on condition of receiving the final Chase agreement so that we can use the bank parking lot for valet parking.

Chairperson Speranza: Is there any reason that you feel you couldn't go to the Architectural Review Board now and start that process?

Ms. Griffin: We haven't felt any confidence yet. Especially I'd like to say it's been frustrating trying to work with Chase. It's a huge corporation, and every thing that doesn't seem complicated is very complicated. It goes through many departments and has taken a long time. So now we actually know it's going to arrive very soon, even though we've been promised this many times. I think we feel prepared only if we have some positive feedback from the Planning Board or some decision maybe based on condition that we receive the lease agreement. There's just a lot of work to do. And also we think that by the time we go to the ARB and develop our construction drawings, most likely in a few months, we'll likely have all the items that you require wrapped up.

Chairperson Speranza: One of the things I just want to say is that I'm not ready for any action tonight. I didn't come here in a frame of mind to act on this application yet. I think a lot of things in my mind have been addressed, but I just want to take a step back and look at everything again since we've been doing things piecemeal.

Ms. Griffin: That's fine.

Chairperson Speranza: But I do want to give an opportunity for Boardmembers to weigh in. Jamie?

Boardmember Cameron: I think I'm like Patty. I'm not ready to vote on something, particularly as a former lawyer I'm not willing to vote on something, until I've seen it. I have no idea about the term of your lease -- grounds on which they can terminate it, grounds on which you can terminate it -- so I would really need to see the agreement to see what term

you have, what right of renewals you have. Then we have to think about what happens if your lease is terminated; what could we do as a Planning Board at that point when you no longer have that piece of property. So we really do need to see the agreement and think about it before we could say to you, yes, we think it's a good idea. And I have some other questions, but I'll get to those later. Those are my comments on the agreement.

My other comment, on the width of the street, is that for some reason there is no parking on the south side of that street and that is the place where all the big trucks go around the corner. I think it'd be incumbent on us to ask both the fire department and the police chief what their feelings are and whether, if we allow this, we should re-stripe the street to put the stripe so it's on the south side rather than where it is in the middle. While you could get by -- I understand it's 36 feet -- you know, it's still a very, very tight thing, and you're coming around a corner. I don't like creating quasi illegal situations. And if we're going to do this, we should re-stripe the street and we should put something about loading there so it's legal rather than just have something going on that potentially is illegal. I'd like to get some feedback from them.

Chairperson Speranza: That's a good point.

Ms. Griffin: Actually, I understand. And, in fact, we're getting prepared to answer those questions about the lease -- what happens when there's a change in lease -- and I thought you might want to see the lease first. I'm wondering, and I'd like to know if you feel that we have satisfied a lot of the questions about parking. I want to get your feedback because we would like to consider maybe going to the Architectural Review Board and taking some steps forward for the project.

Boardmember Logan: This is basically before us for site plan approval, right?

Chairperson Speranza: And view preservation.

Boardmember Logan: Well, there's no impact with view preservation. But George Jacquemart and BFJ have looked at this. Evidently he's comfortable with the parking situation, tweaking a couple of things about valet parking and so forth. It looks like the pieces could be made workable. Obviously it's contingent upon the lease, but there's a huge need in this Village to get commercial activity rolling here. This seems like a good fit from all the evidence we have, and I think we ought to encourage this project to go forward. Obviously it's not going to work if we don't get the lease for the valet parking, but I think we ought to get behind this as much as we can. And if there are some kinks we have to work out, we'll work our way through it, like the striping issue, etc. But I feel very positive about this, and I don't see any inherent reasons why these can't work.

So my personal view is, great, keep working.

Ms. Griffin: Thank you.

Boardmember Hutson: I guess I don't feel as positive about the catering part of it. I wasn't here last time, but I listened to the proceedings and so on. I really think that we're

asking too much at this moment to okay the number of seats, or for me to suggest that the number of seats sounds like it's working vis-à-vis parking. There are so many things that would have to fall into place -- where the employees are going to park, the hours of operation, the other lots and the things that the consultant recommended about how you can insure that the available spaces in the other lots are more likely to be available or for-sure to be available in the future and so on -- I just think it's such a tight fit, with so many variables, that I would really have to see all of those variables in place before I would encourage you to go ahead at this level. And I realize what was said about making a catering hall work and the situation -- you need a certain number in order to do it -- but I just think that it's a little much.

I agree in terms of having a restaurant there and making it work. That part of it, you know, we really need. It would be terrific. And I know that the catering hall is probably not going to operate that many times during the year. But I would have reservations to really say with enthusiasm to go ahead and really feel comfortable with the parking. I guess that's the bottom line.

Boardmember Wertz: I think there still are issues with parking and the loading. I guess I would certainly support what you say, Patty -- you know, not having come in with the frame of mind that we're going to make a decision. And reviewing all the information to make sure that the record is complete on all the questions that we have, we haven't done that yet. So I don't think on the spur of the moment now we want to undertake that. I think the issues that have been brought out are ones that need to be addressed, and I really just don't think we're in a position to say we can make a decision until we really are able to make a decision. So to kind of say that now, before we've even discussed these issues, would be premature. How close we are, and what further information is still needed, I think we can specify better at the end of the meeting tonight rather than now.

Chairperson Speranza: I think that's good. I think it's fair to the applicant that we make sure that we do that before they leave here tonight. Eva?

Boardmember Alligood: I have a number of questions and, you know, I've been thinking about this one a lot since our last meeting and I want to share my thoughts. One is that I think we have to start with site plan review. We have to start with what is the code and how does the current proposal either meet it or not, and go through a process of determining whether there are options for meeting the code. Or if they're not, how we feel about waiving the code requirements.

It's two legal issues that we're grappling with here. One is the parking which, I think, has been analyzed quite a bit. I think some very good solutions were presented by the consultant at the last meeting in terms of parking management -- addressing the issue of how far in you bring the valet parking drop-off. We're getting there, and I'm starting to get pretty comfortable with the parking situation. Although I have to say, David, to your point, I want

to put out the number of what we're proposing here in terms of square footage. Correct me if I'm wrong, but the restaurant is going to be almost 7,000 square feet, the two floors of the restaurant? I got these off of the plans that were attached to the BFJ report last time, so this is recent. I want to make sure I'm using the right numbers. On the plan, the two floors of restaurant are almost 7,000 square feet -- 6,900 -- and then the catering is another 2,500 square feet? That's a significant business in the middle of our town.

What we use as a threshold in our code in terms of exempting requirements for off-street parking and loading is 2,500 square feet. Anything 2,500 square feet and below, obviously we have a reason in our code where we exempt it. It doesn't make sense to require it, and most of the businesses in our town are that size. So as-of-right, the way our code is written, they can use our public parking and they can use our public streets for loading. In fact, I looked into the code situation in terms of the loading. That space that you're proposing is an official loading zone for those businesses that are 2,500 square feet and below. I think you've raised the point many times that Food for Thought and other businesses on Spring Street currently do deliveries there and that's their right because that's officially been set up as a loading zone. But I think we have to really carefully look at, when we're allowing a business of this size -- again, 9,500 square feet -- I want to make sure I'm getting the numbers right. Why don't you check for sure.

Ms. Griffin: No, I will verify what you've just said. The restaurant, we are following the definition in our zoning code which says to get the face of the gross floor area. It includes the kitchen. So the kitchen is the basement, the entire basement. It's 6,895. Now, just so you know, the reason we've been trying to come back almost every month is that we've done a lot of discussion analysis starting almost a year ago. So some of this might have been maybe forgotten or is fading away, but I just want you to know that the restaurant, although a lot of people question it, was very active once. It actually has a sign in the basement that says "occupancy 100." It had some seats in the basement, and it had more of like a catering business/party area. And then on the first floor was a bar, kitchen, and restaurant. The second floor had two apartments. So what we're doing is using the entire basement as all kitchen, the first floor all restaurant. And the second floor, two-thirds of it because there's an open two-story space, instead of being the apartments will be part of the restaurant. The previous square footage, which was basement and first floor for the restaurant, was 5,152. And the catering, you're right, that's the area that's 2,500.

Boardmember Alligood: Okay, I want to get our arms around the numbers because we can compare it to what it was before. I think we understand that the space was there before, and we understand what impact it had before, but I just want to make that real.

So we're talking about a level of operation that is well above the threshold that we use within our code for exempting from the requirement for off-street loading and parking. That's one point I want to make. And I think it's not I absolutely won't consider waiving requirements,

or that we can't find solutions to work with it, because I want to say that I really do support this. I want it to work. I think a lot of us feel that we need to bring that vibrancy back to our downtown. It is hurting. We'd love to have magnets for people to come and visit various businesses, not just this one restaurant. I think we need to do it in a way where we balance the private enterprise and the benefits that that throws off to the public with the impact that that's going to have on our public spaces. So there's a reason in our code that when we reach a certain threshold that we require the private enterprise to push their operations onto their property. There's a reason for that, because the impact becomes so significant that it affects our quality of life in our downtown and it affects safety. Those are the two criteria I want to kind of use as a guide in terms of our deliberations and site plan review.

I know that the consultant came back, after my question last time about the dimensions on the street, and sent information to our Village Planner about the dimension: that a car could pass a parked truck. I think that's not fully exploring what we're looking at here. I think what we're looking at is, what is the impact. You know, we've got a table here of the number of deliveries. Two hours' worth of deliveries parked on that street in the center of our town, in addition to what already exist there, you have to look at that as a cumulative impact. Again, if we're going to waive what is the standard in our code, which is that this should be occurring off the street ... and I actually just want to say I think next time we have a scope of services for the consultant -- and this is where I have sympathy for you that you've come before us many times -- back in August, a scope of services was developed for this report that we asked for. You know, I specifically asked that this be looked at. And not just in terms of measuring the street, but tell us what the code is. Do an analysis. When I say just the way the parking looked at existing parking and the current status within the Village and what would happen with this operation adding to the demand, the same thing for loading. The consultant, I feel, as part of due diligence, should have looked at -- just today, as I was looking at it -- how many trucks are there now, what would be the impact of having three to five deliveries 15 minutes each Monday through Thursday, and then on Fridays eight deliveries in that spot.

Ms. Griffin: Well, why don't we get that study then.

Boardmember Alligood: I think he could have done that.

Ms. Griffin: We can do that.

Boardmember Alligood: I think he should have done that when we asked for it because now we're in February and I'm not satisfied with the level of analysis. To me, that's not good planning work. I think it's not just a measure of the street. It's to tell us, look at the code, tell us how it doesn't comply, and give us a rationale so we can feel comfortable. If we're going to waive the code we have to feel comfortable with that, and I don't right now. I don't feel other options have been ...

Ms. Griffin: I haven't discussed my personal experience because I expected it to come from BFJ. But I'm right across the street, and we're five people. We see the loading every day, we know exactly, and we do feel there's plenty of room to go by those trucks. But I wanted to have that come from the planner, so if that's what you would like to see why don't we pursue that.

Boardmember Alligood: Again, I want to make this point. It's not just a matter of whether the cars can get by. To Jamie's point, I think we have to move the stripe over not to have to go over the double line to pass the truck. Because actually the standard dimension that you need for a truck is 12 feet, not 9, because you have to have some passing room. The way the street is laid out right now you actually do have to go over the double line. Now, granted, there's no parking on the other side so I understand the argument that there is room to pass. I think at some point, when it's constant and if it's added to other deliveries that take place there, I think we have to be concerned.

Ms. Griffin: I wish we could get that for you. You know, historically this was the delivery entrance for the building, but I know you want to see what is the situation now.

Boardmember Alligood: I think it's part of our due diligence, and for the public to feel comfortable about our level of review and the impact that this is going to have on our town I think it has to be more than what we've been given.

