

**VILLAGE OF HASTINGS-ON-HUDSON, NEW YORK
PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARING
SEPTEMBER 18, 2008**

A **Regular Meeting and Public Hearing** was held by the Planning Board on **Thursday, September 18, 2008 at 8:15 p.m.** in the Municipal Building Meeting Room, 7 Maple Avenue, Hastings-on-Hudson, New York, 10706.

PRESENT: Chairperson Patricia Speranza, Boardmembers William Logan, Fred Wertz, David Hutson (left 8:30pm), Eva Alligood, Bruce Dale, Ed Dandridge (arrived 8:45 p.m.), Village Attorney Brian Murphy, and Village Planner Angela Witkowski.

ABSENT: Boardmember Cameron

I. Roll Call

II. Approval of Minutes:

Approval of Minutes: July 17, 2008 meeting

Chairperson Speranza: Left over from the last meeting is approval of the minutes from July 17th. At the last meeting we did not have enough members who were actually present at the July meeting to approve the minutes. I'd like to take the time right now to do that. My recollection is that we'd already gone through the minutes and there were some amendments requested so we could just not formally adopt those minutes as amended.

Boardmember Alligood: One word. On page -- oh, it's not numbered. You know what? Forget it. It's not important. Too hard to find it.

On MOTION of Boardmember Hutson, SECONDED by Boardmember Dale with a voice vote of all in favor, the Minutes of the Regular Meeting and Public Hearing of July 17, 2008 were approved as amended at September 18, 2008 meeting.

Chairperson Speranza: The minutes from our meeting in August we will not be able to approve because there were only four of us there and two of the members, Jamie Cameron and Rhoda Barr, who serves as the alternate, are not here this evening. So we cannot do those minutes tonight.

You might wonder why it's such a big deal to approve minutes. Well, tonight it's an especially big deal because it's one of the last actions of Dave Hutson, who's been on the Planning Board for . . .

Boardmember Hutson: We don't know how long. We lost count.

Chairperson Speranza: But his time's up. I will miss you sorely, and certainly I know the Board has really benefited from all of your very, very rational input, provided often times

with lots of humor. David did a lot of work on the Local Waterfront Revitalization Plan as well as was a severe taskmaster while we were putting together the Vision Plan. It's really a tremendous amount of work from one individual for this Village.

Boardmember Hutson: Thanks, Patty. I did want to come by tonight, even though my replacement will be here a little later, and just bid farewell to everybody and say that it has been quite a run. I think Susan Maggiotto's the person who got me into this. The last time there was a Master Plan Committee or a Comprehensive Plan Committee, back in like 1990, I was asked to join that. Sue was on that, and I think she put the bee in Neil Hess' ear at that time that I could tolerate long meetings. That was qualification enough, and he told Lee Kinnally. From there I said yes. In part, I said yes because of the leadership that Lee had given the Village even then, and has continued to do so until now.

I think one of the things that's great about Hastings is that we have -- since I've lived here 35 years -- really been blessed with mayors who were very effective, starting with your dad, Julie Chemka, and Fran MacEachron and certainly Lee Kinnally. I have appreciated all the Village staff: Angie and Susan, and Meg Walker when she was our assistant on the Planning Board; and Brian's associate, Marianne, who's usually with us -- certainly her expertise and also just her understanding of Village life and her commitment to this work and the positive spirit she brings to it has always been great.

So many projects and so many memories. Some of the interactions have been just amazing, and some of them humorous, as you say. I'll never forget the night -- you know, accessory apartments are always interesting -- the fellow was upset with the accessory apartment across from him because the houses were close together. There was a bay window here and a bay window in his house, and he liked to sit at the table sometimes in various stages of dress and undress. And now that they were going to put that out he would not be able to do that anymore. He wanted us to come over and see what that was like. We said we do feel, but that was a little too much. We draw the line there. Anyhow, it was an interesting time.

I'll always remember the Andrus project and the downtown zoning and Harvest and, of course, ShopRite and so many others. The two-family over in Uniontown which was such a big deal.

Chairperson Speranza: I know you read the minutes from the last meeting. We've actually recommended steep slopes.

Boardmember Hutson: Yes, steep slopes. Between Bob Lee and myself there were some interesting discussions. I'm glad that's finally being put to bed.

And I especially want to say to all the people that I've worked with on the Board, all my colleagues, it's been a real joy to work with people who not only were really committed to the work and brought a lot of ability to it, but also were very collegial in the sense that they

respected each other's opinion and always were able to work together as a group. It's just been the atmosphere the whole time on the Planning Board, and that makes such a difference.

So with that, I wish you all well, and carry on. I'm sure you will. I told the Mayor, "One thing I've really been impressed with is the new members that the Trustees and the Mayor and the Village Manager have brought to the Board. I've really been pleased and thought they're doing a terrific job, so I'm sure things will carry on. Thanks.

Chairperson Speranza: You can watch us on Channel 75.

Boardmember Hutson: Yes, now I can go home and watch what happens. I'm going to take my "name" with me.

[applause]

Chairperson Speranza: David's replacement, Ed Dandridge, is going to be joining us this evening. He's actually at a school function up at Hillside.

Village Planner Witkowski: He said shortly after 8:30 he would probably be here.

III. New Business

- 1. Public Hearing. Site Plan Approval - Buffet De La Gare. (Sheet 9, Block 621, Lot 46) 155 Southside Avenue. Application for the reuse of the second floor former apartment as a 25 seat additional dining area for the restaurant. This will replace the former 25-seat dining room in an adjacent space that is no longer leased.**

Chairperson Speranza: It's good to have you back. I guess I'm glad you found more room, and I see your construction's coming along nicely.

Christina Griffin, project architect: We're here to ask for site plan approval of Phase 2, and that is to renovate the second floor so that we can convert that space from an apartment into dining space. I have submitted a zoning analysis and floor plans that compare the former restaurant to the proposed.

When we were here last time we obtained approval for putting an addition on. That's because they no longer have a lease for this space. The bathroom areas that were in that room had to be rebuilt so that we could have toilets, and at least one handicapped toilet, to satisfy the state code for the restaurant. The ground floor area of the restaurant has a seating capacity of 34. The second floor proposed has a seating capacity of 28. The total capacity for the proposed restaurant is 62, which is the exact same amount that the former restaurant had when it was using the other room.

I'm also showing a zoning analysis on the front, but I just wanted to point out that there is something under Section 295-24 Existing Structures and Uses that says "a change of use of an existing or expansion of an existing use within an existing building occupying 2,500 square feet or less shall be exempt from providing off-street parking." I just wanted to point out that the area of the old restaurant was 2,436 square feet, and the proposed restaurant is 2,498 so they're very similar in square footage. We are planning to have this staircase provide the access to this level. There's an opening into this back area just so we could use this bathroom for the new dining space.

Chairperson Speranza: This is a public hearing on the proposal. I just want to know if there's anyone here who wishes to speak on this application. Yes, sir. Just come up to the mic and state your name and address for the record.

Mike Kerpchar, owner 157, 159, 161 Southside Avenue: I received this in the mail in reference to 25 seats that are in my building at 157 and have been there for somewhere near 20 years, where this seems to say that they want to take the 25 seats out of my building and move them next door, upstairs.

Chairperson Speranza: Right.

Mr. Kerpchar: But the seats are in my building, and have been in my building -- and I'm in the process of negotiating with an ice cream parlor, a sit-in ice cream parlor -- and I haven't had a lease with Buffet for three years. They haven't had a lease with me, and they want to take these 25 seats and use them, and not get an additional 25 seats and provide parking. I went through this 20 years ago, and we established the seating in that building. Now, to me, it seems kind of strange where you can take seating from one building and put it in another building.

I basically have a year in order to maintain the function of that building as far as seating is concerned. If I go past that time, then I will lose it. And if I went after it again I'd have to get additional approval for parking. So for three years there's been no lease, and now somebody wants to take these seats where I'm in the process of negotiating an ice cream parlor.

