

**VILLAGE OF HASTINGS-ON-HUDSON, NEW YORK
PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING
JANUARY 17, 2008**

A **Regular Meeting** was held by the Planning Board on **Thursday, January 17, 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, Jamie Cameron, Eva Alligood, Bruce Dale, Village Attorney Marianne Stecich, and Village Planner Angela Witkowski.

ABSENT: Boardmember David Hutson

I. Roll Call

II. Approval of Minutes

December 20, 2007 meeting

Chairperson Speranza: Changes, clarifications?

Boardmember Dale: Page 27, where I'm speaking, second paragraph, first sentence where it says "to offer." That's saying "to alter," not "offer": "But I have one question, and it has to do with section such and such, where we're saying to 'offer' ..." -- not it's, "to 'alter' in any form."

And then, I guess, an inch or so below that, where I speak again, in the middle of the sentence: "...which was to add a small piece where you can do a wide turn," it should be a "Y" turn.

Next time I speak there should be a comma after "was done," or the sentence doesn't quite make sense: "was done," comma.

Village Planner Witkowski: On the same page?

Boardmember Dale: "...the work was done, whether or not we were in violation of the code, or not."

And then on page 29, the bottom of the page where I'm speaking, the "balcony" should be "development": "...two coverages now, the building and the 'development.'

Chairperson Speranza: I thought you were trying to use a very flamboyant word for the rest of the property: "building" and then "the balcony."

Village Planner Witkowski: Where is that? On page 28?

Boardmember Dale: Twenty-nine, bottom of the page. And that's it.

Boardmember Alligood: Page 7, on the last paragraph where Ms. Rossner is speaking, starts with, "I think I got the letter in August." That second line, where it says "people who

'infected' [off-mic]," it really should be "people who 'inspected.'" Just take out the "Xs" and the "[off-mic]."

Then the next line, where it says, "Then it came back 're-infested.'" It should be "it came back 're-inspected'.

And then page 12, starting halfway down the page, I make a point about the trees. It says: "The other point I just want to make is that in your drawing," blah, blah, blah. The next line, Mr. -- I don't know how to pronounce his name, Mr. Escalalas -- it should say "no, they aren't" instead of "yes, they are." And then my response should read -- so the next line: "Those are not the trees that are going to be left on that property."

And then finally, on the fifth line from the bottom of the page, where I'm speaking, the last line of that paragraph, it says: "There's no way you can build..." You see that sentence? It should say "this" house," not "a" house.

And then I have one last correction on page 14. The voice vote, all in favor, it actually was not all in favor. This is having to do with 48 Whitman. The minutes should reflect that I did not vote in favor, I abstained.

That's it.

Boardmember Cameron: Page 25, where I'm speaking near the bottom of the page, the sort of big paragraph about three-quarters of the way down the page, four lines up, where it says: "...and they haven't been able to come up with it," and then the next sentence, "When he came up with the idea that the," it really should be "frontage line, you know, where it would be long enough there's going to be a curve." So put the word "frontage" in, and then I think you can just knock off the last sentence: "Because if the curb line's long enough you haven't got a frontage." I think it reads fine without that. The last sentence when I'm speaking...

Village Planner Witkowski: Towards the bottom of the page?

Boardmember Cameron: Yes. It says "...because if the curb line's long enough you haven't got a frontage." Just cross that out.

Going on to page 27, the last line of the page, it says: "...800 feet of asphalt." It should say "800 'square' feet of asphalt," and then put a comma in. And also the beginning of that sentence, it says: "My comment on that is," comma. Cross out the word "that." Forget about the other change.

The one on page 30, the exchange between Bill and I about whether he has a Mini Minor or something like this. About eight lines it says: "Boardmember Cameron: The only thing that gets..." it says "him there..." I think "gets him..."

Chairperson Speranza: "...in there..."

Boardmember Cameron: Yes, "...gets in there is a BMW Mini." And then just cross out the rest. The rest of the things are really not material.

Chairperson Speranza: I just had one that I thought should be corrected. Page 17, Angie, somehow Mr. Paradise is shown as speaking during the proposed subdivision of Mr. Tarricone's property. You see down towards the bottom of the page it says "Mr. Paradise," and he had spoken earlier in the meeting? So I believe that should be "Mr. Davis."

Village Planner Witkowski: Where it says "that's attached to the back of my..."

Chairperson Speranza: Right.

On MOTION of Boardmember Wertz, SECONDED by Boardmember Dale with a voice vote of all in favor, the Minutes of the Regular Meeting and Public Hearing of December 20, 2008 were approved as amended.

III. Old Business

- 1. Presentation of 555 Warburton Restaurant Traffic and Parking Analysis.**
The findings and recommendations on the Traffic and Parking Analysis for the proposed project will be presented by BFJ Planning, consultant to Planning Board for this project.

NOTE: NO ACTION WILL BE TAKEN ON THIS ITEM AT THIS MEETING. 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: The next item on the agenda is the presentation of the traffic and parking analysis for the proposed restaurant at 555 Warburton Avenue. We have Mr. Jacquemart here, who was hired by the Village to take a look at the site plan and the calculations that had been done with respect to the restaurant and the proposal to have a catering facility on the top floor. So welcome.

George Jacquemart, Buckhurst Fish & Jacquemart: Thank you. Good evening, my name is George Jacquemart.

I think you have all seen the memo that we submitted to the Village. The memo focuses on parking. We see that as the key issue here, but I will talk about traffic as well. What we did

in this memo, we did our own observations of the parking occupancies in the Village core to kind of confirm the studies that were done by the applicant. There were some minor differences, but basically we found the same results. Based on those surveys we established how many spaces are available in the core of the Village today at various hours, and we broke it down by weekday, Saturday, Sunday -- 5 p.m., 6 p.m., 7 p.m. The critical time period for this application is going to be on weekdays around 6 p.m., or after 6 p.m.

The catering, as you know -- the project here -- is a combination of restaurant about 6,000 square feet or a little bit more than that, and the catering facility. The catering facility will only operate if, and when, the Chase parking lot is available for valet parking. That would be on weekdays after 6 p.m., on Saturdays after 1 p.m., and anytime on Sundays. So we see the critical time period is the period on weekdays after 6 p.m. That is a time period when the reserve capacity in the Village core is the lowest -- it's 95 spaces on a weekday -- and where the demand generated by this application would be the highest; after 6 p.m. when the catering facility is in operation.

So we did two things in regards to parking. The first was to estimate as best as possible what would be the additional parking demand generated by this project, independent of zoning. As you may know, today the building is basically vacant except for the karate studio. So the only parking demand that takes place today is the karate studio. We estimated that and then we took that off, deducted that demand, and added the demand generated by the restaurant and the catering facility on a weekday evening. I can give you those figures. Well, basically, for the restaurant we assume that this restaurant would have similar characteristics as what I would call a suburban restaurant but with only 50% of that parking demand.

Now, we are here in a downtown location. A fair amount of the people that would go to the restaurant, let's say at 6 o'clock or 7 o'clock, are people that walk from the station. We have people that may walk from the neighborhood. So there is a certain amount of people that are either nearby or close by and could walk. Not everyone will make a special automobile trip to go to the restaurant, so we adjusted those rates to represent something that I feel is realistic.

Then for the catering facility we made a worst case assumption, in the sense that those would all be special purpose trips. Imagine a catering event that happens on a Thursday evening would be a professional association from Westchester County, doctors or whatever. They would tend to make special trips to come to this event. So that use in the project will have a greater impact in terms of parking and traffic. So we did take that into consideration, and we assume that the catering event would start relatively early, at 6 or 6:30, and estimated the parking demand generated by that.

So the bottom line is, we calculated the additional demand that would be generated in the area, and I'll give you those numbers. On a typical weekday at 5 p.m., we estimate an additional 17 cars. Seventeen is relatively low. That is because the catering facility will not yet be in operation, but the restaurant will be in operation; but not at its peak. At 6 p.m. the additional demand would be 99 vehicles; 7 p.m., 117; 8 p.m. it would tend to decrease again, to 111. We know that the Chase parking lot next door has a capacity for 39 vehicles in a valet operation where they are parked one behind the other. So if you deduct that the additional parking demand that would occur on the public street or public parking lots in the downtown area is 17 at 5 p.m. -- 60 at 6 p.m., 78 at 7 p.m., and then 72 at 8 p.m.-- that is the impact that it would have on today's parking conditions in the downtown. The occupancy survey that was done basically showed that there are parking reserves in the downtown area today. We estimate, based on the reserves that we were able to survey, that this demand can be satisfied -- the additional demand generated by the project can be satisfied -- within about 500 feet from the location of this application.

Then we also looked at the zoning requirements in terms of zoning analysis. The calculations are a bit different because we have today in that building a restaurant, two apartments, and the karate studio. So when you look at the changes that are happening from the zoning point of view, the additional parking demand would be 47 spaces. So to a large degree, that additional demand is satisfied by the procurement of the Chase parking lot next door. That would then be operated as a valet parking operation.

To conclude, the major element in terms of parking and also in terms of traffic is the catering facility because that will be more special purpose trips. So from a traffic and parking point of view, that's the element that has the greatest impact. But it's also important to remember that the catering facilities don't necessarily operate every day, and it's not operating at capacity every day, so it's not an event that will happen every day. I don't know what the statistics are. Some time ago we did an analysis for an addition of a certain number of ballrooms and meeting rooms. This was the Nassau Inn in Princeton, where you looked at the statistics how often are these facilities occupied at capacity. I remember in that case it was maybe twice a month where you would have this full occupancy, and that was the assumption we made for this memo. So I think that's important to remember. That it is not something that will happen every day. And then there's obviously the other side to that, in the sense of the good and the bad from the Village business point of view. If you get these special purpose trips, these are new people coming to the Village and, hopefully, they will do more than just go into the catering event.