Chairperson Speranza: Are there other items that we would also like to have focused? I have one, and I appreciate the fact that in Mr. Jacquemart's report he mentioned limiting the number of people in the catering -- 120 for families and 80 for business functions. Again, I mentioned this at the last meeting. No one's ever going to enforce it. Can you imagine Deven going in and determining, well, is this a family event -- well, you have 125 people; or is this a business event. It's one of those things that's a ridiculous standard. And I do agree with Eva in terms of being able to come up with things that we can be confident about with respect to the standards that we're going to set. So that's something.

Is there anyone here from the public that would like to speak to this application? I have correspondence that I received this morning that I would like to read, but if there's anyone here? Yes, sir.

Bill Calderbank, James Street - Hastings: I own a business in Hastings. I got a call tonight, so I'm out of breath because I just dashed down here. I looked at the minutes on my computer, and it says "extended restaurant." Now, does extended restaurant mean the catering hall as well, which was originally planned for the third floor?

Chairperson Speranza: "Expanded restaurant."

Mr. Calderbank: But does that include the catering hall on the third floor?

Chairperson Speranza: For this application, yes.

Mr. Calderbank: Well, all the Village businesspeople were greatly opposed to that because of the parking situation. It would take away from all the businesses in Hastings, all the restaurants. Now, it really doesn't concern me so I don't know why I'm talking because the

people that come to my business are not driving cars. But as a resident of Hastings, the situation of parking here is horrendous at the moment. Now, they say it's only going to happen in the evening. But as we all know, they have afternoon parties in the summer and it's just going to take away from every resident in Hastings to park in the Village.

I'm not opposed to a restaurant/bar, which is what the Hastings House was. I'm opposed to a catering hall, where you're going to have 100 cars descending on the Village at one time. That's going to cause traffic chaos as well as everything else. You know, a function starts at 6 o'clock, when all the trains are coming in. It's going to be chaos here on Spring Street. So I'm strongly opposed to the catering hall. No one objects to a restaurant/bar because they come and go at different times.

Chairperson Speranza: And those are exactly the same kinds of things that we're trying to get our hands around also on the Planning Board.

Mr. Calderbank: And valet parking is a ridiculous idea. I've done it. It takes you at least 3 minutes to drive your car down to the lot and walk back, or run back if you prefer. It takes you 3 minutes. Now, when they all let out at 11 o'clock, and you've got 80 cars to pick up, who's going to wait 30 minutes for a car? And if you see an empty spot, you're just going to park there.

Chairperson Speranza: One of the improvements that the applicant is looking at is leasing the adjacent lot at the Chase Bank building during the hours when they are in business.

Mr. Calderbank: Yes. That's going to hold 20 cars?

Chairperson Speranza: I wanted to make sure that you were aware, and anybody else.

Mr. Calderbank: Oh, yes, I knew they were going to try and get the bank lot. But that takes 20 cars.

Boardmember Hutson: It may be 30-some.

Mr. Calderbank: Whatever. I'm just guessing. And they're going to use Steinschneider lot. There's no two ways about that. Why drive all the way down to the station when Steinschneider lot's right across the street? That's my opinion, and that's the opinion of most of the people in town. We thought the catering hall had been squashed.

Chairperson Speranza: No, it has not been removed from the application.

Mr. Calderbank: We were all under the impression ...

Chairperson Speranza: You all wanted it to, but no, it was never officially withdrawn.

Mr. Calderbank: Oh, I thought it was and so did everybody else. And that's why I got a call tonight, and I came flying down here to vent my opinions and I'm sure the opinions of every other business owner in Hastings.

Boardmember Wertz: Well, we're facing kind of a dilemma because the last meeting -- and you weren't there, and the other business owners who had been here at the previous meeting weren't here last time -- we did have an independent consultant analyze the parking. He came up with numbers that really assured us that the parking would not be that much of a problem. And we explicitly confronted him with the views of the store owners and the

business owners, and said “what would you say to them to reassure them?”, because we’ve heard a lot of upset feelings and anticipations of parking problems.

Mr. Calderbank: I’ve lived here for 25 years and they haven’t gone away.

Boardmember Wertz: He laid out all his figures and showed what he thought very conclusively demonstrated that there wouldn’t be parking problems. So we’re sitting here now with a bit of a dilemma. We hear one thing from you and we hear one thing from the business owners, and it’s based on their impressions and so on. And then we have the data and the study -- two traffic studies, one of an independent consultant -- both of which tell us that there’s not that much of a problem. So the question is, what is reality? And that’s what we’re trying to sort out.

Mr. Calderbank: I’m in Hastings on a daily basis. I mean, every time I’m driving in and out of Hastings -- four, five, six times a day -- you try and park in Steinschneider lot at 6 o’clock on a Friday night.

Chairperson Speranza: I’ve done it. It varies.

Mr. Calderbank: You’re one person. You get 100 cars trying to park . .

Chairperson Speranza: Some days you can do it, some days you can’t, some days you’ve got to go around the lot one more time.

Mr. Calderbank: And you know what? When 100 cars descend on the Village you’re never going to park anywhere.

Chairperson Speranza: As I said, this is where we are now -- to try to determine how to move forward with this -- but I’m glad you made it down here.

Boardmember Hutson: Your point is well taken. There may be a little hyperbole involved in the sense that there may not be 100 cars all the time -- and I’ve never not been able to find a spot in Hastings. Many times I’ve not been able to find the spot I want, but I’ve always been able to find a spot. Now, in this situation I do think that to the extent that there is catering, even at the time when all the businesses are open, I think it will be a problem. That’s my personal view of it. I think that if you had a situation where you said that the catering hall could only operate when all the businesses except the restaurants and the evening operations were closed, everything else was closed, you could probably do it. I don’t think the catering hall probably wants to do business that way.

So you have a point, but I’m not sure the point is quite as large as you make it. But then again, I guess that’s your prerogative.

Mr. Calderbank: I also belong to Tower Ridge Yacht Club. You have functions from Thursday through Sunday. It takes me two minutes to drive to Tower Ridge when you don’t have a function. It takes me 25 minutes to get there when they have a function.

Boardmember Hutson: Twenty-five minutes?

Mr. Calderbank: Twenty-five minutes. Because no one’ll let you by, the roads are backed up all the way to the bridge. That’s my experience. You can quote all the professionals and all the surveys.

Boardmember Hutson: Look, I'm not quoting them. I'm quoting my own experience.

Mr. Calderbank: I just go from my experience.

Boardmember Hutson: And I am, too.

Mr. Calderbank: I have been in more arguments trying to get into and out of my boat club on a free access road because of the parking.

Boardmember Alligood: Sir, are you talking about the club next to ...

Mr. Calderbank: That's the Harvest on Hudson.

Chairperson Speranza: You know what, though? Let's keep to topic -- this application.

Mr. Calderbank: I'm just letting my views be known.

Chairperson Speranza: And we appreciate it.

Mr. Calderbank: I'm speaking for other people. And thank you for listening to me.

Daniel Hevia, Pizza Grill employee: I'm also a member of the fire department in Hastings. I watched the video of last month's meeting where the transportation specialist was here. I just think that he's strongly mistaken. If you look -- say, 100 cars come in for a 120-person event and you can put 30 cars in here -- you still need to find spots for 61 cars. They're not going to go down there, they're not going to go there. They're going to go to the Steinschneider lot. There are 54 spots in the Steinschneider lot. You're still short seven spots, and that's if they can take the entire Steinschneider lot. And I guarantee you have a better chance of winning Mega Millions tomorrow. It's not going to happen.

I believe there was something said to the effect of -- when he was talking about parking meter management, raising rates, raising times -- if someone comes into town, and they can't find a spot or they don't want to pay the money, and they go get their six-pack somewhere else it's okay because they would be replaced by somebody else, I have a problem with that. Because if somebody goes to get their pizza somewhere else, the business suffers and all the businesses suffer. There was also a mention of how it would help downtown businesses. The hours of operation -- say 6:30 or later on weekdays -- most of the businesses outside of the restaurants and the bars are closed. No one's going to go to the restaurant or to the catering hall, and then afterwards say, "Let me go get a bite to eat." It's not going to happen. There's just not a possibility for that.

And also I am a member of the fire department, but I don't speak for them. If the valet parking entrance is right here, you're going to have a bottleneck of cars running down north in front of the fire house. If there is an emergency fire call and those cars are lined up right there, that fire engine's going to have a problem getting out. Additionally, if you take that lot, many of the firefighters are going to have a problem finding parking and it's going to extend response time just for that. I don't speak as a member of the fire department saying that -- I want to make that clear -- but my main concern is the Steinschneider lot, and even Boulanger to an extent. I know on a Friday -- and this is a weekday, say a Friday is a

weekday or weekend -- you're saying 6:30 or later, that Steinschneider lot ... I do deliveries. If I go out on a delivery at 6:30 I need to park up against the loading zone behind my business because there are no spots. They come in and they come out, but I can never find a spot. And that's the majority of people.

Now, in terms of employees parking and feeding the meters and being there all day, obviously there's not a lot of options. And also there are delivery drivers like myself, and I know a few others from my business, who'll put 2 hours' worth of money in the meter. Fifteen minutes later I get a delivery, it's gone. Somebody else can have it. But the thing is, if you're going to move people out or extend that -- I know that this really doesn't speak to 555 Warburton -- but if you're going to move the employees around, you have another problem because we have nowhere to put them. The one thing that I think most of the business owners are extremely worried about is the catering hall just because it will subtract from people's businesses. If you can't park, people aren't going to come, people aren't going to want to pick up their food, because it's too much of a hassle and a headache.

So my main concern is, I see that this goes here. But there should be another page going here because that is going to be the huge concern. I don't see the Zinsser lot or the lot down by the train station or any of those lots having a problem. I think it's the Steinschneider lot that's going to be the problem. I just think that that was glossed over when he made his traffic report. Because there are 54 spots there; you're still going to be short. If you take the entire thing you're still short, and I just don't understand. I see the entrance is here.

Chairperson Speranza: You're aware that they're going to move it.

Mr. Hevia: No, I'm moving back to the valet. I'm kind of flying all around here.

Boardmember Hutson: Are you talking about where the valet stops?

Chairperson Speranza: It's been proposed to move it.

Mr. Hevia: Move it to ...

Boardmember Hutson: Inside the bank lot.

Chairperson Speranza: So it won't be where it originally was.

Mr. Hevia: So it won't get bottlenecked. Okay, but I also believe that 39 cars is extremely generous. Because you have a dumpster for Chase, and the restaurant itself is going to need dumpsters. It's not going to just be one dumpster for a restaurant. If you're having a catering hall mixed with a restaurant you have at least two. Thirty-nine spots in there is extremely generous.

I just wanted to voice my concerns. I had heard about this earlier today and I wanted to come down here. I watched the video. I sat through the entire thing and watched the video. And most of you were speaking into your microphones, just to tell you. But the 39, the valet -- God bless them, I hope it works. But this is the main concern to me. I see 39 cars, I think

it's generous. But you could still have upwards, even if every person drives a car you have 120 cars or 100 cars or less. So those are my concerns. Thank you.

Boardmember Hutson: Could I just ask the applicant on this business of the number of cars so we can have some clarification, when you're in at a maximum level of operation what's the number of cars we're talking about?

Ms. Griffin: Including the catering hall.

Boardmember Hutson: That would require parking, altogether -- employees and patrons ... I know you presented it to us, but I don't recall it.

Ms. Griffin: Based on the number of seats is 103; on the area, by code, 125. I want to say for the catering facilities the requirement, based on the number of seats, is 41; based on area is 47. Of course, we should go with the worst case.

Boardmember Hutson: Combined total?

Ms. Griffin: Combined, the total required for the restaurant and the catering facility is 125.

Boardmember Hutson: One-hundred-twenty-five spaces.

Ms. Griffin: This actually shows 42 if you count the number of spaces, but these cars are the actual size of cars -- around 17 feet long. So we have looked at, located, the cars and how they would be laid out. We decided to use the number 39. And we could, in addition to this, get a real valet service to confirm it.