Chairperson Speranza: What you would do with your space? If I understand it now, you don't have a lease agreement, there's no seats there now. Buffet's not using that building anymore.

Mr. Kerpchar: No, but it's a lot . . .

Chairperson Speranza: So what you do, your application for reuse of your building, is a completely separate application. It's not tied at all to the number of seats that used to be in there as a function of Buffet De La Gare. They're totally different applications. So it's not that you would be penalized.

Mr. Kerpchar: I'm not applying for anything. I just want to retain the seating in my building, period.

Chairperson Speranza: What you want is, you want to retain . . . if I'm understanding you correctly, you want to retain the right to have that as a commercial establishment.

Mr. Kerpchar: Well, it is commercial.

Chairperson Speranza: That's right. And it stays, and it doesn't matter if Buffet does not include additional seating or if they do. This application has no bearing on your future use of the building. It doesn't. It's a separate application.

Mr. Kerpchar: Yes, it does.

Chairperson Speranza: No, it doesn't.

Mr. Kerpchar: If you take 25 seats out of my building, then for an ice cream parlor I've got to apply for 25 seats and parking.

Chairperson Speranza: No, no.

Mr. Kerpchar: So if you add 25 seats . .

Chairperson Speranza: It's based on square footage.

Mr. Kerpchar: Yes. But if you want to add seating, don't you have to provide parking?

Boardmember Alligood: Under 2,500 square feet you don't.

Chairperson Speranza: It's the space.

Mr. Kerpchar: Okay, so the seats remain.

Chairperson Speranza: It's the size of the space.

Mr. Kerpchar: These seats remain in 157. So if I open up an ice cream parlor, or this fellow opens something, those seats are in there and you don't have to provide parking for them.

Chairperson Speranza: As long as your establishment is under 2,500 square feet.

Mr. Kerpchar: Well, it's not even 1,000 square feet.

Chairperson Speranza: Then you would be okay.

Mr. Kerpchar: Then it's fine. That's the only reason I'm here, is because it states the 25 seats that were in the building will be moved. That's the impression I got. But they're not being moved.

Chairperson Speranza: They're new spaces, new seats, in their building. You can still do what you would like, what's permitted under zoning, with your building regardless of the seating that's in the restaurant next door.

Mr. Kerpchar: So if I open up an ice cream parlor, which it looks like, and they want 25 seats in there they'll be there.

Chairperson Speranza: And as long as that works out within building standards, etc. you should be fine. You still have to comply with all of the rules of zoning.

Mr. Kerpchar: I understand. I've been in the construction business all my life.

Chairperson Speranza: But the parking should not be an issue.

Mr. Kerpchar: But the way this reads, it looks as though if you want 25 additional seats I'm only too happy for you to get 50 new seats. The more people, the merrier. It's good for business. But I don't want to be put into a position where I cannot use that space as an ice

cream parlor and have to provide parking for it.

Chairperson Speranza: Understood.

Mr. Kerpchar: So I don't.

Chairperson Speranza: Understood. This is only for their building. An application for an ice cream parlor in your space complies with all of the requirements. If it's less than 2,500 square feet you don't have to provide parking in the CC district.

Mr. Kerpchar: Yes, it's less than 2,500.

Chairperson Speranza: So that's based on your space in your application.

Mr. Kerpchar: Then what I did is, I must have misinterpreted it when it said 25 seats that were at one time in . . .

Chairperson Speranza: I think it may have been written that way just so people understood that it wasn't a major expansion; it's still going to have the same seating. It's got nothing to do with what you can put in your building.

Mr. Kerpchar: Then the fact of the matter is, I do not have to provide off-the-street parking if I have seating in that store. That's what I'm concerned about.

Chairperson Speranza: Correct.

Mr. Kerpchar: If it's 18 seats, or 17 -- no more than 25 -- that were already allotted in that area.

Chairperson Speranza: It's not seats, it's square footage.

Mr. Kerpchar: That's all I was concerned about. I'm just too happy to see somebody make it bigger and do wonderful. Capitalism is a great way of life. Hopefully it continues. All right, thank you.

Chairperson Speranza: No, you're fine. Yes, sir.

Mitchell Koch: I want to speak in favor of their application. I want to take full credit: it was my idea, they came to the Architectural Review Board, I said you should put seats upstairs. It's going to enhance and contribute to the charm of Southside and that area and the whole nature of that restaurant row, and it's going to really make the restaurant just a real venue, a place to come to. So I'm in favor of it.

Chairperson Speranza: Okay. Thank you.

Bonnie Kranz, Hastings: I live in Hastings for about 15 years, and I'm the owner of 153 Southside Avenue. My building's immediately to the south of Buffet De La Gare. At the Zoning Board meeting held in May, when the Goulets first requested to renovate their building, my property was mentioned as the building they were going to bring theirs out to be in line with. I didn't attend that meeting. Since my house was already built out to the property line and my river view was not affected, I felt I really didn't have any reason to attend the meeting and complain. However, I feel that the relocation of the 28-seat dining space to the second floor apartment over Buffet De La Gare will have an impact on my building and its residents. I prefer that the second floor remain an apartment.

When Mrs. Goulet recently spoke to me, she said they hoped to use the dining room for

parties. When I hear the word “party” I think of several people getting together for a happy occasion and a bit of noise. Even if there is no party, and just diners, it may very well be noisy. I ask you all to think of the last few times you’ve dined out in Westchester or New York City. In recent times, I’ve been in restaurants that were so noisy dinner was almost not enjoyable. I don’t know if it’s acoustics or a new generation of very loud patrons.

I live between two restaurants, Maud’s Tavern to the south and Buffet De La Gare to the north. We can escape the restaurant chatter by moving from the front rooms, which face Southside Avenue and the entrances to the two restaurants. However, if the Goulet’s second-floor apartment is converted into a dining room there will be no escape. The second and third floors of my building will be impacted by this dining room. My building, and others on the block, are basically one-room wide. I think they’re called row houses. The buildings are narrow and long; the rooms are lined up one after another, and go back about a quarter of the way up the block. If there’s a noisy dining room on the north side of my building, one cannot go to the south end for peace and quiet because there are no rooms to the south. In addition, the majority of usable windows for air and light are on the north side of my property, looking out towards the proposed dining room.

To say it in plain English, the dining room will be in my face. It’s 7-1/2 feet from my second-floor windows. I would much prefer the apartment remain above the Goulet’s restaurant; an apartment that would most likely have tenants with working hours similar to mine and my tenants. I ask that you all consider that my property is my home, it is not a business. I also ask the Planning Board that if the dining room is approved, could there be a request to soundproof the walls and windows.

Thank you.

Chairperson Speranza: Anyone else wish to speak? Yes, sir.

Yurod Amond, 244 Martin Boulevard: Just to answer the lady about the noise, first of all she said she would prefer that they have a family living upstairs instead of having a dining room upstairs. First of all, this is a commercial zone to begin with. It’s always been a restaurant. I don’t see how, if you have a family upstairs -- let’s say they have two children - - the level of noise that you have with two kids crying compared to some people sitting at a table eating . . . could you please clarify that for me, where the level of noise would be more: two kids making noise and running around? I’m a father of four kids, and I know my kids used to run around loose in my house. That makes more noise.

The reason the people are having the dining upstairs to replace, as they say, the seats that they are losing downstairs. And right now, everybody has to try to put things together because the economy is bad. You look at Hastings. You see how many places all over Main Street are closing their doors because they could not afford to pay extra money to rent next

door. So it's better to accommodate upstairs a couple of tables, people sitting and eating there. I don't see how the level of noise would bother any neighbors. And the Buffet's been there for 30 years, or nearly 30 years, and there is no noise there. They're not playing live music or anything. It's not the Copa Cabana. Their people are not dancing, making noise. It's just people sitting, eating like you would be sitting in your own home and eating. So I'd just like to make a point to that.

Chairperson Speranza: Thank you. Anyone else?

Boardmember comments, questions?