From a traffic point of view, I think it's a very similar picture. There will be more traffic coming for those special catering events. The valet operation, what we recommend is that the catering events be scheduled such that they should not start at the same time as the valet

parking lot becomes available. So the parking lot becomes available at 6 p.m. on a weekday, I would recommend that the catering events, the official dinner starts, be at least half an hour later. So we have room; that people come early, they can then park in the Chase parking lot. So that we have an operation that functions and is not too chaotic when we have the beginning of these events.

We also suggest -- because, again, the catering events can have varying impacts depending on the type of that event, if it's a family-oriented event like a wedding, a bar mitzvah and so on -- you tend to have high occupancies; meaning, at least on average, three people per car. So the traffic and parking impact of those, let's say, 120 seats is not so severe compared to a situation where you may have a professional association or a chamber of commerce or Rotary or something like that, where people tend to come maybe one to two people per car on average. The occupancy may be 1.2 or 1.3 persons per vehicle. So I think what we're considering may be the seating capacity be reduced to 80 people, except for family events like bar mitzvahs, christenings, and so on.

Obviously, this has to be conditional upon securing the Chase parking lot, and I think the applicant is in the process of doing that. There have to be signs set up to alert other people who park in that lot -- like today there were vehicles parked in the lot -- so that lot remains available for these customers who come to the catering events. We recommend there be signs set up that say "no parking today after 6 p.m." or "after 1 p.m." And obviously there has to be somebody who knows about valet parking and can operate that as a valet parking lot.

I also looked at the loading, deliveries. It's like any restaurant. I think, in a way, it works here because we have a bus loading zone in front so at least the loading trucks don't have to double park. There may be occasional conflicts between a truck that loads and unloads -- makes deliveries -- and the bus, but that's something that always happens in a village like this. I don't think that's a dramatic event. I can see it happening relatively well because of the bus loading zone that's in front of the restaurant.

So that's basically our conclusions. I'll be happy to answer any questions.

Chairperson Speranza: Okay, we'll start at this end this time. Jamie, anything?

Boardmember Cameron: Sure, I guess I've got a couple of questions. When you're saying you want to limit them --- one of the suggestions is limiting the catering facility, 80 people -- you're just talking Monday through Friday, I take it. You're not talking about weekends.

Mr. Jacquemart: Yes, I think that is the main -- yes, you're correct.

Boardmember Cameron: And you also had the suggestion of the employees, your last suggestion, that they be required to park in the Zinsser lot if they are arriving after 3 p.m.?

Mr. Jacquemart: Yes, yes. I think there is parking...you know, it's like all these commuter lots. Around 3 p.m. some people are already coming back, so they have a few spaces that become available after 3 p.m. And we have made similar accommodations in other towns and villages, where you let those commuter lots open up to anyone after 3 p.m. as parking spaces become available. That's an ideal spot for employees to park. Like restaurant employees that tend to arrive around 4 p.m. or so to park there.

Boardmember Cameron: Yes, because it looks like they have about maybe 15 employees arriving after 3 p.m.

Mr. Jacquemart: Right.

Boardmember Cameron: That's all I have now.

Boardmember Alligood: A couple of questions, maybe comments. One question I have is, in the analysis you emphasize the point that you think the peak demand, or the time when the parking issue is going to be the highest, is on weeknights after 6 o'clock.

Mr. Jacquemart: Weekdays.

Boardmember Alligood: Weekdays after 6 o'clock, right. But I'm curious about Saturdays at 1:30, when you're talking about the banquet factor being open and having up to 120 guests. Because actually, in the charts, the data is not there. But I know that, in my experience with the Village, is when parking is the tightest because that's when a lot of the Village businesses are being frequented the most.

So I guess part of my question is -- and this is really to the owner -- is the restaurant going to be open at the same time as the catering facility. Because presumably if the Chase lot is being used as valet parking, then there won't be any spillover from the catering facility into other public parking spaces in the Village. But if the restaurant is open and has quite a few guests, that's where my concern comes in. And it's not on this chart. I'm just curious whether you looked at that.

Chairperson Speranza: We will allow the applicant to speak after this also, so they may be able to address some of that. My recollection is that that was one of the things in terms of when the restaurant's open and the catering, especially on a Saturday.

Boardmember Alligood: Saturday afternoon -- and that's when we have the Farmers' Market -- we have lots of people running to our stores and small restaurants. That's just something I'm raising as a question.

Let's see what my other questions were with the parking. I guess this is part question, part just observation. Which is that when you conduct the analysis of the comparison of the proposed number of parking spaces and the existing, and then we see that there isn't that much of a difference in increase in demand between what's required for the existing uses as they've been to date and now, again, I think in the case of the uses that were there up until now, truly there wasn't a lot of parking generated by the use because it really was a local

restaurant that people walked to and that didn't have high volume -- except later at night, certainly not during the day.

So that's an observation of mine. I think, given the survey and the times besides Saturday afternoons, there is evidence that we have some spots available through the town that could be used by this facility. But I just want to point that out. That we can't really compare to a required zoning as it was until now because it just never generated that kind of parking, maybe, to date.

Mr. Jacquemart: Yes, that's why we did the other analysis based on high ITE rates.

Boardmember Alligood: The question I want to ask goes to the traffic part because that covers my parking questions. I guess in previous proposals it's been suggested that the deliveries could be made between 10 and 4. And that certainly is a time where there wouldn't be as much conflict between all the cars trying to get down Spring Street and the delivery truck. But I guess my question is, how is that enforceable. And what is the scenario when we do have a delivery truck at 8 in the morning or 7:30 if there is not a way to enforce that rule. I guess what I'm picturing, and I just want some analysis of this scenario, is when the delivery truck is sitting there -- let's say during rush hour in the morning and there's a line of cars trying to make the turn to go down to the train station, they're all rushing to get to the train -- we're assuming you can get around it because normally there isn't that much traffic in the other lane. But if we're talking about rush hour, we may have a line of cars on both sides. I guess, given the dimensions of the road, is it even possible to pass at this point.

Mr. Jacquemart: I think so because we have buses that stop there, and I don't know that the bus would block the traffic completely.

Chairperson Speranza: It's a different road.

Boardmember Wertz: But the buses are on Warburton, Spring Street, where the deliveries take place.

Mr. Jacquemart: What I would suggest is that the deliveries take place on Warburton, if that's possible.

Boardmember Wertz: Right. Well, they have been planned on site plan review. If you look on the map it even designates deliveries along Spring. I was confused by that, too, when you were talking about the bus stop. Deliveries were to take place around the corner.

Boardmember Alligood: The garbage pickup is going to be on Warburton where the bus stops.

Mr. Jacquemart: The garbage pickup is there on Warburton.

Boardmember Alligood: Yes. Right now we don't have buses, as far as I know. Does anybody know?

Boardmember Wertz: The buses are on Warburton.

Boardmember Alligood: Yes, they don't ever turn onto Spring. I don't think it's an issue when we just have a normal flow of traffic, but I'm picturing...we have this sort of window of a half-hour to an hour when it's very congested at that very spot. So I guess I'm still

struggling with that issue. Because, again, I know the deliveries were there before in that area, but there weren't nearly as many and not for as long. We're talking a much bigger operation now, so that's something I'm still kind of having questions about.

I think it's not something we've experienced yet, but we could anticipate, as a potential issue really clogging up traffic in terms of commuter access to the train station.

Mr. Jacquemart: I can look at the width of Spring Street and if it allows a truck to park there and two cars to pass each other.

Boardmember Alligood: That would be very helpful if you could look at the dimensions. And then the other piece of it is, if cars are backed up behind the truck that's stopping to make a delivery at that hour, and we have people trying to make a turn from Spring onto Warburton, is their sight line now obstructed. Because I find that I always have to pull up almost into the crosswalk to see whether somebody's coming down Warburton to make that turn now. Usually there isn't a car in the other lane when I'm trying to look to see if anyone's coming.

So again, just kind of playing out that scenario, that's the thing that I'm really thinking about the most.

Boardmember Wertz: That was one thing I was going to ask, about the width of Spring Street and whether there's enough room for the delivery truck to be there and for other traffic to flow through. I would hope, and assume, that they wouldn't have to go into the other lane in order to get through there.

And then the other issue was, we talked a little bit about the garbage trucks making their pickups, and what happens on Warburton when you may have a bus and a garbage truck and a bunch of cars. How would they work their way through there? Would there be a clog-up and would cars get backed up on Warburton, or wouldn't that be a problem?

Mr. Jacquemart: I think you have a fairly long distance there for the bus stop, all along the building. I don't know how many feet that is. The dimensions of that, it looks like it's maybe 100 feet, 80 feet. So that's long enough for a bus and a truck. You know, we don't have such frequent bus service. I don't know what the headway is here that we would have these events occurring that often. It's something you see. These kinds of conflicts, we see double parking all the time in the Village like this. It's not unusual. Compared to most situations, I think this is a relatively good situation on Warburton. And Spring, I have to check that.

Boardmember Wertz: The only other thing was the differences between your study and the previous study. You said that the differences were minimal, and you really don't see any of them being significant.