Boardmember Hutson: But I guess my main point is that the number mentioned by the members of the public of 100 is not out of the question.

Ms. Griffin: No it's not, for the catering. The requirement for the entire project, yes. But for the catering, it's 41.

Chairperson Speranza: Did you have something else you wanted to say?

Ms. Griffin: In response to the comments, of course I think he understands we moved the location and the flow of valet parking to avoid having the cars line up here. And I guess what we'd like to know is, to be very clear if we could tonight, what further information we should provide.

Boardmember Alligood: To follow up on my comment, I'm not just asking for more data. I don't want to create this burden of constantly being asked to just generate data. The issue I keep raising, I think if we could just brainstorm some potential ways to address this concern -- that we're going to just overload that area with too many trucks -- if you could do some thinking about exploring other options. They may not be possible, and we may run through them and say at the end we tried to mitigate this situation and it just couldn't be addressed.

For instance, I'm going to throw out a couple, and think about it. Could you work something out, the way you're working out with the parking issues, with the funeral home to pull in trucks there to get it off the street? I'm sure you'd have to find something with them that would be of benefit to them.

Ms. Griffin: If you want to do some open brainstorming I can talk to you about a lot of ideas that we haven't ever presented or submitted. That's one of them. We don't have a solution because they're in the midst of selling. They're moving.

Boardmember Alligood: They just put an ad in the paper recently saying they were going to stay, and they're putting money into their business, and they're renovating.

Ms. Griffin: We haven't been able to get a good response. We started this a year ago, and maybe when we first tried to get in touch with them it was very difficult and I think they were in flux. And especially it's so difficult working with Chase. We thought, well, can you imagine trying to work out another agreement and how long will that take. So we can revisit them.

Boardmember Alligood: I think if you could just explore it that would make me more comfortable. Because actually, again -- back to the code that helps try to deal with these situations because the reality is a lot of sites in the downtown don't have enough property to meet the requirements of the code -- one of the ideas in the code is that you share some of these common spaces. Again, if it's not possible ... maybe they're in a different place now and you could have a conversation, and there's something that would be of benefit to them. It's something just so that we can feel that different options were explored. That was one I thought of.

Another one -- and again, this may not, in the analysis, work out -- is that Steinschneider has an official loading zone. Is it to capacity now? It's at least off the street.

Ms. Griffin: Where?

Boardmember Alligood: Behind the pizza place. We have official loading zones within the Village, and that is one of them. It designates exactly where.

Boardmember Hutson: Right inside the lot.

Boardmember Alligood: Inside Steinschneider lot. And, of course, you'd have to take a dolly and go a few yards down and you'd have to cross the street. But maybe that, in the analysis, we'd say, "Well, that creates a burden within that parking lot too much compared to having it on Spring," but we haven't really looked at those. We haven't really weighed those options.

Ms. Griffin: But Steinschneider is across the street.

Boardmember Alligood: You can park a truck and take a dolly and make deliveries.

Ms. Griffin: I've actually been involved in so many things in Hastings. I've even been on parking committees, believe it or not, so I've thought a lot about these things. Because I'm across the street, from personal experience I am a lot less concerned about loading. But I do think that you have to make sure it's very clear and you know how big the trucks are and where they're going to be and have maybe an official area. I do believe that, but in the middle of the day that street is incredibly quiet when you don't have the rush hour. We've seen more than one truck on the street, and there is so much loading going on. But it's a very different street between the rush hours. There was a light there once a long time ago, and

I'm wondering why. Because, you know, if you look at the history of this restaurant it actually was a place where people would come from outside the area. And supposedly it would just get totally packed with people. They had fewer cars then, but I wonder why there was once a light there and there isn't anymore.

When I go to other towns like Yonkers you go to X2O, the restaurant, and there's no parking, it's only valet. I hear BFJ talk about parking management. You go there, and there are thriving restaurant businesses with no parking, just valet. So it makes me wonder how can some towns make this work and we can't. And I really wish we could. You have to work with the Village with that. You have to find out can you -- instead of using a really important parking spot in the middle of town -- is there a way to, get those people to the outskirts, to the other parking areas. It is a management problem, but we haven't in a year been able to get that resolved. We've been to the Village. There's a lot of talk, and it's not easy. I was on the Chamber of Commerce for almost 10 years, I've been in Hastings 25 years, and I can't get over how many times the same ideas keep coming up. I don't think there's been enough leadership or focus on trying to actually make these things happen.

Boardmember Alligood: I think the ideas are good. And Patty, is it possible for us when we make our recommendation that we attach some specifics around the parking management issues? They could just be recommendations.

Chairperson Speranza: Management with respect to this application. We can provide guidance or recommendations or suggestions to the Board of Trustees, to the Safety Council, not tied to the application -- and frankly I think that's the way it should be done -- and the Comprehensive Plan Committee as well. There are many groups in the Village but, again, as Christina has said, part of the problem, what keeps coming up -- and David knows this, too -- how big of a problem do we have really. But it's the management. It's how we manage it.

Ms. Griffin: I have to say that when I belonged to the Chamber -- if you don't mind brainstorming here -- every annual meeting that we had where the Village and the Chamber of Commerce met what was almost the biggest item on the agenda was parking -- and why don't we do another level over at Steinschneider, another level at Maud's. Why don't we put employee parking somewhere. I heard that 20 years ago. We seem to have the same combination of people where you have a big complaint committee and not enough leadership. Where someone would say, "I'm the leader, I'm taking charge of this, we're going to solve it." And it's not just going to be a few residents and a few merchants, but it's going to be top people. I don't know who starts that and who can get that going. I've been so frustrated. It just doesn't seem like it's ever going to happen in Hastings.

Boardmember Alligood: I completely understand your frustration. We should be in a problem-solving mode, and I think that's what we're trying to do.

Ms. Griffin: Sometimes if you want to do positive development, it just seems like it's very easy to critique and come up with problems. It's a lot harder to find solutions. And you

know there is always the option -- we have discussed it many times -- a restaurant without a banquet facility. But Fay Devlin, the owner, prefers to get your decision on this.

Boardmember Cameron: Maybe one of the problems we're going to run into, is that we have had a couple of traffic studies that say one thing, and then we'd have citizens that say a different thing.

Chairperson Speranza: And we all have our own experience.

Boardmember Cameron: And we have our own experience. Maybe the way out of this is to say that there is agreement between you and the town that if the town later determines that our parking's getting all messed up because you're doing too well that we can require, pursuant to this agreement, for you to valet-park them down to the train station parking lot. This is a contingent agreement, and we have this ability that if we feel the parking -- review it once a year -- if we do a study one year from now and two years from now, and if you feel that the parking is too crowded in town and it really doesn't work, valet parking comes into position. And you have an agreement with the town that for a certain price -- I don't know what it is, but that would be in the agreement -- you go valet parking.

Chairperson Speranza: But Jamie, how would you blame it on them? As has been mentioned before, Comfort's opening. You mentioned it at the last meeting. Comfort's opening a restaurant, and they didn't have to provide parking because of their size. My understanding is that Bloom is going to be filled again soon, which is great. The store across the street on Warburton Avenue is going to reopen. I just don't think it's fair to go through ..

Boardmember Cameron: They pay, as I hate to say. You know, we have a rule here that if you're a certain size you've got to have parking and you want to get an exemption. They don't fit in that definition, and we can't do anything about it. So if you're big, and if you want to be here and you're perceived as causing the problem -- you may argue you're not, but if you have those flows of guests and we can look at the flows of guests coming in -- then this grievance springs into place. I'm just throwing that out as a way past this conundrum. Otherwise, we're going to be sitting here with 20 people here next week, next month, and we're going to be sitting here as a planning board going, "On the other hand, and on the other." You want brainstorming and there's brainstorming. It's something that you don't have to invest in if, in fact, all the people who have done the studies are correct and we don't have a problem. But if we do have a problem, then we've got a big problem and we need a way out. And the way out is to have a contingent agreement with you that down they go to the train station after you've run through your 39 spots.

Ms. Griffin: You know, if we could have an agreement with the Village to use the commuter parking lot for the valet parking, knowing this Village so well, I would rather that stay the historical status as open to the public because of where it is, or even for the employees maybe. But we went actually to the Trustees first. When you're actually up against nothing but negative comments, and nothing positive, it's not an avenue you're going to go.

Boardmember Alligood: Can you clarify? I don't think I ever saw the minutes from that meeting. You proposed the ...

Ms. Griffin: Yes, using Zinsser.

Boardmember Alligood: And that was not well received.

Ms. Griffin: No, mostly because the Chamber was very organized and they were very much against the project, I think, at the time. I think there was an attitude -- I think it's dissipating a little bit -- that almost any business is a threat to other businesses.

Chairperson Speranza: I'd like to re-characterize that. I think it's as this gentleman mentioned earlier. What I heard was the businesspeople saying, "The restaurant's great -- the catering will destroy us." That's what I remember being their concern: "We welcome the restaurant, we want a restaurant." Maud certainly said, "Hey, there's synergy -- you have more restaurants here." But everybody was very concerned about the catering hall. There may be other things behind the scenes.

Boardmember Hutson: Definitely when the majority of the people were here, too, from the business community that was the sentiment.

Boardmember Cameron: Was it destroying you because of parking, or destroying because they're competition?

Chairperson Speranza: Because there would be no place for anybody to park with the catering hall there.

Boardmember Cameron: Okay, but if we have this thing where they go down to the Zinsser lot they're not there during a catering event, which is Saturday in the evening and Sunday in the afternoon. You could blow a cannon through Zinsser lot and get 500 cars there. And as for filling it, we, as commuters, manage to put those cars in Zinsser lot in about a half-hour. They just pour down the hill and go in.

Ms. Griffin: I actually just want to clarify or explain something. We did a study on Tarrytown only to show it's not the empty parking spaces that bring people to the businesses. This is actually looking at it a little bit differently. When I said almost any business, what I mean is that if a business comes in and needs parking it doesn't mean that other businesses are necessarily going to suffer. Because people aren't coming to Hastings because there are empty parking spots. The reason why we did the study on Tarrytown, just simply, we were really responding to the Chamber -- that you have other towns that have less parking for business, and yet you have thriving businesses because people will go to a destination. They're not looking at the town of Tarrytown and seeing how many open spots there are and then they'll decide whether they go there. So that was the point we were just trying to make.

Boardmember Alligood: I think your logic is that once you're a thriving destination for restaurants you attract people that say, "Hey, let's go to Hastings," or "Let's go to Irvington" -- maybe without a reservation -- and you attract people because you're known for having several restaurants as options, I agree with that perspective.

Boardmember Hutson: I just want to make a couple of comments. One is, when we talk about no progress, one of the things that has happened is now, with the residential units -- the larger two that we've really approved in the Village -- they are required to provide parking and it's there. I think part of the issue is here, too, that a precedent is a bit of an issue here. Because if you waive, in this situation, to the extent that you're requesting, that's quite a precedent, you know. And it really runs kind of counter of where we're trying to go with this whole thing with required parking.

The other thing is, if you took the first floor of the old Hastings House, roughly what parking would be required for Hastings House as it actually operated?; not with the basement, which three times a year in the last 20 years somebody was down there. I shouldn't say that. There was more than that. I was going to say Patty's rehearsal dinner.

Chairperson Speranza: But that was 25 years ago.

Ms. Griffin: We went through this many months ago.

Boardmember Hutson: The first floor alone was what? What was the parking that would be required for the operation of Hastings House, first floor?

Ms. Griffin: You know, I don't have the exact number for one floor alone. But I can tell you that there's a requirement that's based on area, which is one space for 100 square feet, and a requirement based on number of seats. In our code you have to include kitchen in with the restaurant. So this is what we happen to have today. I have to get back to you on just the first floor. But if you do the entire Hastings House Restaurant -- which is the two floors -- and you divide it by square footage, you need 67 parking spots. And if it's by seats, it's 58. So we need 67. The proposed restaurant, if it's greater square footage but you divide it by 100, the highest number is 88 by code.