Boardmember Logan: I think if there is an issue about acoustics it's quite easily addressed. You can easily put another piece of glass over a window and increase the sound resistance of it. So I don't think this should be a deal breaker. I think if there are complaints in the future, or if noise becomes a problem, it can be addressed. But I don't think this is a reason to stop this from going ahead.

Boardmember Dale: I agree. Having eaten in the restaurant, it's probably one of the quietest restaurants I've ever attended. I think that soundproofing would make the difference. Technology has certainly expanded in this area to make it feasible. I think the benefit to the Village to have the restaurant back to full size so that it's profitable for its owners and continues to exist in Hastings is a major benefit to the community as a whole, so I would be supportive of it.

Boardmember Alligood: I expressed my support for trying to keep the business in place in Hastings the last time this was before us. I think if neighbors are concerned about noise that it should be addressed with soundproofing. I think that's the way to address that.

My only question was, why wasn't this part of the original application. I don't know if anybody wants to address that. I'm curious why it was a two-step process.

Glen Goulet, son of applicant: Just in reference to this whole issue about sound. I'll be managing the restaurant along with my mother and father. I believe we do have the pane glass, glass windows. Again, I'll be running the restaurant so if there are any sound issues I'm more than comfortable in addressing them at a later point, or immediately if there's an issue. We don't blast music -- it's not our style. It doesn't go further than Edith Piaf. I think the only night where it kind of gets a little crazy is New Year's Eve.

Boardmember Alligood: Was this an idea that was added after you came before us last time?

Mr. Goulet: To be honest, we didn't think about it. And it only came about a few weeks ago. We thought that it would just be better for us to turn it into commercial space and try to get a larger revenue than the amount we were getting from renting it. That's basically it.

Now, most of our parties aren't social parties. When we had the other section of Mike Kerpchar's building 90% of the parties were Pfizer, Ciba-Geigy pharmaceutical parties, and

they don't get quieter than those parties.

Chairperson Speranza: Can I ask you a question? You've got a lounge on the second floor. I mean, I'm certainly sympathetic to the change in use of one floor to another or one type of use to another, adjacent floors. And there is that very narrow space between the buildings.

Mr. Goulet: Right.

Chairperson Speranza: So I could see how that change could be annoying and could be a problem. But I'm noticing on the second floor . . . it's a permitted use within the zone, to have that type of facility on the second floor. But can you explain the lounge on the second floor? What is that?

Mr. Goulet: Prior to coming back to Hastings I was a private events manager. To say the word "lounge," it's really not that. Prior to events, you usually have a one-hour cocktail reception while people trickle in. So that's what we meant by lounge: people come in, they have a waiting area. We pass hors d'oeuvres, they have their aperitifs, and then they sit down in the dining room.

Chairperson Speranza: Fred, anything?

Boardmember Wertz: Well, I agree with most of what's been said. I think it's a good thing to restore the restaurant to its full size by utilizing the second floor. It's a great resource in Hastings, a good thing, and that restaurant row there is important to the Village. So I think this is a really good idea.

I guess I'm also concerned about the neighbors and the sound issue. And without having any evaluation of sound levels -- I don't know if we want to necessarily ask for experts to evaluate this -- clearly, there's some subjectivity involved. Neighbors have their sensibilities and perceptions, and we know on this board that perceptions are everything so I'm concerned about that. If there's a way of achieving the goals of restoring the restaurant to its full size and utilizing the second floor in this really good way without infringing on the neighbors . . .

Mr. Goulet: I understand. On the north wall we have four layers of brick separating us from the Kanfer building. So there's not really any issue on that, plus there are no windows. On the south side we have several windows of the other building. We don't really want those open anyway. I don't think I'm going to be opening up the windows on the west side because God forbid if the fire horn goes off and people are startled at the restaurant.

Boardmember Wertz: I appreciate your willingness to respond to issues should they arise in the future. I'd be even more reassured if there were some way of being proactive and anticipating these issues and addressing them from the very start. I'm not quite sure how to do that.

Mr. Goulet: If someone would like to inspect the windows and, I don't know, the sound . . .

Chairperson Speranza: I'm sure there's an architectural solution, as Boardmember Logan mentioned. I don't know if that's something you would be inclined to undertake.

Boardmember Wertz: Christina, would you speak to that?

Ms. Griffin: [off-mic] glazing, they have certain sound insulation value that we consider. So there are methods to give better soundproofing to that wall that we could consider.

I also wanted to let you know, from my point of view, why we didn't have that in our original submission. From the beginning, when they came to me, it was clear that the restaurant's time was of the essence. When they decided that they wouldn't have the other room anymore, we were trying to find a way to make this into a small bistro. This is a different kind of restaurant because they have much fewer seats. They were going to make do. We even had the state code official help us look for handicapped accessibility, try to meet the code minimally. It's very difficult to make this building handicapped-accessible. We were able to do it with the addition coming out the front. At the time I really felt they were overwhelmed. We knew it would take time to go back to the Planning Board to talk about a change in use. We spent some time talking about it and Gwendel, with his experience, felt that they would have a better operation and get back to the kind of restaurant they had before if they had the same number of seats.

And also the finances, I don't think they were prepared to begin with. But then when it became clear that the restaurant would actually function in a similar way -- we could make it work -- we decided to come back and look at the second floor. And that lounge is actually kind of a leftover space. It allows you to get from that new dining room to the bathroom.

Chairperson Speranza: My question was, is it something where people will be sitting there and drinking all night because that's an impact on the neighbor? Thank you. Anyone else wish to speak?

Annie Goulet, owner - Buffet De La Gare: Thirty years in Hastings, and we have a restaurant with educated people. We have all of you, I think you behave. We don't have too many kids in our dining room. And even if people were really laughing and laughing hard the table next door couldn't hear them. I just went nicely to say, "You have to calm down a little bit." So I know how to manage my clientele. We know how to behave, but we also want to be happy.

This apartment becoming a dining room, it's for income. Believe me, we are spending a lot, a lot of money. If we didn't lease the rent next door we are also spending this money for our freedom, just our building. From, on paper, a \$3,000 rental of this lease of Kerpchar, this becomes \$11,000. Can you explain me that? Twenty-five seats? I don't know, he does what he wants to do next door, all right? For soundproof to Mrs. Kranz, yes. For soundproof and everything, I said to, "We are here to help each other, to do what we have to do, to spend the money we have to do -- we will do."

First of all, for noise I am always concerned for noise. For the downstairs, I don't want to

hear the noise for upstairs. So we will make carpeting. You know, we will spend the money, we will do it. And, of course, the windows I assure you we will make sure. First of all, we put curtains or we block it again with double windows or frames. We will certainly do a nice dining room in it. Now, if there is no option of a dining room I have some other plans, okay? So we will always find our way. That's it, so you decide. Okay.

Chairperson Speranza: Okay, thank you. Let me take care of one point of business. We're just doing this -- Dan and I were talking a little bit before. Because this is something which is not a simply residential use, we just want to make sure. We'll go through the formality of declaring ourselves lead agency under SEQRA because we're the only agency that can approve this site plan. And, if it's the pleasure of the Board, to issue a negative declaration on this that we do not feel that there are going to be any environmental impacts as a result of the conversion from the second floor, from residence to restaurant. So why don't we go through that. Is that a fair approach to this?

Male Voice XXX: Yes, Madam Chairwoman.

Chairperson Speranza: First, let's have a motion.

On MOTION of Boardmember Dale, SECONDED by Boardmember Logan with a voice vote of all in favor, the Board resolved to declare itself lead agency and issue a negative declaration on the proposal.

Chairperson Speranza: Now, as to the site plan approval.

Mr. Dandridge. Welcome.

Boardmember Dandridge: Thank you very much.

Chairperson Speranza: I want you to say a few words about yourself once we . . .

Boardmember Dandridge: Sure, I understand business must come before.