Mr. Jacquemart: You know, when you do these parking surveys there are always variations from one day to the other, and whatever we saw was a reasonable variation. I was not surprised at that. And even before that, remember when we worked on the application for 10 West Main Street. We had looked at the parking lot there, so it was all in the same range. There are spaces available. There's not a lot of parking available, but there are spaces available. And it was interesting to see that most of the parking spaces were in the larger parking lots, the Boulanger lot and the other lot.

Boardmember Alligood: I just remembered one thought that occurred to me. When you did your survey, Bloom had closed.

Chairperson Speranza: One of the restaurants.

Boardmember Alligood: Bloom was a restaurant that would be using that lot quite a bit. I looked at the numbers that the architect had put together and they also showed availability. I think you did your survey when Bloom was still open. But I just want to point that out. I anticipate that another restaurant will move in there so it's something that's going to skew the numbers a bit.

Boardmember Logan: Just on your survey -- all these numbers of available spaces -- those were the ones within 400 feet, I believe.

Mr. Jacquemart: On the first page, those were the numbers that were available. It's more than 400 feet. We excluded the commuter lot from that number.

Boardmember Logan: Right, you excluded Zinsser, but you included Maud's, for example.

Boardmember Cameron: And the post office.

Boardmember Logan: Because that starts at 500. Maud's is 500, and then they go up from there.

Mr. Jacquemart: Well, some of the parking on Maple Avenue, the north part of Maple Avenue, is even further as well as -- 650 feet.

Boardmember Logan: But I guess the worst case is for the catering scenario. If we include the Chase lot it looks like the increase in demand is 78 spaces, but there are 106 available so we're not getting even close to full capacity here. We still have a reserve of 30 cars, which could easily be the margin of error. So it's a comfortable fit apparently, at the moment, under this scenario.

Mr. Jacquemart: Right. It gets you closer to that capacity. It doesn't mean that people, on the average, may have to spend a little bit more time to find a parking space.

Boardmember Logan: Right. Worst case, they have to walk down to Zinsser.

Mr. Jacquemart: But some of these parking issues I think can be addressed also through parking management changes. As we sometimes do these parking studies in villages -- we just finished one in Nyack -- you realize there are a lot of things that can be done to improve the conditions. For instance, we should try to get higher occupancy of the parking lots and make sure we create turnover on the street. You know, that's a question of how much do you pay for the meter today, how do you enforce the parking meters, how long are those parking meters in operation. In Nyack for instance, where there's a lot of restaurant activity in the

evening and bar activity in the evening, we recommended that they extend the meters until 8 p.m. Because what happens in Nyack, the restaurant employees come in around 4 or 5 and they may pay 25 cents in the meter for one hour, and after that there's no enforcement. So they take the best parking spaces away from the customers. What Nyack is doing is now, they extended the operating hours to kind of push the employees a little bit further away from the core.

So there are things like that that can be done, and that will improve your parking conditions. Basically what you want to do is create turnover. Turnover is the key idea here. What that means, and it's sometimes controversial with the merchants, it will help the business in terms of creating turnover even if it means increasing the parking meters. But as long as you create turnover, that's the ultimate objective.

Boardmember Logan: One other quick question. Right now the karate studio occupies the top floor. The second floor is empty. Is there a scenario whereby that second floor becomes occupied and that has a competition for spaces, or is the formula in the code that we could anticipate how much that might generate as a margin of error? Maybe this is a management issue for the building owner, where he has to balance different types of uses. But could you imagine a scenario for second-floor occupancy that would put a high demand on on-street parking?

Chairperson Speranza: Well, what's proposed is restaurant.

Boardmember Logan: Restaurant all up on the second floor.

Chairperson Speranza: Public restaurant first and second, and then the catering on the third. So the parking demand numbers are for the entire...

Boardmember Logan: So this covers all of those scenarios.

Mr. Jacquemart: Yes, right.

Boardmember Dale: One question. I don't know if you have a sense of how busy restaurants are on a Saturday afternoon when most people are doing their shopping and other things of that nature.

Mr. Jacquemart: You're talking about the restaurant, not the catering facility.

Boardmember Dale: The restaurant, exactly. Catering we've accommodated in the parking lot next door, but do you have any sense of what traffic would be for the restaurant during that period, say, 1 to 4 o'clock on a Saturday?

Mr. Jacquemart: Typically it's not very high activity. That's not a peak activity on a Saturday at 2 or 3. Depending on the type of restaurant, it may be active on Sundays if they have an active brunch menu but, typically, on a Saturday afternoon I would not worry about the restaurant so much. Because the other part of it is that you tend to have people, at least to some degree, that are in the Village already. They may run some errands, they're here, and then they go to the restaurant -- which is something you like to see, this what we call park-and-walk pattern. It helps the Village businesses and so on.

The catering operation could have a more significant impact. And it's important also to realize, depending on the catering event, the Chase parking lot may not have enough capacity. That's why we are suggesting the limitation to 80 seats. Because, you know, if you do have this professional event, and you have 120 doctors who come here, it's going to be more than 39 cars.

Boardmember Dale: One aside on the Spring Street issue. Existing now on Spring Street you have two lanes of traffic and one lane of parking. So the truck is not going to add that much width, I think, to be a problem.

Boardmember Alligood: The truck is much wider.

Boardmember Dale: It's not that much wider than a car.

I actually would take a very positive number. It sounds to me like this verifies the possibility this restaurant can be there and could function. I think we all agree that the economic benefit to the community of having the restaurant there and functioning is strong, and there doesn't seem to be a parking issue here that's going to prevent that from happening. I've been very pleased with the report.

Chairperson Speranza: Nobody brought this up yet. See, I tend to agree: Spring Street I'm not so concerned about, and the garbage on Warburton I'm not overly concerned about. One thing that I am concerned about is the reliance on the lease of the Chase spaces for valet parking. George, I don't know your experience as far as how valet can function. You've got people who are all coming to an event that begins at the same time, they go to valet parking. How do we prevent backups on Warburton Avenue? You know, we don't have a whole lot of car lengths on Warburton Avenue, and I could see you get five or six or seven vehicles stacked up waiting to get into that lot to be valet'd and there could be some big problems.

Mr. Jacquemart: Obviously, it will take a valet operator who knows his or her business. I think that drop-off location that's shown in the map there, the arrow, may be too close to Warburton Avenue. Maybe the pickup will have to be further down, further back in the Chase lot, so that when there is queuing that we minimize the impact on Warburton.

The other question I had is, could the applicant secure the funeral lot. You know, the funeral lot is ideal for queuing in there, especially if they are larger events. I think the operator of the catering facility will have to pay attention to this. You know, if there's a big event -- let's say the 80 doctors coming to a facility -- that there be more than one valet operator, that there will have to be probably two or three valet operators, to accommodate that demand. It's partially an operational question, but I would say my first reaction would be that the valet pickup be a little bit further in to the Chase Manhattan lot.

Chairperson Speranza: You mentioned the funeral home lot, and I realize for the applicant that this is not something that's within your control. I'm just thinking, in terms of circulation, how very nice -- even if there could be no parking there -- how very nice it could be to have people be able to enter one way off of Warburton, and then circulate through

when they're leaving down through the funeral home lot. But, again, I know that's not within your control.

Boardmember Cameron: Actually, your comment about Bloom Restaurant brought up to me one other of the things in looking at this. While there seems to be adequate parking, it's not the case because the applicant's here and the town may have other people who need parking. You know, if we do this we're giving two-thirds to three-quarters of the available spots that are left, based upon these surveys. One thing which we haven't put into the calculation -- maybe you did -- is that we have a new Comfort Restaurant going in up the street and they're going to probably take five or six or eight spots out of the post office parking lot in the evenings. That would be my guess. It's going to be a pretty decent-size restaurant.

I guess the experience is maybe it's first person in gets the spots. But six months ago we never thought -- and I'm totally in favor of this development -- we never thought of this building suddenly having catering and large events. Maybe there's no other place in town. Maybe we, as a planning board, should be thinking about what other place will generate more parking demand other than the fact that everyone's going to buy one more car in the next 10 years than they have now. So I'm sort of curious. When you look at new studies, do you take into consideration the further expansion of car usage and parking in a town based upon its development for that time?

Mr. Jacquemart: Well, yes. I think when you look at these parking issues we take into consideration it's also a human behavior question. I have a little bit of suspicion -- I haven't really studied it in detail -- that there's room for parking management solutions here. The meter rates are fairly low, and there may be ways to create more turnover. I don't know to what degree there's meter feeding going on by long-term parkers that go out and feed the meters and take spots that they should not take. You know, there are other solutions to this that help in the parking problem.

Boardmember Cameron: One of the reasons I brought up earlier the last point you made on the employees is that while we're sitting here, and before we make a decision at some point in time what we're going to do, I would think that one of our ways of control is to say, then, well, we have the right to make you put your employees where you suggested. Because we may find that we're running out of spots for other businesses that we'd like to have in this town to expand our commerce in the town.

Mr. Jacquemart: Right. It is very important to create turnover. You know, there's a book called *The High Cost of Free Parking*. I recommend it to all of you. It has changed the minds of many people, including many merchants and businesspeople. There are good examples where -- the best that's cited in that book, the city of Redwood City in California -- city council voted, basically told the public works director, "You shall increase the meter rates up to the point where you always have 15% of the parking spaces available." That means on every block you have one or two spaces available. That's what creates a turnover,

and that's what brings people in. They know they can get a parking space as long as they're prepared to pay. And most people are prepared to pay 50 cents, or even if it's a dollar, to park for an hour or so.