Boardmember Hutson: Okay. So 67 would have been for only Hastings House Restaurant both floors.

Ms. Griffin: Yes.

Boardmember Hutson: One way to look at this is, if you think of function and what was really going on, to take that number or some part of it and then say everything beyond that you have to provide, period. Not by arranging to have the Zinsser lot available or so on, but you're providing, let's say it's 30-something next door. I think it's hard, Jamie, to say, depending on what happens, we make a move later. There have been a few times when we tried that. It's hard to follow up, it's hard to get the enforcement, it's hard to really to do it. Now, maybe that doesn't mean it couldn't be done in the future, but I think it's unlikely to work out unless there's real calamity. I suppose if all hell broke loose, then maybe something could get done. But I don't think there's any process that we can count on in terms of changing the management of parking Village-wide in relation to this application that would happen soon enough to satisfy the applicant.

So I think the only thing to do is make it really specific and say, "Hey, here's the realistic figure that can be associated with the Hastings House as it's operated in the last 20 years, and here's the additional we'll provide," and that's it.

Chairperson Speranza: And as we know, we are able to put conditions on the site plan: the hours of operation in terms of when it's open, the times that it's open, that it's not open for lunch. Because you're right, there are things that are more enforceable than others. But I think there are some standard things that we can require, too, in addition to specifics for parking.

Boardmember Hutson: See, if you were talking about 80-some spots, and that was contingent upon always having that bank lot available next door, you're probably close to something real. But I think, from my point of view, in terms of 125 required spots based on whatever calculation -- whether it's square footage or number of seats -- to me it just seems like too much of a reach. And as Eva says, trying to weigh the obvious benefit that having this place be in operation is opposed to the way it is is clear, but I think it's trying to do too much with that property, given where it's located.

Mr. Calderbank: May I have further comments? Of the four catering halls in the one-mile area of Hastings it's not coincidental that they all have their own parking lots. In southern Westchester there is no catering hall located smack dab in the middle of the town in any Village. There are up north -- I've looked into that. If you don't learn by other people's good ideas, then we're going to make the bad ones over and over again.

Boardmember Hutson: But I think it's always true that if you take catering halls in Hastings they don't have any of the restrictions on time that we're talking about, either. Riverview doesn't have ...

Mr. Calderbank: But they all have their own parking lot. He just spent \$50,000 building a new parking lot to keep the people off Warburton Avenue. They were parking on Warburton.

Boardmember Hutson: Believe me, we heard about that parking lot for years.

Mr. Calderbank: Oh, yes. I'm sure you did.

Boardmember Hutson: That was exciting. But I'm just saying they don't have to worry about hours of operation. Here, there would be some restriction.

Mr. Calderbank: Well, that same restriction was put on Harvest on Hudson. There were seven restrictions put on Harvest on Hudson when they first opened, and I was at those meetings. Not one of them is being upheld.

Boardmember Hutson: Is that true?

Mr. Calderbank: Yes. But that was just a comment on restrictions.

Chairperson Speranza: Okay, we've drifted back to Harvest. Just a couple more because we've got other agenda items. Eva, do you want to say something else?

Boardmember Alligood: Actually, I do think the point of Harvest is relevant only because we're trying to think about tools, or instruments, to help us.

Chairperson Speranza: It's fine as a comparative. No more experiences.

Boardmember Alligood: No, it's not experience. I think we're looking at this from a planning perspective, and I think we all got in our packets last summer, actually, a letter threatening to revoke the C of O on Harvest because the original and I wasn't on the Planning Board when this was developed. I'm sure a lot of care went into the wording of the agreement within the C of O for Harvest, which said that there was a kind of give-and-take about public access. You know, the public has a right to access the waterfront and use that lot, and not go to the restaurant. And in my experience -- I am going to say experience, but I think it's a planning issue -- at a certain point that private enterprise took over the entire lot. If you went down to Harvest in the summer they were valet parking all the way up to the bridge. The gentleman is right.

I do think it's informative to look at our experiences as a town trying to manage that balance between private enterprise. Most people in our town are thrilled that we have Harvest, and that level of business down on the waterfront. Nobody would want to kill that project. But we also want to look at what are the tools we can use to make sure that it doesn't have this spillover impact. Back to Jamie's point, are there triggers that we can have in place. You know, they have to be practical and enforceable. That's the problem: what are the triggers we can have in place where we say, "You know, we're seeing a problem, and we need to sit down with you as the owner because you've gone over this threshold of what our agreement is and we need to sit down and kind of come to agreement on how that would be corrected."

Ms. Griffin: Since we're brainstorming, I just wonder. There may be quite a significant difference between a remote valet parking location and this valet parking -- the gray areas, the spillover, the lineup -- things that seem to be hard to quantify. Even as we try, I'm not sure how much we can pin that down: how do people behave, how many are going to follow the rules, how many people are going to go get the pizza or whatever. I'm just wondering how the Board would feel. If we had a remote location, how much of a difference does that make. Is it a big difference? That's what happens in Yonkers -- their car disappears. And it doesn't seem like they're lining up and creating a lot of congestion. They go far away.

Boardmember Hutson: There's nowhere else to park close by?

Ms. Griffin: They go far away. I'd like to find out.

Boardmember Hutson: Most of those places -- are you talking about X20? -- you don't have a choice. There's no Steinschneider across the street. See, that's the thing. So many people -- and it's been said many times -- rather than think that they're going to have to wait to get their car out, if there's a spot open in Steinschneider and they're aware that Steinschneider's there, a lot of people are going to take it.

Boardmember Wertz: They'll just go there.

Boardmember Hutson: So you're going to have to allow for some of that. But some people won't.

Chairperson Speranza: There's that. And if you recall, during one of the earlier meetings on that, when you proposing it -- and I'm not sure if it was here, it might have been at the Board of Trustees meeting -- that people were very concerned about the traffic and the level of activity on the roads with valet drivers bringing the cars down and running back up the hill and going back down, and it's all based on tips, and you've got to be quick. So there were those concerns also.

Maybe we just come back to the thought that maybe we are asking too much of this building with the restaurant and the catering.

Boardmember Hutson: Well, that's my feeling.

Ms. Griffin: I think you've given us a lot of feedback. We'll have to give these things very serious thought.

Village Attorney Stecich: Could I just say, though, if you are going to come back next time that we get a heads-up in advance. To tell you the truth, as much as I worked on this I totally forgot where we are on the parking -- whether there's any variances, whether there are just waivers, and the same thing with the loading. So we should be far enough in advance so that I could put something together to give to the Planning Board so we know what the issues are.

Ms. Griffin: I can give you a summary of the status.

Village Attorney Stecich: But I need to review it for the Board. I was surprised that you were going to even ask for a vote tonight. I know you're not pushing it because I would have reviewed the files, and I think the rest of the Board feels like this. So just give us enough of a heads-up so that we can make sure that we at least know the steps we have to go through. Also, I don't remember where we are on SEQRA on this. I assume you put in an EAF. We still have to go through that. So there's a lot of procedural stuff we have to get done.

Boardmember Alligood: It would be very helpful to get that analysis from you, Marianne, where we just know what are we even granting: is it a waiver, is it a variance, what are the legal ...

Chairperson Speranza: I did want to put into the record -- I'm not going to read the entire letter -- Kelly and Steven Topilnitsky, 18 Maple Avenue. They have been here to the Planning Board before and spoke on a number of items with respect to this application. I'm just glancing through it, and they do reference the traffic study. That paragraph I will read.

“During the last Planning Board meeting a traffic study was presented by a consultant that the Village hired. We were under the assumption that the traffic consultant was hired to do an independent study of parking and traffic and how the restaurant would impact both. However, in his opening remarks he stated ‘we did our own observations of parking occupancy in the Village core to kind of confirm the studies that were done by the applicant. Basically, we found the same results.’ This statement makes it sound as if an

independent study wasn't done, but rather a study to confirm the numbers that the applicant had already submitted."

"The parking consultant also went outside the scope of what he was asked to do and suggested parking management solutions for the entire downtown, which included raising meter rates to turn over the cars -- and expressed his concern," as was expressed here tonight. "So what does that mean? You were going to send people outside of the Village" to go buy things because they don't want to pay. But again, that's not specific to this application.

Again, discussing how the Hastings House never did the kind of business that's anticipated here; parking lot availability at Zinsser; again, questions with respect to the lease with Chase.

So I don't see that there's really anything. All of the Planning Board members did get this letter. We'll certainly give one for the file and to the applicant as well.

Ms. Griffin: I'm going to give you some paperwork to review before the next meeting we come to. I really would like to have the lease so it's a serious thing to look at. And also we will put a letter together to let you know where we're at with the application because so much time has passed. But in addition to that, we were going to try to respond to what you've discussed tonight. So we'll try to get you something to review before we see you again, and thanks very much. I understand your concerns.

Chairperson Speranza: We're trying. We want something to happen there.

Ms. Griffin: Well, you know, we've discussed this many times with the owner and he really wants the catering. We know that if we take that out it's a different project, so we have to look at all these options. Maybe we can have either more concrete solutions when we come back, or other options. Thanks a lot.

Chairperson Speranza: Thank you.

1. Recommendation to Board of Trustees. Continuation of discussion of proposed Zoning Code Amendments relating to lot coverage and development coverage.

Chairperson Speranza: The next item on our agenda, we're going back to the amendments to the zoning code which we've been looking at. There's one more item. Marianne, do you want to talk to us about this? This has to do with the coverages relating to the building coverage versus development coverage. We thought we were finished, and maybe this is it.

Village Attorney Stecich: I know, I know. I thought we were done, too.

Chairperson Speranza: No, but you raised a good point.

Village Attorney Stecich: When I went to actually draft the local law for the Board of Trustees -- and I went beyond the single-family, even two-family districts, and I'm not sure about the two-family -- it struck me. You recall in the residential districts, or for people in the public, that the Board decided to take as a building coverage whatever the existing coverage is and add 10% for development coverage to include other paved things like driveways and impervious patios and stuff. So then we decided in every district it would be X plus 10%.

Once you go, though, to the multi-family districts or the commercial districts it doesn't make any sense. So, for instance, in the MR-2.5, or even better the MR-1.5, the lot coverage allowed is 15%. If you add 10%, that gets you to 25. It doesn't really allow for parking lots. Which is, I guess, pretty much it for all of the districts. I don't have a solution.

Boardmember Alligood: You said you gave us Mount Kisco's.

Village Attorney Stecich: This is just what they had.

Boardmember Alligood: But if other towns have figured out how to work around this, clearly it doesn't make sense to leave it the way we had proposed. So I'm comfortable with just borrowing what another Village has done to address it. I'm not sure if Mount Kisco is. They've done the work, and it's working there.

Chairperson Speranza: I would not be in a position to be able to argue that it should be 60% from moderate-density multi-family, instead of 65.

Boardmember Wertz: That's the difficulty. We have these, but how do we evaluate it.

Village Attorney Stecich: The other thing is that they're not all the same. It's not like they had a particular formula. For instance, sometimes when it's 25% lot coverage it's 65% development coverage. Sometimes it's 70%, sometimes it's 75, depending on their districts.

Chairperson Speranza: You can see the multi-family districts vary between 60 and 70, and I'm sure it's got to do with the number of units that are proposed. Because obviously the more units, you need more parking. And this central business district, these have to be keyed to the level of intensity of each of the zoning districts. We just don't have this many.

Boardmember Cameron: Right. Or maybe a phone call to the fellow in the building department would start you out explaining where these numbers came from.

Village Attorney Stecich: I know that because I was their attorney for four years.

Boardmember Cameron: I figured you were going to say that. I never ask a question I don't know the answer to.