Chairperson Speranza: Okay, site plan approval. Is there a sense of the Board of a motion on this? We're a town of neighbors, we're a Village of neighbors. I want to make sure that the neighborliness continues. This is a change, and I am somewhat sympathetic to it. If the applicant is willing to have, as part of site plan approval, that there will be the appropriate kind of noise attenuation or soundproofing included in the renovation, then I don't have an issue on this application anymore. If anyone on the Board feels the same way, they can move to approve it.

On MOTION of Boardmember Wertz, SECONDED by Boardmember Allgood with a voice vote of all in favor, the Board resolved to approve the application for site plan.

Chairperson Speranza: Thank you.

2. Planning Board Welcome - Ed Dandridge

Chairperson Speranza: Ed, why don't we take this time. Welcome to the Planning Board.

Boardmember Dandridge: Thank you.

Chairperson Speranza: It's good to have you here. You're straight into the fire, huh?

Boardmember Dandridge: I am. For the record, my name is Ed Dandridge. I live at 31 Ravensdale Road, and my wife and I and our two children have been in Hastings for seven years and we think it's the greatest place in the world. With that, we owe no small debt of gratitude to the Mayor, the Trustees, our great Village employees and, certainly, all of our citizen public servants who make this town so special.

So I take this position with a serious amount of responsibility. I'm looking forward to living up to that.

Chairperson Speranza: Great. We've got a lot of work for you to do.

Boardmember Dandridge: There we go.

Chairperson Speranza: We're always willing to share that.

Boardmember Logan: Have we introduced ourselves? Maybe we could formally say hi.

Boardmember Dandridge: Hi, my name is Bruce Dale.

Boardmember Logan: Bill Logan. Ed, hi.

Chairperson Speranza: Patty Speranza.

Boardmember Wertz: Fred Wertz.

Boardmember Alligood: Eva Alligood.

IV. Old Business

1. **Public Hearing. Accessory Apartment Approval - Betty Ming Liu; 243 Farragut Parkway; (Sheet 36C/Block 785 /Lots 5, 6).**

Chairperson Speranza: Okay, back to the agenda. The next item on the agenda is continuation of the public hearing for accessory apartment approval. This is a new unit at 243 Farragut Parkway. My recollection is, at the last meeting there was an application made. There was some question as to whether or not a waiver for off-street parking was required. The applicant submitted a new survey for us which appropriately reflects the dimensions of the driveway, and now it seems pretty clear to me that there would be a waiver required. Angie, I see Deven's there also. That's the reading and interpretation of the accessory apartment rule, correct?

Village Planner Witkowski: Correct, yes. The applicant is here if she wanted to go any further. I know Deven may want to comment on it, too.

Betty Ming Liu, 243 Farragut Parkway: I understood at last month's meeting that if I have a one-bedroom accessory apartment I need three spaces. And all three spaces must pull out directly to the street; not in tandem behind each other, three straight out, which in my house -- as you can see on the survey -- would mean I would need a three-lane driveway.

That was a surprise to me because I hadn't heard that before, but I've been trying to do my homework on this subject since then. I understood -- that was explained -- because "that's the law, that's the practice." But in reality it doesn't seem that's the practice, and I want what everybody else has, which is not a waiver.

Chairperson Speranza: You have to just repeat what you said.

Ms. Ming Liu: Which part?

Chairperson Speranza: Not a waiver?

Ms. Ming Liu: I want what everyone else has, and that's to get this without a parking waiver.

Chairperson Speranza: Hold on. To get an accessory apartment without providing three accessible off-street parking spaces -- you can get the apartment with a waiver.

Ms. Ming Liu: I understand.

Chairperson Speranza: If you're saying you don't want a waiver, then you can't have the accessory apartment. That's what I'm trying to understand.

Ms. Ming Liu: May I explain my homework? What I figured out during the past month?

Chairperson Speranza: Sure.

Ms. Ming Liu: The Village has on file a list of the 29 apartments that have been approved, and who has a waiver and who doesn't. Only nine of the apartments have parking waivers. I personally drove to every single house to see what they had. I've talked to many homeowners. Most of them do not have three where you go straight out to the street. We know Hastings. It was said, by the departing Boardmember, this is a village of houses very close together. The topography is winding, tiny streets. How realistic is it to have that much asphalt on your driveway, and yet we have 29 accessory apartments? Just logistically it doesn't sound possible. That's my first point.

Chairperson Speranza: Let me address that. That's why we have a waiver process.

Ms. Ming Liu: I understand, but these houses, most of these houses, have one-lane parking; you know, one car accessible or two-lane parking -- two cars that can go straight out to the street -- and yet they have no waivers at all. No parking waivers. That's my first point.

The second point is, the last house with an accessory apartment, that was approved in 2005, that house has two lanes -- two cars that can pull out, and multiple cars that can park behind it. And they got the accessory apartment permit without a parking waiver.

My third example is right down the street from me, four houses away. That's Dan and Ann Engelson's house, my lovely neighbors. They live at 237 Farragut. Their driveway is shaped exactly like mine. They can only park two cars up front, and then the rest have to park in a row behind it. *They* have no parking waiver.

And my last example is, when I came to make my case and seek your approval respectfully last month, not barely five minutes before me an applicant was re-approved. And I'm so

happy she got it without the waiver, but her house -- 17 Villard Avenue -- has one-lane parking. All the cars have to park right behind each other. And she has no parking waiver.

Chairperson Speranza: That's not quite true. She has parking behind her house. The parking goes down the driveway and around to the back of the house.

Ms. Ming Liu: But either way, three cars cannot pull straight out to the road.

Chairperson Speranza: The cars can turn around in back of the house and pull out.

Ms. Ming Liu: But how does that fulfill the requirement that all three can get out at the same time?

Chairperson Speranza: You don't have to have three spaces lined up next to each other.

Ms. Ming Liu: I understand that.

Chairperson Speranza: I can see you've done a lot of research.

Ms. Ming Liu: That's the Village's work. That's not mine.

Boardmember Logan: It seems like you're fighting a battle you may not necessarily have to fight.

Chairperson Speranza: Exactly.

Ms. Ming Liu: I just don't understand the issue of why I need the waiver.

Boardmember Dale: What's the objection to having a waiver?

Boardmember Logan: You could argue if you're trying to change the language of the law, but that's more of a struggle than you need to go through. I mean, you pointed out that there are a lot of precedents for waivers, and I think there's a reasonable chance you will be granted a waiver after discussion here and after hearing from the rest of the Board. But I think you're making it more difficult for yourself than you need to by trying to change the waiver law, basically. If the Board refuses to grant you a waiver, then you could perhaps contest this. But I think that there's reasonable odds that you'll be granted the waiver, so there's no issue.

Ms. Ming Liu: If I have to take the waiver I'll take it. I'm a single working mom. I can't wait anymore.

Boardmember Logan: So why not take the waiver like the other seven or eight people have?

Ms. Ming Liu: Because in principle the rest of these homes, more than a dozen, don't have waivers and they have one-lane and two-lane parking.

Boardmember Logan: But why do you have to fight that battle at this particular moment?

Ms. Ming Liu: Because I'm a new applicant, and why should I take the waiver if the majority don't have waivers? I'm just questioning. I just don't understand it.

Chairperson Speranza: You know what we'll do? We'll do a little research, and we will put this over and make a decision next month. I find it very, very hard to believe -- and I know we have approved waivers for parking many times.

Ms. Ming Liu: But it's nine times.

Chairperson Speranza: Well, if there's not a record here -- if your research finds that that has not happened in many instances -- then we will rectify that.

Ms. Ming Liu: It's not my research.

Chairperson Speranza: But I want to take the time now, then. This seems to be very important to you. I want to make sure that we're doing right here in the Village. And that's fine, that's what we'll do.

Ms. Ming Liu: But my question is . . .

Chairperson Speranza: We'll put it off. We'll go another . . . I mean, if you don't want to have a waiver, I don't think that this is something that can be changed.

Ms. Ming Liu: I can't afford to wait another month. I've already waited a month. I've waited a long time.

Boardmember Logan: Then why are you arguing about the waiver?