We see that in the City of New York as well. The city has been increasing the rates very aggressively to generate turnover. And that's what you want to see is turnover here. Even if it means that somebody will be going now because they have to pay 50 cents to go to an outside location and buy their six-pack somewhere else. But as long as that person is replaced by somebody else who's prepared to pay, the Village will gain.

Boardmember Wertz: I'm not sure how easy it is to answer a question like this, but when we look at the study we see a certain number, a significant number, of parking spaces that'll be open. But could you talk a little bit about the subject of, the experience of, driving around the Village with that many spaces open? Maybe there are spaces when you have the numbers, but as you're driving around is that going to be evident to you, or might it still feel like there aren't enough spaces?

You know, it's funny with parking that often times people complain about the lack of spaces, and then you do the study and there are plenty of spaces. So I guess what I'm wondering is -- and I know that physical spaces are important -- I think the experience of driving around looking for a parking space is also important. I wonder if you could address the results of the study from the standpoint of the experience of the person looking for a space.

Mr. Jacquemart: You're talking about human behavior. I drove into the Village this evening. I wanted to get a bite to eat at Maud's, and I could not find a parking space in front of Maud's. So I had to go into the lot, I had to drive in front of Maud's.

Boardmember Wertz: That's purely anecdotal.

Mr. Jacquemart: So I had to park in the lot that's next to it, and I did find parking. There were two or three spaces available in that lot. So yes, you drive in and it looks busy. That's a good sign at least: it's not a dead village, it's very busy, and you may have to look around to find a spot. And it's all relative. Here, on the average, you may have to drive half a block, and in other places it may be a block or two blocks. You know, in Manhattan you see people looking for alternate side parking. It's almost like a war sometimes.

So I think it's not an unusual situation that you have, and it's something that can be improved through what I call smart parking management strategies.

Boardmember Wertz: Your overall message is very positive. The last time we talked about this we had a number of business owners who came in and, frankly, they were pretty anxious about it. I think everyone agrees that this is a good project and has a lot of advantages for the Village, but some of the business owners are nervous. I wonder if you could tell us what you'd say to them. It sounds like you're reassuring us that this is okay. Is

there anything more you'd add to address the concerns of business owners who I think are nervous about this?

Mr. Jacquemart: No, I think the answer is good parking management strategies. The business owners think they're all competing against suburban shopping centers where they have free parking, but that's not the case. There may be a small segment, as I said before, where people may decide whether to come to the Village or go to a shopping center, but it's a small proportion. As long as you create turnover the Village will be in good economic shape. And that may take some changes from what you have today, but I think there are opportunities to improve the parking system.

Boardmember Logan: I'm wondering, as part of that, whether we have adequate signage to direct people from out of Hastings to, for example, the Boulanger Main Street parking lot or the Steinschneider lot. If you drive along Main Street either south or north, is that well-marked?

Chairperson Speranza: I just don't even notice.

Boardmember Logan: I don't notice myself because I've been here so long.

Boardmember Dale: You sort of have to know that that's where they are.

Chairperson Speranza: Sometimes you can't find it.

Mr. Jacquemart: Another related issue, and something I thought about when I mentioned the employee parking in the Zinsser lot, the commuter lot, is lighting at night. That's very important, to make sure that you have good lighting. That people feel secure when they walk to that lot late in the evening.

So if there is an increase in meter rates and increased revenues, that's definitely something that should be paid attention to -- to make it safe to walk to those more remote locations.

Boardmember Cameron: You talk about meter management and what have you, and what concerns me is that there are a lot of people in Hastings who live in the downtown area who actually aren't exactly interested in paying a meter. And they haven't been doing that, actually. They park on streets where there's enough parking where they can park without a meter. I'm not quite sure, since I don't think we really have stickers, how we can assuage the concerns of those people that they will be able to park where there's no meter.

Mr. Jacquemart: No, you're right. And one has to pay attention to that, to the residents who don't have a parking space and rely on on-street parking. At this stage you need special legislation to have on-street parking meters. But you have lots, so you could sell parking meters to the residents -- parking permits to the residents -- that allow them to park in a lot for longer time periods, or whatever the Village decides. And no restrictions in terms of parking in municipally-owned lots, as there are restrictions on parking on the public street. So there is flexibility to let the resident park in the lots, and give them a special permit if the Village decides to do that.

Chairperson Speranza: I think we may be taking this conversation a little further than the application. We absolutely want your experience, for sure.

Village Attorney Stecich: I just wanted to ask a question. I wanted to double-check. On your chart, it had the increased parking demand on a weekday. Does that include the employees' parking?

Mr. Jacquemart: Yes.

Village Attorney Stecich: So that at 5 o'clock you've got 17 spaces? Now there's 12 employees there by 5 o'clock, so that means there's only five?

Mr. Jacquemart: Yes, but I don't expect that every employee will bring in a car. You know, in the restaurant business you have a lot of employees that are walking. You have, for instance, students that may walk in that live in the area. You also have people that come by public transportation.

Village Attorney Stecich: So that's accounted for. That's the ITE figure.

Mr. Jacquemart: Correct.

Village Attorney Stecich: So the ITE figure assumes patrons and workers.

Mr. Jacquemart: Correct, right.

Chairperson Speranza: Okay, anything else? Does anyone have any questions? Christina, did you want to take some time? We received information also from you, and I'm just wondering if there's anything that you wanted to add to the discussion.

Certainly one of the things I would be curious about -- and I know that we have discussed this at an earlier meeting -- is the intended hours of operation. I'm also curious as to whether or not you had any thoughts about limiting the seating in the catering portion of the business. You know, we always talk about being able to enforce the laws. I don't know how we would say, well, you can only seat for 80 if it's a non-family catering function. It just seems kind of ridiculous for us to say, well, you can have 120 seats when it's a family, but only 80 when it's a function that's not family-oriented, in terms of making it be a worthwhile law. But I think putting a cap on the number of seats is something which is an option that we could consider as far as the catering facility.

Christina Griffin, architect - 555 Warburton Avenue restaurant: I think Paul would like to address the operation of the restaurant. I know we're going to consider seriously suggestions that George has made tonight, so I'd like him to speak about that.

But what I wanted to add tonight is simply my experience as a business in the downtown. I've had a business on Spring Street for 10 years, and we have large trucks coming there in the day, I think mostly for Food for Thought. They never deliver during rush hour. They mustn't. Our entire office goes dark, when the truck comes up, for 15 minutes. So timing management, I think, is very important for traffic and parking.

I also wanted to let you know that I was in the Chamber for, I think, eight or ten years. I feel like this topic has come up so many times. When you actually have a business in the downtown, you are very much aware of all the employees there, and the merchants, that are running out and feeding the meters. They have the prime spots, and the residents, too. You talk about management. I really believe that if you gave merchants, merchant employees -- residents may be a different situation -- a special permit to park further away for maybe less cost than the meter, although the meter cost may go up some, I think people would want to pay less. And it's a nuisance to feed the meter, but I see people running out all the time. Other than saying that I'm a good employer -- I'm going to tell people not to do that -- there really are no rules. I know this has been discussed many times for many years. Sometimes somebody has to take a leadership role and try to see if they can really make this happen.

We started this entire process by going to the Trustees to discuss the Zinsser lot, but the Chamber had such a negative reaction. I think that was the first exposure to the project, so they were just concerned about parking. You know, we did do a study comparing Tarrytown to Hastings. Not really for the sake of the planning board, it was really to address the business people's concerns that if you have less parking how does it affect the businesses. We did that little demonstration just to show like in Tarrytown they have a worse parking situation, but they have a lot of thriving businesses. Because when there's a destination people come and they will walk. I think that the economic benefits of this kind of business, that will draw people from outside into the town, should outweigh the minor concerns of parking because it's going to help improve the other businesses in the downtown. And we all know that is lacking right now. We all know there are not a lot of magnet stores. There are very few restaurants, and the restaurants bring people there. And they don't just eat. They often walk around and use those shops.

Chairperson Speranza: We are in complete and total agreement with you.

Ms. Griffin: But I think Paul can answer specifically the questions you have about the operation.

Chairperson Speranza: Okay, great.

Paul Walter, general manager - 555 Warburton Avenue restaurant: To address your concerns, on Saturdays we wouldn't open the restaurant until 5. A prime steakhouse, first of all I know to open for lunch maybe I'd get some decent business. But that's not even on the table. And anybody coming on a Saturday to my restaurant at 2 o'clock isn't going to want a Porterhouse steak. They're going to want a hamburger, you know. So I wouldn't even consider opening.

Sunday, 4 o'clock, yes. But also, at 4 o'clock the Farmers' Market's long gone and parking is wide open. So if I had a function that came in at 1 o'clock, or even 2 o'clock, and opened at 4 o'clock, there's still tons of parking on a Sunday. So I wouldn't even have brunch. Steakhouses don't do brunches well.

As far as the deliveries, I'm not going to be there or my chef is not going to be there until 10. And there's not a company around that's going to let their guy sit there from 8 o'clock until we get there at 10. So you know, I really don't think that's an issue. Like Christina said, I've sat there at the restaurant and watched an 18-wheeler pull up for Food for Thought -- and there's another truck parked for Food for Thought, a small one -- and cars go up and down, and there's plenty of room. And if you look on the drawing, our truck would start at the funeral home -- say it's an 18-wheeler -- come up, and there'd still be about 20 feet left to make that turn. He would park at the driveway entrance coming up this way.