Village Attorney Stecich: No, this just happened over years. To tell you the truth, we spent a lot of time -- I mean months and months -- working on it, and it was peculiar to each different district.

Chairperson Speranza: Is this scientific enough?

Village Attorney Stecich: No, it's not.

Chairperson Speranza: The MR-2.5 is the most dense district that we have in the Village. I mean, we've got a 25%, which seems to correspond to their moderate. I thought there was

a way to do this easily: high-density, multi-family for theirs would be equivalent to MR-2.5 in the Village.

Boardmember Alligood: With the residential, which is where we started with this defining the potential problem, that's where we don't have an automatic review. And we don't want to be reviewing everybody's.

Chairperson Speranza: Only for single-family. We don't review single-family. Not all residential.

Boardmember Alligood: Right. Single-family, yes. Thank you for making that clear. If we wanted to put something in place it would be easy for whoever's drawing up the plans to know, okay, this is what my guidelines are -- without having to come and have a discussion about it. For some of these other zones you need site plan review anyway.

Village Attorney Stecich: Yes.

Boardmember Alligood: So we could just implement it in the zones where you have to get a building permit and you want to give the architect guidance as to what our rules are with regard to development coverage. But we could just not specify, and leave it to the process that we already have in place for trying to just gauge what's a reasonable amount of lot coverage and development coverage. I mean, lot coverage is specified anyway. I'm sorry, leave it to the site review process to determine development coverage.

Village Attorney Stecich: Deven and I talked about that because that was the first thought that occurred to me. I said, well, it's not such a concern because these do require site plan review. On the other hand, somebody doesn't come in for site plan review until they've drawn up plans, and it's almost like they should have some notion.

Boardmember Hutson: Marianne, you have here, for these districts, the building coverage limits. These don't have lot coverage limits in the code?

Village Attorney Stecich: In our code?

Boardmember Hutson: Yes.

Village Attorney Stecich: No.

Boardmember Hutson: None of these have lot coverage limits.

Village Attorney Stecich: No. Well, they have lot coverage. That's all they have is lot coverage. But the way we compute lot coverage, it's only buildings. It doesn't include driveways. We haven't included driveways, so parking lots aren't included.

Boardmember Hutson: On any of these?

Village Attorney Stecich: No. In fact, the only district that has it is the MUPDD because we wrote that in and put in a number.

Boardmember Hutson: But do all of these have number of parking spaces required related to square footage?

Village Attorney Stecich: Yes, except for the downtown.

Boardmember Hutson: That's really what's going to guide somebody in terms of the amount of asphalt they have to put down.

Boardmember Cameron: You might ask how many parking spots they're required to have.

Boardmember Hutson: Are they going to say, "Hey, you can't say I can't have that"? I mean, if somebody wants to go beyond their required parking and sidewalks, then I guess it's an issue. But it's almost built in to the calculations they already have to make vis-à-vis parking.

Village Attorney Stecich: Except let's say somebody came in a multi-family residence thing and they just had tons of pavement, where if there were a limit on how much they could pave they might be forced to put some of the parking in the bottom of the building.

Boardmember Hutson: Well, that's what I'm saying. I see what you mean.

Village Attorney Stecich: You see? So they come in to you and they've maximized the number of units in the building, and then they have this huge parking lot. And the Board says, "Whoa, that's too much paving. Why don't you put a layer of parking in the building?" Then they have to totally redo their plans, which may be fine. Maybe that's how you want to deal with it. Or you may want to give some more guidance, which seems like the better thing to do.

Boardmember Alligood: Yes, that makes sense. I was trying to simplify it.

Village Attorney Stecich: I know. That was my first thought. I thought, oh, it's not such a big deal.

Boardmember Hutson: Because they aren't going to want to go beyond the required parking. I was thinking limit it at the required parking, but they aren't going to want to go beyond that anyway.

Boardmember Logan: Well, you don't know. People, once they start laying that asphalt, they just keep going. You know, we could use the required parking as the upper limit for lot coverage and then say the rest has to be non-developed plantings basically, as opposed to letting them asphalt over the whole ...

Boardmember Hutson: You could even put in, Marianne, the point that under review it may be that even that would be reduced if it made sense to include parking within the structure. Again, once you put such a wide-open thing it's always hard to deal with. But I think at least it could be said no more lot coverage than that required for parking beyond the building.

Boardmember Logan: That gives you some threshold.

Village Attorney Stecich: But in a multi-family building you might want to allow them to have a pool area and stuff.

Boardmember Hutson: But that would be the exception. We'd have to then review it and say yes, that's a great idea.

Chairperson Speranza: But then it goes to the Zoning Board as a Zoning Board action. I'm kind of swayed back to where you were coming from originally. Maybe we don't have anything to base these percentages on for the total lot coverage, development coverage. Maybe we are served best by the site plan review powers. If somebody comes in and proposes a sea of asphalt we say no, it's not in keeping with the character of the

neighborhood, with the adjacent properties, I mean the thinking within the context, of Hastings.

Boardmember Hutson: No, there would definitely be guidelines in the Comprehensive Plan to address that, within the vision plan.

Village Attorney Stecich: But see, the problem I would see with somebody looking at the code is, you put the restrictions on single-family houses. But the truth is, there are some other restrictions. There's a limit on the size the driveway can be and stuff like that. Whereas in the other districts, where it seems to me you're more likely to have issues of over-paving or overdevelopment, then ...

Chairperson Speranza: We don't review those other applications.

Boardmember Alligood: I think it's with the single-family homes -- again, based on my experience of looking at where I've been troubled, even in my neighborhood, even with my own construction -- I see the impact of all of us trying to maximize our little lots. We have small lots in this town, and I think when everybody puts an addition on and a patio in the back it starts to have impact. There's not enough space for all the runoff to go, and that's what we're trying to deal with. I think it happens really on the single-family lots. I don't know, I don't have enough examples of multi-family.

Boardmember Hutson: We don't have that many of these other things being built.

Boardmember Alligood: Exactly. It's a rare case that we take a hard look at them.

Boardmember Hutson: It comes into play with large tract stuff.

Boardmember Alligood: They don't want to come here.

Boardmember Hutson: We already give them enough.

Boardmember Cameron: We seem to think we know enough to do things for single-family.

Chairperson Speranza: Oh, yes. Everybody was comfortable with that.

Boardmember Cameron: Do we know enough to do two-family? We have this vernacular of multi-family and that gets very hard, but do we have enough for two-family?

Chairperson Speranza: Two-family comes for a site plan.

Boardmember Cameron: Do they come for a site plan when they want to put a driveway in?

Chairperson Speranza: They have to go to Building.

Boardmember Cameron: They have to come to us for a driveway. That's what we decided last time.

Boardmember Alligood: But it's not in the code yet, right?

Chairperson Speranza: Right. It's not in the code yet.

Boardmember Cameron: So we got the driveway covered because they have to come to us for approval of a driveway.

Chairperson Speranza: If someone had a two-family home and wanted to put in a driveway, that would be subject to site plan approval.

Boardmember Cameron: If they're building a two-family home. But if they already have a two-family home ...

Chairperson Speranza: They're changing the site. But a single-family, there's no recourse for site plan approval.

Boardmember Cameron: But they have to come in for a driveway.

Chairperson Speranza: They have to come in to get a permit -- but not to us, to the Building Inspector.

Boardmember Cameron: But don't they have to come to the Building Inspector for a two-family home for a driveway?

Chairperson Speranza: Yes. But a two-family home, the Building Inspector, I believe, would say, "This is a two-family home. You're requesting a building permit, you've got to go for site plan approval to the Planning Board."

Boardmember Cameron: Okay. But other than the fact that the person may draw up the plans first and then come in, we do have it covered that if someone comes in to have a driveway someone has to approve it.

Chairperson Speranza: Right. That's what we have at this point.

Boardmember Cameron: So we have driveways covered. We actually have a formula for driveways: no bigger than 650 square feet, I think we said.

Village Attorney Stecich: Nine-sixty, yes.

Boardmember Cameron: So we do have those two things.

Chairperson Speranza: And specific slope requirements, grade requirements.

Boardmember Cameron: So now we're into the fact that we don't have impervious patios covered because they don't go into an overall limitation. But they are a structure, too. We made them a structure. I'm trying to figure if we don't have enough control as it is even if we just make this thing, the site limitation, apply to single-family dwellings. Maybe the problem is, the person comes in with a multi-family and they're going to put in a maximum driveway and they also want to put an impervious patio over everything, they can't put it in the required yard. Is that right, or have I got that wrong?

Village Attorney Stecich: They can't put it in the required yard, but short of that they can put it everywhere.

Boardmember Cameron: I think we just should spend a little time thinking about it if we don't have enough controls. I'm not sure if we don't have enough controls; that if we don't, just make this new requirement we created, the plus-10%, apply to single-family. And that we actually can deal with the rest through site plan -- a little more sloppily, but through site plan -- and also through the Building Inspector looking at it as getting a permit. But we may just think about it for the next month.

Boardmember Alligood: It's another one of those cases where in the absence of actual examples it's hard to figure out whether we need it. I do feel strongly that we need it for single-family homes, and I'm ready to just say go, put that in the code. But the other zoning classifications, I'm not sure.

Boardmember Cameron: Maybe we should ask Deven to think about it and come up with some examples in the town where it might be an issue; that he thinks we need another control about specifically identifying individual homes. Because I could walk around town and try to figure out where it's going to impact, but maybe that's what we should be doing.

Boardmember Logan: I think we ought to nail down this single-family home thing, make sure that that's taken care of. And the rest we have some discretion over, so there's a little bit of a comfort level there.

Village Attorney Stecich: And you could always amend it. If it seemed like it was an issue it can always be amended. So I'll just draft the amendment for the single-family districts.

Chairperson Speranza: Right. And then we can think about it, and we can always come up with this again.

Village Attorney Stecich: But should I go ahead with the local law, or do you want to wait?

Boardmember Hutson: No, I would say go ahead.

Boardmember Logan: Go ahead.

Village Attorney Stecich: Okay.

Chairperson Speranza: Okay, 5 after 10. Jamie, you're going to be clear as a bell, I can tell, aren't you?

Boardmember Cameron: I am indeed.

3. Recommendation to Board of Trustees. Proposed Steep Slopes Law revision.

Chairperson Speranza: We're going to be talking about steep slopes, and all of these great diagrams.

Boardmember Cameron: I'd rather talk about the heights of buildings, and then we can talk about steep slopes after that maybe -- because they're two different things actually.

I put together a cover memo on this topic dated today, two spread sheets which, unless you happen to like spread sheets, probably are less than the easiest thing to understand. Then I included a possible regulation, even though I did point out in the cover note that it was rough. It was just to get some ideas down. I wouldn't actually suggest that this regulation be the actual one adopted. Assuming we do make up our mind what we want to do, we would then get our town council to draft something up that would fit tighter. Maybe I might just go through a little bit of some of the ideas.

Chairperson Speranza: Jamie, there was a cover.

Boardmember Cameron: The memo's dated February 21st. Behind that email right there. That document is about 10 pages long or 9 pages long, and it includes two spread sheets and then a possible regulation. And then in a separate document are some diagrams which were not specific, to Hastings, but were general. And I decided after looking at it then and looking

at my spread sheets that we really needed some diagrams specific to slopes we would expect in Hastings. I made up this diagram, 1 through 8, which you have here.

The general concept is that in two districts, CC and MRC, that one way to deal with, and possibly be a substitution for, steep slopes would be to regulate the height a bit different. Because much of the topography in this area, or a fair bit of it, is actually a steep slope. And therefore if our current regulation were to apply to it, it would subtract so much property that people couldn't build. And also we've been used to the fact that these buildings are on steep slopes and it's part of our downtown. That's the good news. The bad news is that the buildings, if seen from the back side or if seen from the side when you're an adjacent building -- we have dealt with that problem of adjacent buildings -- can get all too high. I give an example on the front of the cover memo showing that you can have a building which would be 65 feet high on the back side were it to be 100 feet long on a 25-degree slope. That really is part of the issue here, particularly where you're adjacent to another building which is smaller and you could just dwarf that building.