Ms. Ming Liu: Because in principle it bothers me.

Boardmember Logan: Well, then, it's your choice. You get your choice. You can hear what the Board has to say. If we grant you a waiver, you're okay. If you want to argue principle, then fine, we'll go through the process and it'll take more time.

Boardmember Dandridge: There seems to be a misunderstanding of the three cars lined up so they can pull out. If there is a garage in the back and cars are housed in the back, and they can back out or turn around and come out both forward, you don't have to have a lane wide enough for all three cars as long as they can enter, find their parking space in the back, and pull out without having somebody blocking their path. So as long as you don't need the spot in the driveway -- and I suspect that in a lot of these properties there are those alternatives -- they're not just one single driveway without anyplace else to go.

Ms. Ming Liu: Some are. Well, this is the thing. I can't wait because I'm bleeding money. I'm a working Mom and I'm alone in doing this so I can't wait. Principle's important to me, but is there any way I can just take this and state my case, and maybe if you do research it I can be part of it somehow or something? I don't even have to be part of it. Because actually this research is the Village's research. I didn't pull this together. The Village pulled this together. So it's official. I'm just concerned about -- I don't understand why some people have it that way and some have it the other.

Boardmember Wertz: But think about our responsibility. We're here with the responsibility of applying the regulations.

Ms. Ming Liu: I understand that.

Boardmember Wertz: And if the regulations say that you need a certain number of parking spaces or you have to have a waiver, the only way we can responsibly grant you your accessory apartment is by giving you a waiver if, in our determination, you don't have a sufficient number of parking spaces. That's our responsibility right here and right now, and that's how we're going to proceed. So we will not give you the accessory apartment building without the waiver if, in our analysis of your site, you don't have enough parking.

Now, the question of whether the other accessory apartments have been analyzed and

evaluated in line with the regulations is something that we're, right now, not in a position to comment on.

Ms. Ming Liu: I understand.

Boardmember Wertz: We've done good process to the best of our ability, and we always do and continue to. If you're raising questions about the way things have been done in the past we can look back at that, and we can do the research and analyze it and report. Whether your informal observations of these sites are accurate or not, we have six people who think a lot about these things, visit the sites, analyze them, discuss it, and that's how we arrive at our decisions. So I have confidence in what we've done in the past, but if there are any errors that have been made we would have to rectify them. But that's not going to help you.

Ms. Ming Liu: No, it's not. And I want to say I thoroughly value your work. I know you all work really hard at this and that you're volunteering your own time.

Boardmember Wertz: No, it's not a personal thing. It's a matter of principle. We just have the responsibility to abide by the regulations, and to take your application and evaluate it based on its merits and its characteristics. So I think what you've been hearing from the other Boardmembers is that it would be in your best interest to abide by the regulations because it would take much more time to change the regulations, which I doubt is going to happen.

Then the other thing that could come out of research is to find that some people may . . . if there are people who should have had to get waivers in order to have their accessory apartment buildings, then that's a matter that would have to be rectified in the future. But chances are they will have to get those waivers in the future because that's the regulation, just as you would have to get one now in order to have your accessory apartment. And that's the solution.

There are two possibilities. We change the law, or we rectify any errors that have been made and applied in the past. But those are our options, and changing the law will take time. Rectifying any past oversights will take time. The one thing we can do now is for you to apply for the waiver, for us to consider that, and make a decision on it.

Boardmember Alligood: I just want to point out, too, that we've gone thru many of these since I've been on the Board. One of the things we take into consideration is whether any neighbors have come forth with any complaints about the parking situation. That certainly plays into it. In your case, you have a neighbor that came out and said there's a parking issue. So it's a little tricky to ask that you not even need the waiver at all when this has been put in as an issue. I just want to put that on the table.

Ms. Ming Liu: My question with the neighbor who complained was that, as you know the block I'm on is right across the street from the gas station, the deli, and two stores. It's a busy street. And if you look at that street, you know that when people there are mad they come out. My neighbor did mention the objections to a proposal for new housing that she

signed a petition for. I signed that petition, we all signed it. I mean, there was a huge protest and everyone rallied together. It's a very articulate block, and you don't see anybody else here. You didn't see anybody else here last month. If they were really upset you know they would have been here in force. If this was really a neighborhood issue you know people would have been here.

And that neighbor that actually cited Dan and Ann Engelson's driveway as being much wider than mine? Well, Dan was really nice about it. He just said, "come on over and measure my driveway and you can talk about me all you want." I did, I measured the driveway, and it's only 7 inches wider than mine. It's shaped exactly like mine so it might feel bigger.

Boardmember Wertz: This is the kind of evidence that we want to consider. So if you give us an opportunity we'll do it, and try to make a fair, and our best, decision.

Ms. Ming Liu: How about this. I really appreciate the work you do and I really need to try to rent this out. Can I take the waiver and then have this discussed with you as an issue in the future? Because my thing is, I don't think that the law hasn't been obeyed. I just think the spirit of the law, as it's appropriately interpreted in Hastings, is what people have been doing all this time. I know you do hard work. Actually, Christina Griffin's been my architect. You've looked at my plans, you've commented on things, you've thrown things back. I know you make adjustments that are in the neighborhood's best interest because, thanks to you, I have a great house. Because there were things where you said no, you have to change it.

I know you all know what you're doing. All I'm asking is to please consider that maybe there is something here that might be looked at as the spirit of the law versus the letter of the law. And I hope you will grant me the ability to go ahead and rent this out.

Chairperson Speranza: Okay, let's go back to the public hearing portion, if there's anybody else in the audience that wishes to speak.

Jim Metzger, 427 Warburton Avenue: I don't have this issue, but I'm curious. Is there a downside to getting a waiver, and has a waiver ever been rescinded once it's been granted? I'm asking this question, actually, on behalf of a person I don't know who is standing up for a principle. I believe you were trying to let them know that the principle may not be that important in light of what they're trying to achieve. So I'm asking the question for them. Is there a downside to granting a waiver, and once a waiver's been granted has anyone ever had a waiver rescinded? This may help edify. This principle may not be as important as the person coming before you thinks it is.

Boardmember Wertz: Well, there's no downside to getting a waiver because you get the accessory apartment. So you get the accessory apartment whether you have a waiver or not. However, and correct me, I think every time the accessory apartment comes up for renewal the waiver has to be renewed also. I think it's viewed freshly each time. And if, for instance, a waiver is granted now and then however many years down the line the apartment

is applied for again, and a bunch of people come out and say this didn't work out very well, this waiver you granted was a real hardship to us, we have to consider the situation freshly again. So that's a downside.

Mr. Metzger: That's what I wanted to know. I didn't know if that was a potential possibility.

Boardmember Wertz: It's a potential, yes, but the idea of changing the regulations here and now is just not something we're going to do.

Mr. Metzger: Nor do I believe you should.

Chairperson Speranza: And it's not a law. It goes to the Board of Trustees.

Mr. Metzger: I just wanted to be edified on the pros and cons of that. Thank you.

Boardmember Logan: Speaking of the pros of that, I think the waiver process gives the Village and the Board the discretion to look at each of these cases individually. And that gives us a forum where we can hear from the neighbors if there are some nuances involved. So this is a tool that works in the Village's favor, I believe, ultimately, just as you pointed out earlier, Fred.

Boardmember Dale: There is the possibility that some of the applications were approved without the proper information having been presented to the Board at the time of the approval; in which case there should be clarity made on future presentations to make sure that we have the proper information about whether or not a waiver would be necessary. I think going back through every one of these at this point would be a significant amount of work. They have to come to us anyway.

Chairperson Speranza: They come before us for renewal anyway.

Boardmember Dale: The other question I had was, when were the regulations put in place that are part of the law now? A lot of these date back to 1995. Were the regulations changed since then, and were they originally approved without a waiver under other regulations?