As far as grease and garbage pickup, when it snowed the last time the buses stopped for their patrons in front of the bank. So if my truck is here -- here's the pickup and here's the entrance to the bank -- and the bus pulls up, normally they would pull right behind my truck. They're going to pull up like in the driveway, the out driveway, of the bank, have their patrons get on and still have enough room to get around my truck -- which is only going to be there a max of 15 minutes. Also, I've seen an 18-wheeler pull up on the other side of the street and spend 20 minutes delivering paint to the paint store. Bus came, pulled around it. So we're not even going to think about doing deliveries on Warburton.

For valet, if I had 120 people coming I'd have minimum four valets. Two would go after everything was parked, two would be there to get the cars out for the guests leaving; 120 guests don't leave all at the same time, so you get two or three bunches of people leaving, they wait. And like you said, he said this should be pushed back. Probably it would start here, and as we filled up these parking spaces it would move back here. So you get a rush of 20 cars, you're going to have seven cars to be able to come in, to about here, but you have four valets. So the first four come in, they get parked over here, then these people sitting in their cars would move up and so on. I didn't think about that, but that is a good idea.

Chairperson Speranza: You mentioned 120 people. Suppose you give some thought to reducing that number in terms of the maximum seats for a catering facility. Is there a reason that you're wedded to that other than you can fit that many in that space?

Mr. Walter: That's how you design restaurants. You maximize.

Chairperson Speranza: How many people you could fit?

Mr. Walter: Yes, maximize. Do I think I'm going to get 120 people, as he says? Maybe I'll get 24 parties a year. I had a 100-seat facility at Ruth's Chris in Manhattan and I filled once a year for 100 people. The rest of the time it was less: 60, 50, 75, 80. It's very hard to get 120 people to a party. I mean, I anticipate maybe one or two a year. The rest of the time, business is they're going to be 40 or 50 businesspeople coming for a meeting and a meal. But the big parties are families. I don't ever anticipate having 120 people while my restaurant's open. I don't see 120 people coming to dinner at 8 o'clock, you know, for a

family kind of function. That's always in the afternoon, always. They have kids; you know, it's a bar mitzvah, it's a christening, it's a wedding.

Zinsser Park is an alternative for the employee parking, except in summer when Zinsser Park does fill up a lot. So then in the summertime you might make the exception when the commuter parking lot isn't as full because everybody's on vacation.

Chairperson Speranza: Right. Just know that it is a park and people can park there that are park users. But again, I think that goes more along the lines to what we were talking about earlier with respect to parking management for the downtown. And I don't know how you segregate. It is kind of the discussion that we had last month. That if you have an employee who drives to work there's nothing to say that they can't park on Main Street at a meter. You can't prohibit people from parking on the street at a meter. But anyway, go ahead.

Mr. Walter: But like you said, I'm going to have four busboys, no cars. Out of the eight waiters, six cars. Maybe my two hostesses both have a car. The bartender has a car. Cooks, no. Chef, yes. Head broiler man, maybe yes. Dishwashers, no. It's not all 25 employees on a Saturday night driving to work. So you have to take that into consideration as well. You know, parking with your employees, can you control it? Sort of, yes, no. When I was in Weehawken we designated an area that they could park, and it was only on the first floor of the parking garage and they had to have stickers. Can you control all of them? No, but you know your employee's car, you slap a big sticker on it and say don't take it off because if I see your car...can you control it 100%? No.

As far as where the parking lots are, we would have that on our Website as far as our guests coming here. I don't pay attention either. I don't know what the signage is. I think that's about it, unless you build more parking spaces for us. That would help.

Village Attorney Stecich: One of George's recommendations was that the events not start until 1:30 on Saturdays, and 6:30. Did you mention that that's something you would agree to?

Mr. Walter: Absolutely.

Village Attorney Stecich: That wouldn't be a problem. Okay.

Mr. Walter: I anticipate any night functions not to happen at 6. Because just getting 40 businessmen to leave their office at 5 o'clock to show up for a 6 o'clock dinner...at the restaurant out in Brooklyn we'd schedule for 6 o'clock. You'd know the dinner started at 7 because 10 out of the 40 guys got there at 6 o'clock, the rest of them got there at 7. So I wouldn't have any problems with 6:30. In fact, I'd probably even schedule...just say we can't do it until 7.

Village Attorney Stecich: And 1:30 on Saturdays?

Mr. Walter: No problem. If there's an exception, then maybe we put it in that we'd come to you and ask, okay, we have a party of 50 that we'd like at 12 o'clock. Well, 50 people can

fit into the Chase, and is it going to affect any public parking? I don't think so. But that would be an exception, and I really wouldn't have any problems with the times.

Chairperson Speranza: What is the status? You are in negotiations with Chase.

Mr. Walter: Yes.

Chairperson Speranza: I got an e-mail.

Ms. Griffin: You received the letter and an e-mail.

Chairperson Speranza: I received an e-mail.

Ms. Griffin: I'll explain.

Chairperson Speranza: You might as well, for the folks viewing at home.

Ms. Griffin: There's a letter from Jerry Keel. He is the attorney for Fay Devlin. He's negotiating with Chase. He sent me a letter that "indicates we're in the final stages of the lease negotiations. I have negotiated all the indemnifications and insurance terms with Chase. We have come to an agreement on these terms." And then he continues to say that "Chase wants to do an inspection of the property this coming Tuesday"; and his expectation that "the lease will be executed by the end of the month."

Then I have an e-mail that Jerry Keel sent me, which is a note from the Chase Manhattan rep to Jerry Keel saying that "JP Morgan Chase is continuing with due diligence on the proposed parking agreement. I will be touring the site in order to gather additional information to make a decision on the proposal. I anticipate to have adequate information by January 25th, and will make a recommendation and render a decision by the end of January."

We know that this is very important, so as soon as we get this agreement we're going to submit it to you.

Chairperson Speranza: Okay, great. Are there any other items? Anybody from the public, anybody else who's here? Jim? Because this is here for a couple of actions, which I'm struggling to remember even: site plan approval, and view preservation. So you would have to get back into that as soon as you're ready with respect to the whole Chase agreement. Because I think you've heard from this board that without that in place we won't do anything.

Ms. Griffin: Yes, we understand that.

Chairperson Speranza: At least for something that involves a catering facility.

Ms. Griffin: Yes, I understand. Do you think there's any other information you will need?

Boardmember Alligood: I'd like if you could look at that question that I've been asking. Just to show me a diagram. I want to see Spring Street, I want to see the dimensions, and see that people trying to pass won't have a problem. And then my question will be answered.

Chairperson Speranza: Anything else?

2. Report on Progress of 45 Main Street and 422 Warburton from Urban Green.

James Huang, Urban Green Builders: Good evening.

Chairperson Speranza: How are you? We haven't seen you in awhile.

Mr. Huang: Good. I know. It's nice to be back. I'm here also representing the owner entities of 45 Main Street and 422 Warburton Avenue, which are our two projects, obviously, here in the Village. We're here for two different reasons. I hope you all got the letter which I sent to Angie. We are here to give a report on our progress. We also are seeking a slight modification to one of the resolutions, the site plan approval resolutions, on the 45 Main Street project regarding the affordable set-aside units that were established in August of 2005. I gave a recap as thoroughly as I could in the letter, but I think it probably makes sense to walk it through here. Several of the Planning Board members were not part of that decision, so it might be helpful.

We first came in front of the Village for both of these projects almost five years ago now, in the spring of 2003. At that time, both 45 Main Street and 422 Warburton were in about the same place in the design stage. So we always thought of the two projects as running concurrent throughout the entire process. That was pretty much true until the fall of 2003, when, though both projects were recommended for approval by your board, the Zoning Board of Appeals did not give us several critical variances on the affordable 422 project. That caused a lengthy redesign, and that was not then approved until the summer of 2004. So the 422 project, at that point, falls behind a little bit in all the different development processes that we have to go through to get financing and other things like that.

Now, the original site plan approval for 45 Main Street, which is really where we are right now, had a requirement that the 422 Warburton project had to have its certificate of occupancy before...actually the language was not clear. It just said that the approval on 45 Main Street was conditional on a certificate of occupancy on 422 Warburton. No one really realized the problems that the vagueness of that sort of wording was going to cause until we got very close to getting our lender to close the construction loan on 45 Main Street. Suddenly we had a sort of mini crisis that the lawyers for the bank said this is going to imperil the project because we don't know anything about 422 Warburton, and if you don't have a CO on this project how can we lend you the money to build 45 Main Street. That took place during the summer and fall of 2005, and if your recall -- surely Marianne recalls -- we went back and forth at least four Board meetings trying to perfect the language that both our lender would like, but also the Village would be comfortable with, as a guarantee of some sort that the affordable project would get completed and that the Village would get the affordable units that you seek.

So that's how we arrived at the August 4th, 2005 resolution. At that time I included the text of that in our application as well. The original condition from back in 2003 was point number one of that resolution: we could still get the 45 Main Street certificate of occupancy with the original condition, which was a C of O on 422 Warburton. And then the entire paragraph two was added. In paragraph two, we basically agreed that three of the units in the 45 Main Street project would not be able to be marketed until the completion of the 422 project. Additionally, the guarantee was given that if the 422 Warburton project was not finished in a timely fashion after the completion of 45 Main Street, then not only would those three units become affordable, but the entire project of 422 Warburton would be given over to Sue Smith's group, the affordable housing fund. So we thought the second point there provided a very strong guarantee to the village at the time, and allowed the lender of 45 Main Street to be comfortable to close the financing so we could start 45 Main.