The second problem we have which I've tried to deal with is where a slope actually goes in two directions; both down to the back and also to the side. And that probably isn't such a serious problem if we're dealing with a 25- or 30-foot wide lot. But it is a problem where you're trying to apply this same thing we have, which is just take the average and suddenly you've got 120-foot wide multiple lots and it's going down this way. Picking something in the middle doesn't work. So somewhat arbitrarily in the cover memo -- and this is just numbers arbitrarily -- I say where the lot is bigger than 30 feet we're actually going to draw two planes on that. It doesn't have to be 30. It could be 35, it could be 40. But we're going to draw a couple of planes and they're going down, and that's going to control the height of the building. So a building on a slope going this way and that way would actually slope in both directions. So it would walk down, much like if you saw a building up a side street You'd see it going down like this.

Boardmember Hutson: It could either slope or step down.

Boardmember Cameron: Step. Actually, I am talking about stepping because sloping is very hard to living quarters on. Anyway, I arbitrarily divided into a multiple of 30 feet, but we can look at these. I did look at the zones and I looked how wide the lots were, the usual lots, and they're a bit wider than that. Maybe it should be 35 feet. But where we have normal single lots we really want to take the average of that and bring it down. Or we could have one line on each side, but we don't want to be chopping things into little pieces. We want them to be chunky.

Then the next thought I had, as we look at these buildings and they're moving down a hill, we should give the person 40 feet before you step down. So even if you're on a steep slope you should actually have the number of floors you're going to have for 40 feet going out, and

then after that you'd step down because we want to give a decent floor plan. My thought was, on the top floor -- which is the one you lose when you first step down -- if you had something 25 feet wide and 40 feet long you're giving someone 1,000 square feet on that top floor, which is a nice size, before you have to step down, no matter how steep the slope is. So that was another thought that went into it.

With that in mind, I put together these diagrams. Bill and I were working on a variation of this earlier. I did eventually find one town which has done this, on the Web. That's where the green diagrams came from. It came from that town. But after looking at them, they're much bigger buildings -- they're 55 feet high -- and they're longer buildings. It just seemed in the end that we should have our own set of diagrams. I put together a series of diagrams of 10-, 15-, 20-, and 25-degree slope, and at a 35-degree slope. I made another one at 40, but when you get to a 35-degree slope you're dropping down really fast. And hopefully we don't find those slopes in our town, at least for buildings of any depth.

The interesting thing is that these buildings, as they drop down, actually do create good opportunities for putting terraces on the drop-down piece. So the person's not losing space, and you're giving him a nice series of terraces going down, which can be very nice. The first one, on a 10-degree slope -- which is not much of a slope -- you can see that one there which basically goes out 60 feet and then drops down 10, and then goes out 40 feet. In fact, as I note here, this is how I set it up on the spread sheet. Looking at it now, probably after 40 feet it should have gone down either a whole 10-foot unit or 5 feet. In other words, it should have dropped down a bit because now it's violating the envelope.

Maybe a good thing to discuss with this group would be the 25-degree one, diagram 4, because this will really show you the whole principle behind it. In diagram 4 we have you going out 40 feet initially, without a drop-down, to give you the 1,000 square foot top floor. Then you have to drop down, so your building is then within 40 feet of the ground or 40 feet of the slope. You can see we've dropped down a full unit at that point. We go out 20 more feet, and we see at that point that we're above the 40-foot level, as we would undoubtedly be. At that point you can actually do two more units because when you start the fifth unit you're still within the envelope.

So this concept here is that you can pierce the envelope, but you come back in again. It's sort of like the envelope we have in other parts of the town, but there you can never pierce the envelope. This one here, in recognition of the fact that slopes are so steep, we allow them to pierce the envelope, come back within it, pierce the envelope, come back within it, pierce the envelope, come back within it; except for the last unit on the back side, where the suggestion is that we make sure that they never pierce the envelope in the back unit. So the back unit always ties in to 40 feet above the ground. The idea is, that's what we were

focusing on, and we're trying to get the back side so it looks right. And it's 20 feet in, so you don't necessarily notice that he's behind it that much.

These diagrams have been set up with a four-floor building. As I'm sure all of you know, the four-floor building is not something which you're entitled to; it's something which the Planning Board has the ability to give to you as an option. So in diagram 6 I took the same structure and put a three-story building in it of 10 feet on each floor. You can see with that I actually don't even go outside of the envelope ever. So it's actually quite interesting what you can do. Now, you could decide with this that, well, the person wants to go outside of the envelope, that's okay. We'll let him go outside of the envelope within the constraints we mentioned because they actually want to make the ceilings higher. There was a more generous-looking structure. So that's another option in that. I think this seemed to fit in actually very well as you step down the hill, as you can see.

I'll go to the end, and then I'll come back. I'll go to the 35-degree one. There, you can see how quickly things get really dramatic -- that's slide 7, not 8 -- as you get to a 35-degree slope. Because now you can see how fast things drop because the hill's dropping so fast. It drops down the hill very quickly. Hopefully, when we look at Hastings and actually measure the slope of the hill, we don't find many things at this steepness or even greater. You can do it, but it actually takes a lot of building depth.

Chairperson Speranza: Jamie, just a question on diagram 7. Those first two modules that are equal ...

Boardmember Cameron: There's a concept that you'll get 40 feet before you have to step down. Now, we may not like that, but the concept is that the person gets to have 40 feet before they have to step down.

Boardmember Hutson: And then the next one's 20, 20, 20 you said.

Boardmember Cameron: Then the other modules are 20, 20, 20.

Chairperson Speranza: Forty feet down.

Boardmember Cameron: Horizontal.

Boardmember Hutson: He's got you going 40 feet, and then you have to drop down every 20.

Boardmember Cameron: But that was just to get a big enough floor plane.

Chairperson Speranza: To be able to use it.

Boardmember Cameron: In this one here it would be good to have it, even though it's quite dramatic and they have to step down, because as you can see all the other floors are discontinuous at that time because he has to step down half a floor. So it's good to give them these 1,000 square foot spaces, and then you can have a staircase that goes down half a floor to the rest of them.

Diagram 8 is actually a reverse.

Chairperson Speranza: We didn't get 8.

Village Planner Witkowski: You do have it. It got out of order.

Boardmember Cameron: Before 7?

Boardmember Hutson: It's in the middle. You have to look for the diagram.

Boardmember Alligood: It's the second to last.

Boardmember Cameron: It's probably my fault. I probably gave them to you in that order. Here, actually we're going the other way. The street is on your right and the building is going up the hill. This is, I think, an improvement on what we currently have in our law, in which the person would start at the street side and he gets to step the building up the hill. You don't see that much of it because the first module was 20 feet, and then they can step the building up. But notice, whenever they step the building up it actually ends the 20-foot module at the envelope. So the piercing is sort of in the other direction, but it gives the person more space. And visually it's almost the same as if you're standing in a side street looking at four buildings from the side on a fairly steep slope. The current rules we have allow the person only one step up and then that's it. It's rather a funny thing. It would make you say, "I'd rather own property on the downhill side than the uphill side because I get a lot more space" because you only have one step up. Whereas this one allows repeated step-ups, again limiting the back side to 40 feet. We have to explore this thing, but it seems to me that it works properly.

Chairperson Speranza: It does work properly.

Boardmember Hutson: Do the offset floors work architecturally? I mean, every 20 feet to have the offset floor?

Boardmember Cameron: This doesn't happen that way. As you see here, you've got to go in 40 feet before you have it.

Village Attorney Stecich: You're talking about beyond the 40 feet.

Boardmember Hutson: The last three. It's good from the outside. I just wondered what life is like inside.

Boardmember Cameron: First of all -- Bill, you can speak to this -- you have half-floor stairs.

Boardmember Logan: I would agree. Jamie and I have sat down several times, and I've tried to analyze some of his previous statements. I think we've identified some things that are really positive and some things that are loopholes that would allow us to have 65-foot floors. I think a goal would be to prevent out-of-scale, out-of-character buildings in the downtown. What out-of-character is is kind of hard to define, but I think we can define heights of walls, and I think we should define setbacks. And I think we need to do this on multiple axes. If we look at some of the bigger properties, the hill actually does slope in two directions. So we could satisfy height requirements on one elevation, but we'd find ourselves with huge walls on the other because there's no formula for that. So I think Jamie's identified a lot of critical things here.

You are making one assumption which I'm not sure we should apply to the downtown. The fundamental assumption you're working with is that it should follow the slope. I think we can get to a lot of what we want -- that is, to have setbacks and break up the appearance of massive walls -- but what's up for discussion is what is that angle, does that have to follow the slope. If, for example, Patterns for Westchester says we should encourage higher density near the downtown in our train stations, why should we limit the developer who can get floor area, and possibly more units, into the space and more tax revenue -- whereby we can still get the setbacks and the scale effects, but not follow the slope.

I think the idea of following the slope is somewhat arbitrary as an idea in the downtown, and I think it may hinder us. As an example, in New York City, in the old code, there was the notion of the sky exposure plane; you wanted to get light and air down to the streets so you defined an angle out of which none of the building could project. So we had all these ziggurat buildings essentially in the '60s. Since then the code has changed, and there are other formulas where you have a podium and then a tower and it still does a similar thing. What I would just suggest that we explore is, instead of following the slope we pick an angle and we can name what that angle is, maybe it's 45 degrees, and maximum heights. But to allow, for example, a developer to build out more of this bulk in that zone, but still get a stepping effect and getting the scale, and limiting the absolute height of a building. For example, if a developer wanted to do a courtyard scheme this would be very tough to follow this kind of stepping arrangement.

I'd like to hear what other people have to say, but I think we could achieve all these goals that Jamie has set out for us, which I think we should go for. It's just a question of do we have to follow the slope, or can we pick another angle which gives us the character of enough setting back and enough sky, but allows the developer some flexibility about how he plans his floor plates and maybe get more density in there. You know, sometimes you want more density. You want to be able to build out and get more revenue. So I think that's one of the issues that's up for discussion.

Boardmember Cameron: There is actually a lot of density in this plan. As I point out in one of them, on the 20-degree slope/100-foot long building the developer's got 10,000 square feet in that building, which is one hell of a lot of density. What I would worry about, as you go for higher levels, is that you are going to actually have adjacent buildings out of line. You are going to have buildings sticking way up. I don't think you can choose 45 degrees if the land's only going up 10. And also, the angle that you use ... in New York City, I understand -- you have these skyscrapers.

Boardmember Logan: It's a much more acute angle than would be appropriate here.

Boardmember Cameron: You're trying to see the sky. We're not trying to see the sky. We're trying not to see the building stepping back. We're trying to pretend we're in Italy someplace looking at these palazzos going up -- at least I am.

Boardmember Logan: Yes, so am I. And some of those go up fairly steeply.

Boardmember Alligood: Where we started with this was -- when we were looking at projects, examining projects, and trying to figure out what it's going to look at when we're at the street either looking up the slope or from the side -- I appreciate this kind of diagram because I think I can see that once you have a certain setback, and then it goes up, you're not looking at such a massive building. So it addresses our concern. I'm trying to describe what the concern is because I think it is different than New York City. In New York City you don't have these kinds of angles. Maybe way uptown you have some minor hills, but we have some steep slopes that are downtown that we recently have struggled with.

Boardmember Cameron: I'd be very interested in trying to figure out, in these zones that are 25, 30 feet wide, how many square feet it has in it. And then if we allowed them to build this, say how many square feet they would get. I think we should compare that to see how much density we really are going to get out of it.