Chairperson Speranza: No. Always had a waiver provision. I don't remember, but I believe the way the law was passed when it was first put into place, you had a certain time frame to apply to legalize an accessory apartment, an illegal unit in your home. That's why I would bet it was probably 1995. But there have been instances where we denied an accessory apartment because the neighbors came out and couldn't imagine off-street parking and that the people did not have enough off-street parking. In another instance someone actually constructed an off-street parking space at the edge of their property. Someone else came in and did the same thing, and then pulled it out because it was for a family member who subsequently moved. They got rid of the parking and restored it.

So there have been a wide variety of ways in which the rules were fulfilled. As to whether or not some of these, as you mentioned . . . were there oversights? Maybe there were oversights, and we'll catch them. We'll be really diligent now every three years.

Boardmember Dandridge: Maybe I can just jump in here, but it seems, being the new guy, maybe I'm oversimplifying things. It seems like there are some principles here that are not

necessarily in conflict. We're charged with upholding regulations that are in place for a number of reasons, paramount of which is safety. And then we have to make sure that those regulations are adopted and implemented in a fair fashion. You've given us some information that may or not speak to that, but I think once you put us on notice we now have a responsibility to go back and take however much time to exercise the appropriate diligence to get to whether or not there have been variations or whether or not there was prior controlling statute that may have been relevant.

In any event, what I think I'm hearing from my fellow Boardmembers is that that's not an answer that could be resolved tonight and maybe even not even by next meeting. It's a process. At the same time, my understanding is that if you get the waiver you're not economically injured or harmed. To the contrary, it would enable you to make use of the apartment right away. And it's not a permanent thing, because if I understand it correctly the next time you rent the apartment out you could come up again.

Chairperson Speranza: No, it's every three years.

Boardmember Dandridge: So every three years. So it doesn't really permanently affect you, or perhaps affect you at all. I understand there's a principle here that you've raised, but I also understood that you had some very pragmatic concerns. I think what the Board is saying, if I understand it correctly, is that your pragmatic concerns can be addressed and taken care of rather quickly. The broader principled concerns are things that are beyond the control and the ability of the Board to address tonight. Unless we misheard you, you're fine with accepting the waiver, given the circumstances, given your choices, so you can start making economic use of your apartment. And we now have the responsibility to go back and look and see what, if anything, needs to be addressed here moving forward.

Chairperson Speranza: Very good.

Boardmember Dale: Patty, I have one question. When you apply to build an accessory apartment -- the issue of getting a waiver from the Planning Board -- is that not part of the approval process prior to having the apartment built? Because it seems to me apartments are being built and then the application comes in.

Chairperson Speranza: You can't build an apartment. It's apartments that are in effect, is my recollection. Deven, you want to come up and speak about this?

Building Inspector Sharma: There was another similar situation, and I talked about Catch-22, chicken-or-the-egg. She did get the permit to finish up the basement, but I wouldn't let her call it an apartment yet until it's approved as an apartment. You can use it as a family room, recreation room. You can't have a kitchen, but it's all set up to have a kitchen and to act as a regular apartment only after you approve it. Then it will become an accessory apartment. Right now it's a finished space that can be used as an apartment. Was that the question? A new circumstance, somebody comes for a building permit to do an apartment in a basement or attic or someplace, I can't let them do it in a single-family home.

Boardmember Alligood: Deven, I'm sorry. Can you clarify? Does that mean that the person can't build a full kitchen and bathroom, or they can put it in but they can't call it an apartment?

Building Inspector Sharma: Different municipalities act in different ways. It becomes a very different situation. Some people say they have a summer kitchen downstairs. It's not really an apartment, but for their own use they want to do some cooking certain times of the year. Now, is there anything in the local code or state code that would say I can't allow that? I didn't see anything. But it cannot be an apartment, which means a second unit where it could be rented or another family could live there. That would only happen after the Board approves an apartment. Then it becomes an apartment. Right now it's just a finished basement with functional spaces there.

Chairperson Speranza: Anyone else wish to speak on this application? Let's close the public hearing and take Board action. Any further discussion from Boardmembers, or does anyone wish to make a motion regarding this accessory apartment?

On MOTION of Boardmember Dale, SECONDED by Boardmember Alligood with a voice vote of all in favor, the Board resolved to approve the accessory apartment with the waiver for parking.

- 1. Public Hearing. Site Plan Approval and View Preservation. MetroPCS of New York, LLC (Sheet 9 / Parcel P-97 and Sheet 13 / Parcel P-109), 7 Maple Avenue (rooftop area lease for wireless service facilities). Application for site plan approval of addition of 6 Panel antennae and related equipment for Personal Wireless Services to the roof of the Hastings-on-Hudson Municipal Building. Recommendation to ZBA regarding Special Permit and View Preservation approval requests.**

Chairperson Speranza: At our last meeting there were issues we were very concerned about with respect to the sight lines. Putting the equipment and putting the antennas on the roof of this building, based on the application, was just going to be very, very overbearing. We had asked for a couple of things. First, to have the applicant go back and see if there were modifications that could be made with respect to the equipment or siting the equipment on the building in a different location. Recognizing that there was some concern over how exactly things could be sited on the roof of the building, it was the recommendation of this board to get an independent engineer to act on behalf of the Village to go out and work with you to site the location.

There was also a request for having someone come and evaluate the noninterference portion of your application. The ARB also saw this application and made some comments, which I know you have to go back to. And I believe it was on the agenda for the Zoning Board also,

but I'm not sure what happened there. So we'll get filled in as far as what happened at the Zoning Board. Deven, could you speak to, at the Zoning Board of Appeals, what happened to this? Are they waiting also for the ARB and Planning Board recommendations?

Building Inspector Sharma: Not so much the ARB, but for the Planning Board's recommendation. I think both boards, the Zoning Board and the Architectural Review Board, it was more of a preliminary get-to-know kind of meeting for the project and it's still in an evolving state. So it would change -- the size of it, the location of it, all those kinds of things -- and when things seem to jell, come to a certain point, that's when the recommendations for you with regard to the view preservation, the Zoning Board will act on it. And the ARB has made some recommendations. They sent copies and, added to all, they would need to go back to the Zoning Board and the Planning Board to get the final blessings from them.

Chairperson Speranza: That's what's expected tonight?

Building Inspector Sharma: Whenever that happens, not necessarily tonight.

Chairperson Speranza: Why don't we have the applicant now explain the changes you've made. I know there were some changes made for the equipment particularly.

Daniel Alp, Cuddy & Feder: I'm here on behalf of MetroPCS. I did appear before you last month in support of this application.

Just to touch upon what you were discussing, Madam Chair, there was a tremendous amount of concern regarding our proposed facility with the associated equipment cabinets. Just to sort of thumbnail that, this facility is located in what is known as the Personal Wireless Services Facility District in the Village, as well as the view preservation overlay district. We are here for site plan and special permit approval. We do require also view preservation overlay approval from the Zoning Board as well as referral to the Architectural Review Board for the final building permit application.

The facility essentially considers six-panel antennas for the operation of the facility, as well as equipment that's associated to operate those antennas for the associated radio frequency signals. As you'll recall from our original submission and the photo simulations that were included therein, the equipment cabinets are located on this building, Village hall, as well as the antennas. The equipment cabinets are in the front portion of the building and, as you're looking at the building, to the left, essentially the southwestern corner of the rooftop.

What we had discussed last time was that we should try to explore alternatives regarding what we could do with those equipment cabinets, where they could be positioned on the rooftop or elsewhere, and what the options available were for those equipment cabinets. As I think I had mentioned last time, part of the equipment cabinet issue involves where else you could put them. There's really no other space available on the grounds where you could put them. There's no space available in the building where you could put them. Some similar

applications often locate the equipment in a basement storage area. As part of a site visit I had the opportunity to actually be in the basement myself the other day, and I know there's really no space for these kind of equipment cabinets. And I think, honestly, that AT&T, which is existing on the rooftop, has also located their equipment in cabinets on the roof.