We're basically here today to ask the Village, the Planning Board, to release us from the first two paragraphs of the second of the conditions from the August, 2005 resolution. The reason we're here, and feel comfortable asking for this, is because of the great progress we've made on the 422 Warburton project in the time since the August, 2005 resolution was enacted. So we need to go back to August, 2005 and remember where we were when we were in front of you asking to be released from the original site plan condition. We had not yet secured a site, and we had not yet secured construction financing on 422 Warburton -- even though we were very deep in the negotiations with the people that eventually became our lenders, most notably the Housing Finance Agency of New York State.

At the time of the August, 2005 resolution the project at 422 Warburton -- though we were very confident it was going to happen, and it did -- could still have been considered speculative, without site control on our part. And I think that now two years later, or more than two years later, we feel much better about the likelihood, obviously, that that project will be completed and all of the 14 units will be available very shortly. And on the 45 Main Street side we are now at a point where marketing the units is a very important and intensive part of our project as construction winds down. We're starting to see legal conundrums coming up regarding those three units that we would like to smooth out and clarify. At this point we are starting to get inquiries about those three units, and we're not in a position to actually give interested parties clear direction on exactly what their options are, and what our options are going to be very shortly. So in a nutshell, that's why we're here tonight.

Chairperson Speranza: Let me ask you, and I remember this -- and it was very painstaking, and Marianne you remember this, the number of times we went through the language to make sure that we could satisfy everyone, including your lender at the time -- the section here, section two, second paragraph: "Notwithstanding the above, if Urban Green obtains a certificate of occupancy for 422 Warburton Avenue within 24 months after the issuance of a certificate of occupancy for 45 Main Street, the three units referred to in the

previous paragraph will no longer be designated as affordable units.” What do you think -- you know, there are time frames relating the projects -- what really is that relationship now, do you see? Because I’m not sure -- and I’m not in your shoes -- I’m not sure what the issue is for you. I’m not understanding why you need this release, other than if someone wants a unit and says, I want this unit, and this is one of the units that we’re holding hostage.

Mr. Huang: We don’t use that language, by the way.

Chairperson Speranza: Well, you can’t just say, “You’ve got to wait a year.” I mean, not that you want to say that.

Mr. Huang: We certainly don’t want to say that. I’ll tell you how we’ve been marketing the project in its completion from, let’s say, throughout 2007, when we started seeing steel and structure go up, and now the building is almost entirely enclosed and finishes are going in. For these three units in particular, the marketing people have had...it’s been a sort of limbo status, where they haven’t been able to market them. And people who have inquired about them have been told, “No, these units are not being sold, we’re not allowed to really market them actively because of some prior obligation.” And that was not a problem when the project had just started. There were other units that were comparable; there were other units that were similar. We are often able to send people in those directions, and that seemed to satisfy people in terms of the choices available to them on this project.

We’re now at a point where, for instance, one or two of these units are the last of their type in the project that are not either sold or reserved. Which means that a potential buyer who might be interested in them now would not have another choice to look at in the Riverton Lofts project. And we think that’s a shame for someone who...often these buyers are people who have seen the project coming up for a long time and just were not available to express interest in time to beat some of the other people who did. And you’re right. We don’t want to tell people you have to wait a year because obviously that’s a huge disincentive for them to stay interested.

Boardmember Dale: Could you actually give a summary of how many units there are and how many are under contract now?

Mr. Huang: I’m sorry, there are 25 condominium units in the 45 Main project.

Boardmember Dale: How many are under contract?

Mr. Huang: I believe it’s 11 or 12 right now.

Boardmember Dale: Eleven or twelve. So you still have at least another 10 to sell before these units become an issue, other than the fact that there are not other units like them?

Mr. Huang: Right. Mr. Dale, you haven’t probably studied the plans as carefully as some of the members who were here since 2003, but the building is quite eclectic in the collection of units that are available. There are one-, two-, and three-bedrooms, and there are many different types. The front half of the building is all simplex loft type units, and in the back are sort of townhouse types. So what we’re finding, and we’re quite pleased with the results, is that a lot of different types of people are coming to the building and finding the unit that

they want. But just because there are 10 or 12 units available, that doesn't mean it's applicable to someone's price range, or the bedroom count they're looking for, or the type of unit that they want.

Boardmember Dale: And can you get your TC of O on 45 Main for the remaining units, for the 22 non...

Mr. Huang: You know, I'm talking to Deven Sharma at the Building Department about exactly how we're going to start taking care of the municipal requirements, the same way Marianne and I have just started talking a little bit more about the requirements in the site plan. We've been in conversation with Fran Frobels on some of the ones that involve the Village Manager. And yes, we are confident that we'll be able to get individual TCO's on the units.

Boardmember Dale: So how far are you away, besides the bureaucratic part, of actually getting that TC of O?

Mr. Huang: Well, the status of the construction is one of the things...

Chairperson Speranza: I'm sorry. You just said something I want to correct. They're not individual units for certificate of occupancy, right? It's not for each unit, it's for the buildings.

Mr. Huang: I'm sorry, I overstepped what I just asserted there. Deven and I are talking about the possibility of that, actually, at this point. Deven and I have been talking about it for several months, actually.

Chairperson Speranza: But I thought our action was a certificate of occupancy for the buildings, not for the units. Because that's the way that we've written this up. Now, I'm not an expert on those definitions, but I thought it was building and building rather than unit and unit.

Mr. Huang: I understand what you're saying. Deven and I were talking the other day about the possibility of let's say, for instance -- this is a hypothetical -- but if, for instance, the entire front half of the building which is separated from the back half by a courtyard, if the entire front half satisfied Deven in all of his inspection requirements, but maybe something in the back half was not, it's a possibility that -- again, I didn't mean to state that Deven has agreed to this -- but it's a possibility that Deven would give us a TCO on the front half of the building because the back part of the building does not affect any of the occupancy requirements of the front half, for instance.

Chairperson Speranza: Okay. I have to find out whether or not that's within his purview to do that. And what does that mean, Marianne, a TCO? Temporary certificate of occupancy so people could start moving in? I don't know that I'd want anybody moving in, if we have to get rid of them.

Boardmember Dale: Patty, that is the issue, I think. Because once you get your TC of O you can sell the unit and people can occupy it. So he says 11 or so contracts which he cannot close as sales until he has a TC of O. So at this point 422 is holding him back from closing any of his units, where he might be able to get his...

Mr. Huang: Well, that's actually correct.

Boardmember Dale: But he might be closer to getting his TC of O on 45 Main. If he could get his TC of O -- I mean, I don't know how far your construction is on either of the two projects at this point -- but if he's very close on 45 Main, and he could get his TC of O, he can close his sales. And given he's in a difficult market, that's part of his intent.

Boardmember Cameron: But that's not why he's here tonight.

Boardmember Dale: That's his motivation, yes.

Boardmember Cameron: No, you're here tonight because you want to be able to market the three units and enter into contracts with three units.

Mr. Huang: Patty, your point of the TCO versus the CO is pertinent on a bigger level, but Mr. Cameron's right that the main thing that we're here tonight to do is to like unclog the legal position of three units that we think are very quickly going to be released from the requirement. But the difference between, let's say, three months -- when our buildings are complete and we will come before you and ask for a complete release of the requirements -- and now is a critical three months in the period of our marketing, for instance, and could be the difference between having certain people moving into Riverton Lofts and not having them move in.

Chairperson Speranza: Well, let me ask you this, then, given what I've now heard. If you're entering into contracts with individuals to sell other units, but that's not, in effect, the closing -- you're not selling the units -- it's a contract, but it's not...

Boardmember Dale: Contract to buy.

Chairperson Speranza: Right, it's a contract to buy, it's not a sale.

Boardmember Dale: Correct.

Chairperson Speranza: Why can't you do the same thing on these other units?

Mr. Huang: Well, there's no reason that we couldn't, except that the same issue that came up when our lender read the documents in 2005 and said wait a minute, this might be a potential pitfall -- this hasn't happened yet either, but...

Chairperson Speranza: But it's the same problem for the rest of the units, too, because you don't get...no, no, you're right. It's a little bit more.

Village Attorney Stecich: There's an extra speculation in there.

Chairperson Speranza: Right. Because there's another caveat which, probably, we are at the point won't happen.

Boardmember Dale: What's significant to him is that if he had 22 units under contract, not counting these three, he still couldn't close any of them until he gets his TC of O on the other building. And all 25 have that cloud over them that I'm going to sign a contract, but you don't know when I can buy it, when you can deliver it to me.

Boardmember Alligood: Why does that affect the others?

Chairperson Speranza: Because he doesn't get a certificate of occupancy.

Boardmember Dale: Until he gets his TC of O on the other building he can't deliver these units.

Village Attorney Stecich: Yes, he can. No, that's the misunderstanding. He can; it's just before he can market them, these three units, if 422 isn't done they can only be marketed as affordable units. So all 22 can be sold as regular units.

Boardmember Dale: Will he get a TC of O on the 22? No, the TC of O is held up by Warburton. No?