Boardmember Alligood: I agree, Bill. I think we should be aiming for density in the downtown. I support that. I just think the conflict comes in when visually that doesn't work for our town.

Boardmember Cameron: On your going up the hill and the floors not meeting, you can actually fix that very easily. I know you're losing some space, but if you got rid of one of these modules you could raise this one up so everything lines up. So out of a building with 16 modules you lose one of them, but you line all the floors up. But if you're going for all 16 modules you could have this half-floor effect, which Bill says in some cases would be very nice, maybe not so nice. And one of these examples here slides the modules up and down so you can make it that they all line up.

Boardmember Hutson: You wouldn't want to design senior housing with all of these, we're assuming.

Boardmember Cameron: No, but if they line up you could actually have an elevator there and it would work very well.

Boardmember Hutson: I really think this makes a lot of sense. I think it would work well. The issue, I guess, that this doesn't speak to is if somebody wants to dig out the bottom of the hill like they did on Main Street that would happen, too. That's basically where that was addressed. I mean, there was a hill at the old Gulf station, there was a mountain there, and they just took it out.

Boardmember Wertz: But that would be independent of these considerations.

Boardmember Hutson: I'm saying they could have worked upslope.

Chairperson Speranza: I don't even think of it as a hill. I think of it as a cliff.

Boardmember Hutson: Well, a lot of places you're not going to have an even grade up the hill. You're going to have rough terrain so you're kind of slicing through.

Boardmember Cameron: Well, that is a concern. In fact, I've thought of that building and it may be this thing would produce too high of a structure on that site, higher than it is.

Boardmember Alligood: Would you have enough depth there to actually go higher? Because that's not a terribly deep lot.

Boardmember Cameron: You may not. We have to measure these things. That's what I'm saying.

Boardmember Hutson: You have quite a bit of depth when you take it to the back.

Boardmember Alligood: Really? I can't tell.

Boardmember Hutson: But you wouldn't allow the fourth floor if they decided to go up the hill and not dig out.

Boardmember Cameron: You have that ability, and that's the key part of it.

Boardmember Alligood: One question, Jamie. Do you remember what the slope was for 10 West Main, just generally?

Boardmember Cameron: Yes, 25.

Boardmember Alligood: So it's this diagram 8? No, because this is going uphill. Sorry, you have to look downhill.

Boardmember Hutson: It was 4, wasn't it?

Village Attorney Stecich: Four and five.

Boardmember Cameron: No. Let me get to it. It's actually here, as you might suspect -- the one closest to it. Yes, you've got to pick one that's 100 feet long.

Boardmember Hutson: Oh, 100 feet long? That's 120.

Boardmember Alligood: No, that's 6 then.

Boardmember Cameron: There is one. That's built the wrong way. If you look at the 120-foot long building, and you move the last module over and up a little bit -- up half a floor -- then you have it. I thought I did one with 100, but I guess I didn't. So if you take the last module and get rid of it, and take the module after it and pull it down -- because you have to bring it down about half a floor to line it up -- then you've got it.

Boardmember Hutson: But under this scheme, how would you determine a slope on a very uneven slope?

Boardmember Cameron: That's another thing in the cover memo which is a little controversial. The way I determined slope, because of what you're saying, is, I've taken the front lot line and the back lot line and drawn a straight line between the two. That's how I determined it. Because otherwise you get situations where the land goes flat for awhile and then goes down, and it produces very awkward houses compared to the one right next to it. So we have to think about this, but that's how I did it and you'll see that in the writeup. I've just taken the front lot line and the back lot line, drawn a line straight between the two of them, come up with 40 feet above that with the envelope, and then built the structure down inside.

Chairperson Speranza: Jamie, thank you very much, and Bill, for pulling this all together.

Boardmember Logan: This is a huge amount of work.

Chairperson Speranza: I think for our task for the next meeting: take all this, our Steep Slopes Law, and be ready to address them within the context of this.

Boardmember Cameron: If anybody has any questions in the meantime, just shoot them to me and I'll try to deal with them. I wrote it up the best I could.

Boardmember Hutson: I thought it was very good.

Boardmember Logan: I think one of the exercises might be, taking all these studies, is there a way to boil this down into a paragraph of language.

Chairperson Speranza: That's Marianne's job.

Village Attorney Stecich: You're going to have to get an architect or something. I'm telling you, when I read the language I truly could not understand it. I'm not saying that I don't understand the concept, but I just can't.

Boardmember Cameron: Once we decide what we're going to do I can make it a lot simpler. What I did with the language -- and the language was a bit different than what I did here -- it actually comes out of this other town. There, their structures were so long that they actually looked at both the slope and the length of units. So on a shallow slope you've got to go 35 feet before you step down, and on a steep slope you've only got to go 20 feet before you have to step down. So if you were on a 30-degree slope you would step down every 20 feet. If you were on a 5-degree slope you never step down. And if you were on a 15-degree slope you step down after 35 feet. But looking at our slopes, and where we are -- and that we were not such big buildings -- and if we think this is where we're going, I could certainly make it a lot simpler. A lot of the stuff I put in there on the multiple distances needs to be changed. Anyway, I'd be happy to crunch it down. Then we could give it to someone who does this stuff, or whatever.

Village Attorney Stecich: Could I just ask, Jamie, I guess one thing that conceptually I don't understand is why wouldn't it work to just use the definition of height that we use everywhere else in the district in the CC and the MRC? I see that it would make a slightly different building because the way you have it drawn it pierces that line sometimes. But on the other hand, the height is pretty high downtown, too, 40 feet. So I don't understand what would be lost, if that's the direction you wanted to go in, if you just used the same definition of height.

Boardmember Cameron: Well, that would be diagram 6 -- could not go through the envelope. And there was a decision made by the Trustees and by this Planning Board that we wanted more density downtown.

Village Attorney Stecich: So it would end up a lot less dense.

Boardmember Cameron: But on the other hand, people didn't want more than a 40-foot front.

Boardmember Logan: Or I think one thing that's not addressed right now is the height of a rear wall. You could wind up having it even at street height. So we want to approach this

from both sides -- like the parking lot down by the train station, we don't have it look like Greystone.

Boardmember Cameron: When Bill and I discussed it we decided that we should have the rear look like the front in height, at 40 feet. So we backed into the back with this.

Village Attorney Stecich: Okay, and I see the issue. If you said it just had to be like in the rest of the district you do lose a lot of density. I see what you mean, when you look at diagram 6.

Boardmember Cameron: You lose all the peaks. And then when you lose the peaks, the problem with doing it is if you started on a street and you stepped out your building down a hill it has violated the envelope before you get 6 inches because the line's going like this and the building's going like that. You can't get there. So all right, you can back it in. You could say -- but we really don't want to do this -- "If you're on a steep slope, the front of your building, if you want to have a flat roof, can only be 28 feet." Well, that doesn't make sense. And we don't actually care as much. We actually are happy to have it break the envelope and come down on a really steep slope. But I can make it a lot simpler.

Boardmember Hutson: It invites the stepdown. It encourages it, and makes the stepdown more economically as well as aesthetically workable.

Boardmember Cameron: And it provides terrific terraces on top of the building, looking at a view.

Boardmember Hutson: Which actually, in terms of some of the discussions we had with 10 West Main, to the extent there has been change and evolution, that's kind of the extent of the code -- that it just came as a result of back and forth.

Boardmember Cameron: I will get it down to a page and a half. I might use smaller print.

Boardmember Logan: I think we ought to offer a prize for the shortest amount of language that achieves the same results. We each, collectively, put a dollar into the pot, and the winner gets it.

Chairperson Speranza: That's a great idea.

Boardmember Cameron: I can get it down to a page very easily. This is a lawyer's trick: you put everything to definitions and you stick them in the front.

Chairperson Speranza: What's the planning trick? Appendices?

Eva, do you want to spend some time and talk about a couple of things?

VI. Discussion

1. Safe Routes to School

Boardmember Alligood: I wanted to actually put on my Hastings school board hat and just provide a little update to follow up. Angie updated us in terms of her work on the Safe Routes to Schools application. I just wanted to, since I'm on the planning board also of the

school board, update that internally we had our facilities committee meeting to go over our thoughts on what we would like to see in the Safe Routes to School application, which is wonderful. And I'm very pleased that the Village wants to go in on it with the school district.

Let me just briefly mention the priorities. There's a follow-up meeting on March 6th, by the way, with the Village involved. Angie, you'll be there, and the superintendent, and George Foster, our Superintendent of buildings and grounds. The priorities really are Lefurgy Avenue in terms of sidewalks for the schools. Lefurgy Avenue is critical, and has come up many times in the community because it's just disappeared after all the road work. There's practically no sidewalk left there. And it's not in our transportation plan, but it's really critical. I know that came up in your discussion with our principal at Hillside, Bill Huppoch.

Village Planner Witkowski: And George Foster.

Boardmember Alligood: George Foster was there, right. Another key needed walkway or pedestrian path, for children to get to Hillside is what we call the Chemka Pool walkway that comes up from the pool and that parking lot. It really could use a lot of work. It's not in great condition. One of the problems, as I understand it -- because I got the history from the facilities committee -- is that they tried to put that in the bond issue the last time the school district got that approved and they couldn't because it's Village property but it's used primarily by schoolchildren.

Chairperson Speranza: I hope it's not parkland.

Boardmember Hutson: I think it is. Isn't it designated parkland?

Chairperson Speranza: Is it part of Hillside Park?

Village Planner Witkowski: It's part of Hillside Park.

Boardmember Alligood: But it is paved already, Pat? There's a path there that the Village has put in. It just definitely needs to be upgraded, and maybe even lighting at night. I don't know if that's allowable in the grant. That's something to talk about in terms of details.

And then the third one was Hillside Avenue. Going back to the discussion with all the boards on the transportation plan, it really dovetails with that discussion because Hillside -- and we didn't talk about Lefurgy -- is just one of the key missing links. There's no sidewalk there, and it's one of the main ones.

Village Planner Witkowski: That was one that we had talked about. We were putting it in.

Boardmember Alligood: Exactly. I think Edgewood would be great, but given the cost it seems that it doesn't rise to the top of priorities.

Village Planner Witkowski: The only reason that we had Edgewood in there is because if you read that application package carefully they need to get this money out quickly so you have to have your plans pretty far along. I thought, when they told me Lefurgy, that would be a perfect continuation of Edgewood. That's why we had it in there. And I have sort of

gone through the spread sheets and cut out certain things so we can have more, but that's why I put Edgewood in there.

Boardmember Alligood: Because you have plans for it.

Village Planner Witkowski: Because we had started it.

Boardmember Alligood: I guess what I'm saying is, it's not a priority that was set in the discussions.

Village Planner Witkowski: I understand that. And also in the discussion that we were having we were just talking about where we already had something started in that particular area. I thought that by just continuing that, basically all it needs is a sidewalk. It doesn't need a lot of extras. So I'm going to have Charles Sells just do that Lefurgy part.

Boardmember Alligood: Survey that, yes. Anyway, I think there'll be a follow-up discussion, and I just wanted to update everybody on what's going on on the school board side.

Chairperson Speranza: Now, the transportation plan meeting, which is coming up March 11th. This will happen before the meeting with the Board of Trustees.

Boardmember Alligood: Yes.

Chairperson Speranza: Which I think is really great because if there can be agreement between the Village staffs and the school board, the Trustees then can go ahead and say okay, send the application, at that meeting. That would be wonderful.

Village Planner Witkowski: It has to be because the application is due April 1st in their office; no post mark -- in their office. So I've already started working on the applications because we have to. I mean, it's a brand-new thing.

Chairperson Speranza: Eighty percent of it is going to be boilerplate: the background of the Village, etc., etc.

Village Planner Witkowski: Right. But because it took them so long to get those regulations and guidelines together, that's why they want to have the plans pretty well done.