Once you're narrowed down to the roof, the question becomes where can you go on the roof. We've been trying to tackle that question over the last several weeks. I should mention, too, that in our process of meeting with the Zoning Board on September 11th and the ARB on September 8th -- and I wouldn't speak out of turn for them, or presume to -- my understanding was that their concerns were largely similar to yours in terms of the appearance of the antennas and the cabinets. In addition, I should note that the ARB also had a concern about the location of the conduit, which I can get to sooner. There's a conduit that comes up the side of the building.

But as part of our process, we also had a site visit with Mr. Sharma, and a sit-down with Mr. Frobels and our team, to try to work out what our alternatives might be on the roof. Our team was actually able to locate building architectural drawings for the building dating back to 1929, and they also had some drawings from when the building was refurbished about 10 years ago, completed in about 1999. There really is no indication that there are any load-bearing features of the building other than the outside walls. There is a small elevator shaft and there are some other buildings, but there's really nothing in the architectural drawings that would support that there's any kind of load-bearing feature more centered to the roof, away from the edges of the building. That's important because this equipment would need load-bearing structures to be able to connect to -- at least to absorb the weight that's associated with -- this facility, and the cabinets in particular. I should note that the antennas would be pipe-mounted along the parapet.

So the solution which our engineers, Tectonic, had come up with -- which is actually the same as the one that AT&T had come up with -- was to provide steel dunnage basically crossing across a corner, attached into the parapet. Basically you dig into the parapet and attach the steel dunnage by epoxy and then connect it to the wall that way, using the load-bearing nature of the parapet walls that go all the way down to the foundation. And then using that steel dunnage to put on the platform, which will then support the equipment cabinets. That's basically the engineering solution that's available on the roof as a result of its structure and the research that our team has been able to do.

Chairperson Speranza: Can you stop for a second? I'm wondering if we had the opportunity to hire someone. There was someone whom we'd asked to act on behalf of the Village. There had been an escrow set up for the evaluation of the plans. I'm just wondering if we have our own engineer who's confirmed the report of the applicant.

Building Inspector Sharma: I have contacted and lined up a couple of engineers, and we can go to either one of them when the time comes. Right now I don't think there's anything in their report that needs to be verified or checked by engineers. The first letter we had in the report was from an engineer to say that they will design the structure and the details that'll be appropriate, code-compliant, and to the standards.

The other thing we needed to make an assessment on was whether the building was strong enough structurally. That we have done, or met.

Chairperson Speranza: His engineer did it, or ours?

Building Inspector Sharma: Ed and I did.

Chairperson Speranza: You did.

Building Inspector Sharma: But for the record, if you need to get an outside engineer -- the two engineers I've spoken to -- we can always get that. I'm completely comfortable with the way the AT&T platform is built. It's about the same way this platform will be built. Actually, after we did the review, the platform and the cabinets are a lot smaller than what was presented previously and also what AT&T has, apparently. So as it is, yes, I'm comfortable as the Building Inspector and an architect, too, that what's being proposed and what's been done before by AT&T can, indeed, be done here in this other corner as well. If we need a third-party engineer to corroborate it at any time I can have an engineer produce that report for us.

Chairperson Speranza: So you're comfortable that this building can handle more equipment. Because that was one of the things that had been a concern of the Board, and why we said let's take advantage of having the escrow and have somebody come in.

Building Inspector Sharma: Why don't I then, between now and next week or so, have this engineer corroborate and verify. He'll give me a report, and I'll send copies to the Board for its record as well. I can do that.

Chairperson Speranza: That would be great. Because one of the things, Deven, that came up when we were speaking last week also was how much more can we handle on the roof. You know, it is one of the sites in the Personal Wireless Facility Overlay zone. Can we keep putting stuff up there, or do we take it out of the zone. Do we make it no longer a location? I don't know.

Building Inspector Sharma: This question actually came up at the Zoning Board as well. The way I see it is really first-come, first-served. There will be a time that we will not be able to put up any more such equipment or facilities on the roof. And when that time comes -- from the engineering point of view, from the architectural point of view -- we let the boards know. But at this point, what is being proposed, everything else being okay, it is doable and can be done.

With regard to how much more can we do, that's kind of hypothetical. I mean, how many more do we need to do? We don't know. So when the time comes we'll assess that situation

at the time. That's my feeling.

Boardmember Dale: Deven, do you know how many such facilities there are in the Village already set up?

Building Inspector Sharma: In the building?

Boardmember Dale: No, in the Village.

Building Inspector Sharma: In the Village, no. There are some on the Andrus home, and the only other location I know is this. If there are other locations I'm not aware of them.

Boardmember Dale: It's more a question for the gentleman representing the company. Is there a possibility that the phone companies who work in a Village of this sort could share facilities, and have a single location that might serve all of them rather than having half a dozen of these things and further applications as the industry expands?

Building Inspector Sharma: We dealt with this situation in Croton when I was on the Planning Board there. A lot of times, when they do, it's cellular towers. Usually the height and everything, there is room to put more antennas. Here, that was my first concern, too: can we co-locate it with an AT&T platform. I understand that our lease arrangements with AT&T is that they could, in the future if need be, use the space that AT&T has leased out or is promised to AT&T. So that we had to rule out. But what we did say, after discussing with them the platform size and equipment size, and height and numbers of cabinets, everything has come down drastically. View preservation, visual, and position-wise, it's become a lot less of an imposition than the original scheme.

Chairperson Speranza: Okay, thanks. I interrupted.

Mr. Alp: No, it's quite all right. Just to clarify, the process we had discussed with the Building Inspector -- knowing that the Board had concerns about . . . and, quite honestly, I thought the direction was more to work with the Building Inspector and to proceed in terms of assuring where we're at with the engineering of the building and the capacity for the equipment. And that at some point that an engineering consultant would be . . . and I know that we had the escrow established and that an engineering consultant would be brought in to review things. Quite typically, having done this on many other locations and applications, the final engineering calculations and structural analysis is often included at the end once you're through planning and zoning as part of the building permit process because we've already kind of got our third iteration of the project in terms of where things are and how they're located. So doing a structural analysis, with all the associated calculations and things, often gets a little confusing -- with everybody running through the numbers and going back and forth, and which one are you looking at, and, oh, now we're changing it again.

So typically what's been done before on many of our applications would be something along the lines of what we presented in our original engineering letter as well as, I think, the letter that we've also provided to Building Inspector Sharma today, which was pursuant to our conversations on Tuesday at our meeting. You know, our engineers have indicated to them affirmatively that the building's parapets in good condition and can support the loads which

are associated with this proposed project. My understanding from Mr. Sharma was that he was fine with us submitting our engineering calculations and structural analysis later, and having your engineering consultant look at it at that time. I understand that it's a concern of the Board. Obviously, I know it's a concern of the Board, but I didn't know at what point that that would be a requirement for the approval process, given the way that we're kind of working through the process here.

Chairperson Speranza: The concern was based on, as you said, things shift. What we approve, should we approve this tonight, we want to make sure that what we approve is what ends up there. And that it doesn't move because the engineering calculations show the building can't hold it here, it's got to be over here. Again, it's in the interest of the Village. Your engineer can say this and this and this, and this works best for you. It may not work with the integrity of the building structure on the Village's end of things. If it's got to be moved, then it's going to be moved to a place that then creates a problem for us for view preservation.

I have no problem to have the engineering review done at the building permit phase, with a recognition that should it shift it comes back for view preservation again. And again, that's me. We've got to have a discussion with the Boardmembers as well.

Mr. Alp: And that would absolutely be understandable and reasonable in light of where we're at.

If I could just kind of outline where we went with these cabinets, roughly, for perhaps those at home, you were talking about refrigerator-size structures being placed up on the rooftop, on top of the platform that I've described. What we've been able to do, we submitted on September 10th a revised location for these cabinets. Originally we had proposed four cabinets; we reduced those down to two. We were able to take one of those cabinets and reduce it further and make it what's called a "compact cabinet," I think basically reducing its size by about 50%. Pursuant to our site visit on Tuesday, what we were then able to do and discuss was to further bring the entire site more closely together; basically line up the cabinets together, keeping the tallest cabinet -- which is approximately 36 feet 6 inches -- above grade level, whereas the top of the parapet is approximately 34 inches above grade level. The top of the roof is 29 feet, so I think this cabinet's approximately 7 feet 6 inches, somewhere in there. My math may be off, but that's one of the main cabinets of concern.