Village Attorney Stecich: Bruce, no, it's not. If the building's done, if 45 Main is done, and it qualifies for a certificate of occupancy -- forget about temporary certificate -- and 422's not done, that's fine. He can sell 22 at market rate and rent three at an affordable rate, and they have to be rented for at least a year. So it's not holding anything else up. That was the point, Bruce. That was why the Planning Board modified the site plan condition in 2005, to permit that to happen so the whole thing wouldn't be held hostage by 422.

Boardmember Dale: Okay, good.

Village Attorney Stecich: In fact, nothing's held hostage. The only thing is that three of the units would have to be marketed as affordable.

Boardmember Dale: So it's only three units that the sale of which could be delayed.

Village Attorney Stecich: Right. Or they could be rented as affordable. Well, I guess they would have to be marketed as affordable. You can't just leave them empty. Yes, they would have to be marketed as affordable.

Mr. Huang: Marianne, your analysis is correct. Both projects are proceeding very smoothly, and the 45 Main Street project is a little bit ahead of the 422 Warburton project. So what's happened over the course of the last five years is, the 422 project, which is significantly smaller, despite the delay of probably six or seven months -- and the construction is almost caught up, and it's only about a third the size so that's not unusual -- we think that both projects will probably be ready sometime in the neighborhood of April of this spring. I'd be happy to come before you in April to give you an update on that report. And that's maybe a good idea for us to schedule it now.

But the issue of what to tell interested parties -- between now and when another event might occur -- is really the reason that we're in front of you right now. We would like to be able to tell people that are interested in that unit that we are not going to have a legal problem with letting them purchase those units.

Boardmember Cameron: My problem with striking the first two paragraphs of 2 is that, first of all, it gives you an extra two years to finish off 422 Warburton without any penalty. And in fact, the penalty is you're supposed to deliver 422 Warburton to us if you don't get it done in two years. And I don't know whether it's a pig in a poke, or whether it's actually an asset; whether you would even want it. I'm sure it's got mortgages all over it, and I'm not sure...so we're just giving you an extra two years to finish off 422 Warburton, as I read this, if we were to strike those first two paragraphs.

Mr. Huang: That's true if you're under the assumption that we don't want to finish 422 Warburton, and it's also true if you're under the assumption that 14 affordable units is not an asset.

Boardmember Cameron: We would look very stupid if you took an extra two years to finish 422 Warburton for any reason.

Boardmember Logan: *They* would look pretty stupid if they didn't finish 422 Warburton in two years, too.

Boardmember Dale: They would have a real economic problem if that were the case. Construction interest for the next 24 months would be fairly intense.

Chairperson Speranza: I'm not sure what you know about this. I know you had discussions with the Affordable Housing Committee, and originally we had received correspondence that said they didn't see a real problem with this. However, we have received new correspondence that says that's not necessarily the case, so please, don't take action.

Mr. Huang: I'm sorry, can you read the note? I did not get that memo.

Chairperson Speranza: The Affordable Housing Committee sent Planning Board members a memo on January...I shouldn't say...they didn't say take no action.

"The Affordable Housing Committee sent the Planning Board members a memo on January 11, 2008 as a response to Urban Green's request with regard to 45 Main Street and 422 Warburton. By this memo, the Affordable Housing Committee requests that you withdraw our memo from consideration at your January 17th meeting. We have new information that we are trying to understand, and it prevents us from taking any stand on the request by Urban Green at this time. We are sorry for any inconvenience we have created."

Mr. Huang: I have to admit, Patty, I have not seen that memo, and I'm not privy to the information. Is that Sue Smith or Jim Keaney who sent that letter?

Chairperson Speranza: Sue Smith, the Affordable Housing Committee.

Village Planner Witkowski: Today, or maybe it came in yesterday.

Boardmember Dale: Yesterday at 9:25.

Chairperson Speranza: So I have, first of all, some reservations to taking action on this, in light of this. I'm not privy to exactly what the concerns are, but I also feel the same as Jamie to some extent. That the only thing we're left with now is the potential for you taking two more years and leaving us with a building that might be 85% done. So I'm hesitant to do this.

Boardmember Logan: Although that would probably be a pretty good deal, 85% done.

Chairperson Speranza: I don't know. I know of a building in Greenburgh that stood half-built for a very long time.

Boardmember Logan: Have you got an updated list of the status of Deven on this thing? Has Deven weighed in officially on where we are with this, what his opinion is?

Chairperson Speranza: No, and now that I'm thinking about it we were going to get a memo from him. Didn't I read that?

Boardmember Cameron: He was going to tell us something. That's what it said.

Boardmember Alligood: It said we were going to get something from him.

Boardmember Dale: What is the status of 422?

Chairperson Speranza: Yes, why don't you tell us.

Mr. Huang: As per my memo, 45 Main is somewhere around the 90% completion rate, and 422 is a little bit behind -- let's say around 80%. Obviously, all of the major structure is completed, all of the masonry. The stucco is completely done except for the final color coat. All of the windows are installed.

Village Attorney Stecich: But 422 doesn't have windows.

Mr. Huang: Sure. I take that back, Marianne, about your earlier astuteness.

Village Attorney Stecich: I didn't think the windows were in.

Mr. Huang: The last bits on 422 are finishing up the finishes, which include the wood flooring, installing the kitchen cabinets. We have one major mechanical inspection on the roughing, which is the sprinkler. Jim Drumm was here earlier, but I believe my sprinkler subcontractor has an inspection scheduled for the beginning of next week. At that point all of the walls can be closed and we will start painting, painting doors.

On the outside we still have to do the parking lot, which involves the paving. And then a big piece of the project is the public infrastructure work, which the Village just approved the DMA and the IMA agreements at the last Board of Trustees meeting. I think that was 10 days ago or something like that. That will go out to public bid, and that actually does not involve Urban Green as a contractor, though we're involved on the development side in our responsibilities for that agreement. I'm sorry, there's one other piece. Once the site work in the back is more complete, we'll drill the two geothermal wells which will serve the heating and cooling functions of the building as well.

Boardmember Dale: And those haven't been dug yet?

Mr. Huang: No. Unfortunately, due to the topography of the site, there was never a good time to do them until all the retaining walls in the back were completed, and those were just completed last month. So we've been waiting now for the rest of the site to be cleared out so the drilling rigs can get back there.

Boardmember Dale: So you don't have mechanical signoffs yet.

Mr. Huang: Well, the ductwork is all installed, and the heat pump units that will work off the geothermal well are on-site. We don't have the entire piping system laid out, though, which involves the well, yes.

Chairperson Speranza: Let me ask you a question on 45 Main Street. The electrical wires, the Con Ed wires, and...

Mr. Huang: Oh, I'm glad you asked me that, actually.

Chairperson Speranza: I didn't see anything going on with those.

Mr. Huang: You'll recall, one of our other sub-tangential, non-stop conversations with yourselves: what to do with the pole in front of our street. Originally we thought we were going to take it underground, then we thought we were going to just relocate it to make room for the new public parking that's going to be in front of our building. And I'm happy to report that the new plan is to take it underground, to get rid of it entirely.

Chairperson Speranza: Good.

Mr. Huang: This was only affected by a large monetary contribution to Con Edison. That contribution was made in September of 2007, and it's now January of 2008. They have promised us, in our last go-round, that we will see some activity next week. But rest assured, there isn't really anything else we could have done except write that six-figure check to them and then start calling them every day.

Chairperson Speranza: See, again, I was just trying to get a sense of how far apart these things are, and I understand your concern about the marketing. But in terms of the development of the structures, when I see that the wires are still up there on poles and haven't been undergrounded, that's why I think, well, maybe 45 Main isn't so much ahead of 422. But that may change.

Mr. Huang: Yes, Con Edison is not your typical subcontractor, let's say.

Chairperson Speranza: Yes, I understand that.

Mr. Huang: Enough said.

In answer to Mr. Cameron's query -- and yours as well Patty, about the two-year window -- it is true, your decision here relies a little bit on an act of faith that Urban Green and the other entities have performed as promised and to the best of our abilities. And allowing for things that happen in this industry that are hard to control -- everyone who knows anything about construction will attest to that -- that we've been doing what we said we would do when we came in front of you five years ago. And that is part of our request tonight, as well.

I would also say I'm not expecting an action on this, especially with Sue Smith's letter which, frankly, I'm a little bit in the dark about. So I would like to bring this up again next month, if that's a possibility.

Chairperson Speranza: Okay, sure.

Mr. Huang: And if there are any other questions about technical or other components of the project I'd be happy to take them.

Chairperson Speranza: Anything? No?

Okay, we'll see you in February.

Mr. Huang: Thank you.

555 Warburton Restaurant Traffic and Parking Analysis (continued)

Chairperson Speranza: Sir, did you have anything you wanted to talk to the Planning Board about tonight?

Male Voice XXX: Are we [looking at the XXX] one?

Chairperson Speranza: No action tonight. We're not taking action on that. If you check, we will always have it on the agenda. But as you can see, it's no action and no discussion at this meeting. So always look for that. We want to keep people informed that it's still before us.

Boardmember Cameron: I hope you enjoyed the rest.

Male Voice XXX: I did. I want to comment about your parking.

Chairperson Speranza: You know, we'd love to hear what you say. Come up to the mic.

Male Voice XXX: In regards to the parking with the caterers, you have to watch also if he has two groups -- one coming in at 1:30 and another coming in at 5 -- the crisscross of things. Because I used to park cars, and I know what it is.

Chairperson Speranza: Good point.

Male Voice XXX: When you get an early dinner crowd, and then you may get a crowd for drinks and dinner, and then later if you have dancing or something and drinks, you have a third crowd. Or weddings. So you have interaction. They're coming both ways.