One thing I did want to ask you about. Fran forwarded the letter from the superintendent. Those programs that he's talking about, is somebody from the school working on those? That should be something that whoever wants to have the programs, the non-infrastructure, they should start writing the application because that really is their expertise.

Boardmember Alligood: I think, obviously, the sooner we can get the components of the proposal together the better.

Village Planner Witkowski: You've got the application package, right?

Boardmember Alligood: Yes.

Village Planner Witkowski: So I think maybe whoever felt that those programs were important, they should start working on it now. Just follow the rules.

Chairperson Speranza: But there's one application, is that correct?

Village Planner Witkowski: But we could have two.

Chairperson Speranza: I think it's much stronger to do one.

Boardmember Alligood: We talked about that at the facilities meeting. We're not competitive as an application if we can't coordinate our school system and the Village to jointly apply for routes to school. I think it's not a big pot of money. I mean, the towns around us have been working on this for awhile, and they've hired consultants, and there were articles in *The Enterprise* about different Villages going for it. So I think the coordinated approach is going to be the most competitive.

Village Planner Witkowski: Well, I know that George Foster told me that he had put together a plan awhile ago for that area coming down from Chemka Pool, and he's trying to dig that out. So he's working on it, too. All I'm saying is, the programs people, if they want to get that done they should get started on that.

2. Planning Board Agenda - Planning

Boardmember Cameron: I have one other thing I'd like to bring up, which really came out of this evening and prior evenings. I would like to suggest that we try to get better control on who comes on our agenda and when. Because there's an example of tonight, and prior meetings, where on the Hastings restaurant people who have something to say about an issue really can't come to every meeting, yet that issue has been on our agenda every meeting. So I think we should try to make sure that if somebody's coming to our meeting they've got clear materials, they've got a real thing to discuss with us, and then we try to get them to bring two or three things to our meeting at once so we don't sit here and get lost about what they said when and what they did.

It's also a disservice. I think we just have to say no to them. It's a disservice to the people who sit here in the audience and wait forever to get to see us because someone else who's got a big project has been here every time the last 10 times in a row. I know you've lived through this a lot longer than I have, and you feel the same way I'm sure.

Chairperson Speranza: We do this every month. Every month we say who's ready, who's going to be ready, who's going to submit things. There are people that we *do* say no to.

Village Planner Witkowski: A lot.

Boardmember Hutson: Well, the issues on the public hearing requirements, I mean, when you keep something open you keep it open.

Chairperson Speranza: And that's the reason we keep it open.

Village Planner Witkowski: You have to keep it open.

Chairperson Speranza: We were criticized for not noticing it again, and you can't notice every time it comes on the agenda.

Village Planner Witkowski: That's right.

Boardmember Cameron: I think we get criticism from a whole bunch of different directions, you know. We never deal with things: that's one criticism we get all the time.

Secondly, people never know what's going on because we're doing the same thing again and again. I think we need to force people to bring larger chunks of their project and what they're talking about to us at one time, and just say to them, "We really think you need to bring more issues to the table at one time than just coming in here and keep asking us, 'Here, I got another idea. What do you think of this?'"

Boardmember Hutson: Are you talking about applicants now?

Boardmember Cameron: I'm talking about applicants. First of all, I think we all get confused where we've been when the person's in here for the ninth time. I'm not talking about the present applicant tonight; it's just that lots of developers do that. I think we need to say to them, "You need to have a good stack of well-organized papers, and you're to come in here when you have something concrete to talk about or don't come in. Come next month."

Village Planner Witkowski: We do that every time.

Chairperson Speranza: Let me assure you, we do that. It's the ones you don't see that have often asked.

Boardmember Cameron: We've even told that applicant not to come in, but he showed up anyway?

Village Planner Witkowski: They do that.

Boardmember Cameron: Well, I would just say, "No, thank you. We're busy tonight. Come back next time with your papers."

Boardmember Alligood: I hear what you're saying, Jamie. I can think of one case where we clearly -- I won't say the project -- said, "This site plan is not legible, it's too confusing. Come back once you have really provided a site plan that we can properly review." And they came back with the same thing with some highlighting on it the next time. I think there are a lot of times where we don't let them back, but there have been some cases where we had to go through the whole thing again and we haven't gotten a lot of new information.

Boardmember Cameron: Anyway, I'm just throwing this out because I think we are going around in circles too much. We could do this thing quicker, and with people being better able to understand what's before this planning board, if we force people to come in with bigger chunks of their project. And I understand I'm not the first in saying no.

Chairperson Speranza: Maybe we should do another meeting, a pre-meeting. We could do that. We could have a meeting of the Board to talk about the next formal agendas, or we could do two meetings a month and move through it more quickly.

Boardmember Logan: You could email people.

Chairperson Speranza: Can't do that, I don't believe. We can't do discussions ...

Boardmember Logan: Agendas to be edited before the meeting, rather than have to meet physically.

Chairperson Speranza: Among the Planning Board members.

Village Attorney Stecich: Or you could circulate an agenda, but you couldn't meet.

Boardmember Logan: You can't take any action, but these are potential agenda items and you've got to choose five out of the eight.

Boardmember Hutson: Well, we do get an agenda though.

Boardmember Cameron: No, I have no doubt that you, Patty, together with the two people at that table couldn't make those decisions that someone shouldn't come up now, they should come up at the following meetings, they don't have enough stuff. You don't need to have me having to meet on that issue. I'm just suggesting that we think about what sort of standards we want to put in place before you can bring things to a meeting so we get a more organized agenda and we aren't going around in circles.

Boardmember Hutson: Well, Jamie, recently I can't think of the number of times when we've had much come to us that wasn't relevant. This person, the applicant tonight, wanted to get some more sense before they invested too much in a certain direction. It was unreasonable, but ...

Chairperson Speranza: But they were also here to respond to the recommendation.

Boardmember Hutson: It wasn't terribly productive. On the other hand, I don't know what they could have done differently and I don't think there was a basis on which to say to them don't come tonight.

Boardmember Cameron: We could have said to them, "Why don't you come when you have your lease agreement," and then we could actually look at it.

Boardmember Hutson: We could, but I just think that applicants to some extent, as well as the public, you have to cut them some slack in terms of spontaneity. They're chomping at the bit from their point of view in response to what's been said at the prior meeting and they want a response to that before they go on. That is a major project.

Boardmember Cameron: Absolutely.

Boardmember Hutson: To kind of spin your wheels on that one, to me, is probably worth more than some of the other things which are on the agenda and for which people are fully prepared. I don't know, I'm not defending chaos or anything.

Boardmember Cameron: All I'm suggesting is that we look at the things we've done in the last year and see which ones pass through us at one meeting and which ones pass through at more than one meeting and try to figure out why it took more than one meeting. Obviously, projects like the Hastings House Restaurant will take more than one meeting. But just to see where we are not getting enough information in advance to make whatever decision we can make at a meeting and make it. My perception is that people are coming before us too often when they just have one little thing they want to ask for.

Boardmember Logan: The other lever we have is how much time do we devote to listening to them on the agenda. If they're not prepared we should just give them 15 minutes, and next, and let's discuss our items. We have a little better control over that. Patty can say, "Okay, we've got to move on now," and, "You had your chance." Usually these things expand.

Boardmember Hutson: I'm guilty as much as anybody of dragging things out. People have told me that for years.

Boardmember Alligood: I think often it is helpful, especially with a tricky project like, let's say for example Hastings House, which we all support. But there's this need to kind of address some of the issues in order for us to feel that we've properly reviewed it and feel comfortable with site plan approval.

One of the things I'm concerned about, and this is sort of in the domain of public perception, is I think that's a useful process. But sometimes, in the end, we get accused of -- I want to say Planning Board, but let's say a reviewing board -- "Wow, what took you guys so long? They had to go to you eight times," and, "Why are you taking so long with your approvals?" And you know, that's not the issue. There's no way we can approve a project like this without the legal instrument to look at. And that should be out there so the public knows we're not holding it up; we have the courtesy to hear you every time you want to come in and have the conversation. We're trying to have productive input, but it's not us holding it up. It's that in order to approve the project we need this information from you and Chase is taking a long time, or whatever the project is.

Sometimes I feel that pressure that, wow, planning approval takes a long time. So I get concerned that maybe we just need to publicly say we can't approve this project until X, Y, Z.

Boardmember Logan: Well, there is a checklist out there, isn't there? In order for it to get proper consideration of a site plan we need topo lines, we need sections, elevations: "Here's a checklist, come prepared, if you have this stuff we're well on our way. If you don't, you've got an incomplete submission."

Chairperson Speranza: But remember, part of what some applicants do is come to us to get our impressions about things before they invest.

Boardmember Hutson: Well, there's a provision in the code for it. We have riders in the code.

Chairperson Speranza: So that's another stage in the process. If you have something then with an environmental review -- I mean an environmental impact statement or an EAF attached to it -- then you're easily going for another 30 days because that's what's required under the SEQRA law.

I'd be curious to see what the results of that would be; how many people were here in the past year. I can think of one, and we don't have to say the name. We all know. And they will likely be back, and maybe it will be something that we'll be able to act on in one meeting.

Five to eleven. Anything else?

3. Miscellaneous

Chairperson Speranza: LWRP work session is on Tuesday, the 26th at the Community Center. We are meeting with the Comprehensive Plan Committee on March 6th, 8 o'clock, at the Community Center. Then the Board of Trustees transportation work session is on March 11th.

Boardmember Hutson: With the comprehensive plan group, is there any preparation we should be doing for that, or that's just a chance for them to inquire of us whatever they care to inquire about?

Chairperson Speranza: The discussion I had with Kathy Sullivan was primarily for us to sit down. We've got a wide range of items that come before us. There are things that we have been seeing that they would like to know about. Lighting, is a good example; parking in the downtown, now where do we stand.

Boardmember Hutson: So they have a bit of an agenda?

Chairperson Speranza: Well, we've talked about it. It's kind of like what are the hot topics for we, the Planning Board; what are we seeing. Because we were the authors of the vision plan, what did we do? Community outreach work; are there any war stories that we can tell them and give them hints as they move forward. I think it'll be a good dialogue for everybody.

Boardmember Logan: Will they publish an agenda, a rough one, before?

Chairperson Speranza: We can do that.

Boardmember Logan: I think that would be useful, if there is some preparation any of us should be doing, to get a heads up.

Chairperson Speranza: Then we also have just one other thing I do want to mention because it could be quite interesting. I'm not able to make it, the American Planning Association New York Metro Region is actually having an audio Web conference on March 5th, and you can earn AICT credits for this. It's "Design Guidelines for Small Towns and Rural Communities," Wednesday, March 5th, 4 to 5:30 p.m. They're holding it both on the Web and down at the New York Metropolitan Transportation Council on Water Street, New York.

Village Planner Witkowski: And they're doing a lot more of those, so as I get that kind of information I'll pass it along. I think most of you already have your four hours done for last year, so you only need a couple of hours. I think you went over; in most cases you had six. If you went to all three of those you had six, so that means the extra hours will carry over. So if you could just give me a call or email me and let me know so I can double-check and make sure I have all the information correct, I want to fill out the spread sheet and I'm keeping track of it for all three boards that have to do it. I just want to make sure that we start early because April is when the land use training institute is going to be. I talked to Kay Eisenman the other day and she said she'd be getting the information out fairly soon on that.

Chairperson Speranza: Great. We did receive a note on the 555-565 Broadway parking from a Mrs. Eleanor McGinagle supporting the construction of additional parking. Just make sure this is in the record.

Village Planner Witkowski: This is what?

Chairperson Speranza: Put in the record for the public hearing, since we left that one open. Thank you, sorry.

Village Planner Witkowski: I noticed that after I looked at it again.

VII. Adjournment

On MOTION of Boardmember Wertz, SECONDED by Boardmember Cameron, with a voice vote of all in favor, Chairperson Speranza adjourned the Regular Meeting at 11:00pm.