Chairperson Speranza: I hope we get that successful an establishment.

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

Chairperson Speranza: Okay, we are not going to be talking about steep slopes, for those of you -- there's nobody in the audience right now -- who are waiting. There's been a little bit of a subcommittee developed here, Jamie and Bill, who are working through some of the language. They're going to be doing some diagrams for us.

Boardmember Logan: Yes, but this should not be, I think, an exclusive group. I can't speak for you, Jamie, but I welcome anybody else's participation. I've been talking about this thing for 10 years, and I'm getting a little tired.

Chairperson Speranza: Now, how many meetings ago was it that you said, "Yes, we can do this. I know we can do this."

Boardmember Logan: But I think we have to have some scenarios about what our target dates are and what the various scenarios might be. I did get this draft of Croton's language, which is very interesting and very thorough. Has everybody looked at it?

Chairperson Speranza: Yes, we just got that today.

Boardmember Logan: A lot of boilerplate there, a lot of stuff, a lot of language. And, you know, do we need to be that complex? And can we just zero in on really what is broken, if anything, and then focus on the real critical issues without overly elaborating on this language? It's a little intimidating.

Boardmember Cameron: The Croton language -- and we should ask Deven about this -- actually has got a lot of commonalities with a lot of the other language in a lot of the other steep slope provisions. As you read through them you realize that just about everybody has that list and they may change a couple of things. We should understand why that list is a bunch of linked events that are supposed to cover the waterfront. Excuse me, I'm sorry to say that. So I think we should get some wisdom on why the list is that way.

Boardmember Dale: When you say you want participation, I would like to see what you guys are doing.

Chairperson Speranza: You're in.

Boardmember Cameron: I'll send my rough draft. I've been drafting things, and Bill has been trying to understand what I wrote.

Boardmember Dale: I'm interested in your diagrams, actually.

Boardmember Cameron: I haven't given Bill any diagrams yet.

Boardmember Dale: The test is that: what happens on the land.

Boardmember Logan: And is it comprehensible, and can anybody understand what the language says.

Chairperson Speranza: And enforcement. Okay, so that will be forthcoming in February. A couple of repeats now already for February.

IV. Discussion

1. Planning Boardmembers' items

Chairperson Speranza: I just wanted to mention to everyone, I went last night -- as did Angie -- to the kickoff of the Westchester County Planning Department's new planning effort, Westchester 2025. It's very interesting. Having been involved in planning at the county level for quite a while now, they have really taken away the idea of the master plan document and they're doing interactive computer Website-based planning for communities through Westchester County. I have not yet gone on to the Website, but they're going to be providing a toolbox for communities to look at in terms of determining what kinds of densities, what kinds of characteristics, what kind of vision you want to have for your community.

I think it could be a good thing for the Village as we move forward with the comprehensive planning effort. And I did see that Mr. Metzger from the Comprehensive Plan Committee was there, which is good. Go to the Website in Westchester County planning. If it works, I

think it could work out well. It's certainly a new way of determining how planning could proceed and how a land use plan for Westchester County could really come into being.

Village Planner Witkowski: And they'll have a Web page for each municipality with all the data: the aerials and the GIS mapping, topo, everything.

Boardmember Dale: Would it include Hastings, or is Hastings part of Greenburgh?

Village Planner Witkowski: No, it's all municipalities. What was it, 53 centers they were talking about?

Chairperson Speranza: Right, 54 centers, including hamlets.

Village Planner Witkowski: So it's really every level of analysis you can imagine.

Boardmember Alligood: My question was, I know this was a countywide meeting to launch it, but are there going to be others, or is it going to go down to the municipalities?

Chairperson Speranza: They're now going to start meeting with the municipalities. They want it to work both ways. They're going to reach out to the municipalities. And at the same time, municipal agencies, municipal bodies should be looking at the Website and saying, okay, well, this is the kind of information that we need. For instance, one of the community character slides is, do you want to be a walkable downtown, do you want to be a rural community. They give lots of options. And when you think about the diversity of Westchester County in terms of its built environment, it really does run the gamut from the horse farms up in North Salem to the Yonkers waterfront now. So I think it's pretty exciting.

Boardmember Cameron: Speaking of the Yonkers waterfront, I actually had to go down to the Wall Street area last week on a nice day. So I took the train down to Yonkers, got off, walked around, and got in a taxi and just rode it straight down to the river. It's the most wonderful ride; 12 bucks, cup of coffee. It was 60 degrees, a gorgeous day. So I really commend that to you.

Boardmember Dale: How long did it take?

Boardmember Cameron: It's 45 minutes. It's very close to being the same trip as if you went in by train and then switched to the subway and went down. So you just sit there and you watch the scenery go by. Absolutely fantastic.

Village Attorney Stecich: Does it only have the one stop, Wall Street? Does it stop anywhere else?

Boardmember Cameron: No, it stops at the World Financial Center and then Wall Street. And it starts at Haverstraw, and then goes to Yonkers and...

Boardmember Logan: How much did it cost?

Boardmember Cameron: Twelve dollars each way.

Boardmember Dale: That's a good deal.

Village Planner Witkowski: It's not bad.

Boardmember Cameron: But it's so gorgeous.

Boardmember Logan: The train is seven, eight bucks just to Grand Central, and you just buy a day ticket.

2. Project updates from Director of Planning.

Village Planner Witkowski: I just wanted to kind of give an update on the Safe Routes to School program. I went to the work session that the Department of Transportation had last month and got the application package, and it's all on their Website now. But I met with George Foster, the buildings and grounds super at the schools, and also with Bill Huppek today. He's the principal of Hillside Elementary. We went over the projects as far as sidewalks were concerned in the transportation plan, and also what their priorities were. So we got it figured out. The maximum amount of infrastructure projects is \$400,000. It's 100% reimbursable. Then you can also do the non-infrastructure projects; it's \$125,000 max.

So there's a program that the police department has that Bill Huppek said really went over well with their students at the elementary school. One of the officers brought a robot in to teach the kids on crossing the street and other things about pedestrian safety. I'm going to talk to Dave Bloomer in the police department to see what the costs would be for that. Because we could also put in the application for a non-infrastructure project.

Their priority as far as the sidewalks, Hillside Elementary by Lefurgy there's no sidewalk really there. But we do have the sidewalk project that would be from Edgewood, and thought we could just expand that project to include Lefurgy. Then the other was Fairlane. Tonight the Safety Council was going to be talking about the proposed arrangement on Mount Hope for dropping off students, and that if there's any cost involved to that we would pick that up in the application, too. I know it ends up being more than \$400,000 for the infrastructure projects, but I'm sure I have a spread sheet that Susan Fosnacht and Ali Resa did on the transportation plan that has all the line items.

So I'm going to go through that and get down to bare bones, and make it a phased project. Phase one would be to get the sidewalks and curbs done where we can. And then Phase two we could do at another time, and figure out what the landscaping costs and things are that would be involved in that. Just so we could keep it at the \$400,000 or as close to \$400,000 as possible, since there's no match involved. Then we could kind of chip away at these sidewalks leading to the school to get those eventually done.

But I want to get the draft done by mid-February because then I can go up to Poughkeepsie and talk with the people up there. Since it's a brand-new application, they said if we wanted to come up earlier, then they can go over it with whoever's preparing the application and make sure that everything's in order since it's a brand-new process. They're not due until April, but that gives you plenty of time if there's any adjustment you need to make to it. So it's under control.

3. Miscellaneous

Chairperson Speranza: The next meeting is February 21st? I wanted to make sure that we have a quorum.

And then there were just a couple of the other meetings that I wanted to make sure we were aware of. February 26th is the LWRP session, the second one with the Board of Trustees. And March 11th is the next Board of Trustees transportation plan session.

Village Planner Witkowski: One more thing on sidewalks, the CDBG project. Susan Maggiotto and I had met with Suzette Lopane from county planning, and we realized that in order to really do a streetscape project that we should focus all the money from the block grant just on the north side of Washington. That way we can get the entire stretch because of the fact that on Broadway you want to get it done, since it's the last year for this three-year cycle. We'll be doing the application for the next cycle. The kickoff meeting is February 1st for that. Charles Sells Engineering is doing the surveying now. They started last week. And then Suzette Lopane will be doing the design for the north side of Washington. So that'll be done this summer, the north side of Washington all the way from Warburton.

Chairperson Speranza: Constructed.

Village Planner Witkowski: It'll be at least started, yes. We've got the survey being done, and then as soon as Suzette gets the survey she can start working on the design and go out to bid and, hopefully, have it done this summer.

The other thing is that she was really impressed with the amount of information in terms of sidewalks in the transportation plan. Because we want to kind of focus on sidewalks and streetscapes in the next application, so what we can do is go through and pick from those areas where the priorities should be.

Chairperson Speranza: Right, as long as it's eligible. It's got to be within the eligibility area.

Village Planner Witkowski: For the eligibility area, so then when Safe Routes to School comes up again we can tackle other streets. Because those projects just have to be within 2 miles of a school it could be any street in the entire Village. The advantage of having a small Village.

Chairperson Speranza: Okay. Anything else?

V. Adjournment

On MOTION of Boardmember Cameron, SECONDED by Boardmember Logan with a voice vote of all in favor, Chairperson Speranza adjourned the Meeting at 10:28pm.

PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARING
JANUARY 17, 2007
Page - 35 -