We were able to take that cabinet and move it furthest back on the platform, and actually kind of hang it off the back of the platform kind of cantilevered, if you will, over one of those struts that comes across where that steel diamond check comes across. So basically it's now approximately 14 feet. It's at an angle, so it's a little hard. Where before I think it was maybe 6 feet or even less from the edge of the parapet, it's now approximately 14 feet back. Again, if you were at eye level -- if you were floating up in the air -- it would come over the

parapet, but the top of it would be approximately 2 feet 6 inches; if you were floating mid-air looking across at the quote, unquote engineer's view. So we were able to reduce the number of cabinets, reduce the size of the cabinets, push them back further from where they were previously proposed. Again, I should note that's the end result, but this was also part of a process where we started at the beginning and tried to say, "Okay, what else could we do here, where else could we go." Eliminating the options, this was basically the result that we came up with.

What I should also note is, as per our letter -- which we copied the Board on today -- to Building Inspector Sharma, pursuant to our conversations with the Architectural Review Board one of their concerns was also, for example, the antennas. The Zoning Board brought up the same question: can you locate the antenna somewhere else. The problem with the antennas being located somewhere else is, if you had a building that had a larger penthouse or equipment penthouse or something you'll often see them flush mounted to that or using some other superstructure that's on the roof. Because the problem is, as you move the antenna away from the front of the building -- or from the side of the building or wherever you are, from the edge of the building, if you will -- as you move it back you need increased height to clear the edge of the building. This building, with a 5-foot parapet, you're starting to talk about moving the antennas back and up, which requires it's own superstructure. Often there's mounting options which are weighted, having pipe mounts, or there's sled mounts. But it starts to get higher. And they do get heavier because they do have to be weighted in order to stay on the roof.

So that, as an option, is far less elegant. And it would be incongruent with the AT&T facility, where these are pipe-mounted to the parapet. What you can see sometimes when you go to other municipalities in other places is antennas mounted in one way and then mounted in another and in another. Sometimes that works with the building, sometimes it doesn't. I think in this case it would probably look very incongruent, be different, and would obviously require greater height and a different structure.

Also, as discussed at the Architectural Review Board, one change that we've also proposed here is the conduit, which is the telephone and electricity conduit which we are required to operate at the wireless sites. Not everybody realizes it, but wireless sites actually use land lines. They do have to be connected into the land line. So it's basically a large -- I'm simplifying it -- version of your wireless phone at home. You basically have your base station antenna, which would be a facility such as the one we're proposing here, and your handset connecting with that station. Then it goes into the land line system.

So that conduit, the electricity, has to be run from the building. We would be separately metered. The conduit was previously proposed for the western side of the building, and the

Architectural Review Board felt we should explore some other options. AT&T is located along over here, which is the eastern portion of the northern face of the building as you come over on this side. We explored trying to put it there. Basically, you'd need 3-inch conduits to service the telephone and electricity needs for the site, and there's really no space left over there from the existing meters, the existing conduit, and other things.

This was a first for me. As part of our Architectural Review Board meeting we actually got up and did a site visit. Usually you're not at the site, but we were able to walk around. We walked out of the meeting and went out to the fire escape. There is actually some existing conduit which is on the western side of the northern face of the building over by the fire escape. That conduit is actually no longer functional. When we were up on the roof the other day we actually confirmed it just comes up and it looks like some sort of air hoses or empty piping for some other conduit. We're not actually sure what it was for, but it's no longer in use. What we discussed preliminarily with the Architectural Review Board, and subsequently discussed with Building Inspector Sharma and Mr. Frobel, was that MetroPCS can remove that nonfunctioning conduit and could actually put our conduit in that location, which would be less visible, a better location, and a better solution overall, which would work better with this building; basically removing something that's not functioning and putting something in that same general area that is. Obviously, again, I wouldn't presume to speak for those other boards, but I think I've covered a lot of the bases which we had as part of our discussions.

One final point was actually the antennas. The antennas, I know the Architectural Review Board also mentioned that you had the pipe-mounted antennas. The pipes come up from the parapet, and then there's the beginning of the white antenna. So their suggestion was, in addition, that where you have maybe views of looking down on the roof we could paint the cabinets white to match the white that is on the building. But also that that portion of any of the antenna that is not actually the panel antenna -- you have the pipe, and then you have the associated wiring that comes down -- can be painted white as well. We would have no problem with that. The idea is just trying to get the least amount of contrast as possible. I think that was the overall mission.

Chairperson Speranza: Good. Sounds like it was a good meeting.

Mr. Alp: We've been very busy over the last month.

Chairperson Speranza: Again, this is a continuation of a public hearing. Is there anybody who wishes to speak about this application?

Mr. Koch: I'm here on behalf of the Architectural Review Board. A couple of concerns. I think he covered everything pretty well. We've asked them to submit for our review, at our next meeting, all the pertinent information about really how big these conduits are and what are the connective pieces and any other sort of devices that will be mounted on the building. We also expressed at the last meeting our desire that it should be painted to match the brick.

We couldn't find any invisibility paint, but that it match the brick.

Everybody should know that there's an issue. We have a very, very deep cornice at the top of the building. All of that conduit just makes this big flying leap going over it. So we've asked that it at least hug as tight as possible to the building. But I think one of the considerations is how big is the conduit. Is it actually three 3-inch conduits? That's a lot of material and, really, how that last little turn is made is going to really make a big difference. So we would ask that they could demonstrate to us that it can be done not inconspicuously, but with some kind of sensitivity to the architectural features of the building.

Then I think just speaking to the question of how many more units can we have on our building, I would argue that it's not the cabinets -- which are pretty inconspicuous -- but all the antennas that festoon the top of the building that will govern how much equipment we can put up there. Even as it goes down the road, and these service providers will be asking for bigger and better antennas we'll have to look at it with a very critical eye.

That's it.

Mr. Metzger: I apologize that I'm new to this project. I know you've been discussing it for awhile. What's the benefit to the Village for utilizing our building for a private concern?

Chairperson Speranza: There is a lease agreement that's been entered into by the Board of Trustees.

Mr. Metzger: So it should be financial?

Chairperson Speranza: It's done.

Mr. Metzger: No, that's fine. I was just curious. So it's strictly financial. Do we, as residents, benefit from having this equipment on the roof? Will it improve our cell phone service?

Chairperson Speranza: I have no idea.

Mr. Metzger: Could we find that out? I'm just curious.

Chairperson Speranza: Sure. My understanding is your company's not operating right now.

Mr. Alp: Correct. Well, not here. To answer the gentleman's question, MetroPCS is a new carrier in the market, similar to and a competitor of AT&T, Verizon, Sprint, and Nextel. The reason you probably haven't heard of MetroPCS is that, obviously, the network is still being rolled out. I think, as I mentioned last time, typically you would see kiosks and things where you could buy handsets and be able to get your services. But MetroPCS has rolled out in many major markets in the South, in the mid-South, Midwest, West Coast, and now rolled out in Philadelphia. So it is another carrier, another option, another opportunity, a competitor in the marketplace. So that's basically what it is. It's an additional carrier, additional opportunity for service.

Male Voice XXX: So down the road consumers, residents, might benefit by greater competition in the marketplace. It'll be a long-term benefit to each resident, and then short-term there's revenue that the Trustees felt was . . .

Mr. Alp: Precisely. You know, this was part of the Telecommunications Act. It was Congress' intent to kind of create competition in the marketplace to foster innovation, foster lower prices as a result of competition. That was the idea, instead of having the old Ma Bell standard, which I think we all remember.

Male Voice XXX: So yes, and yes.

Mr. Metzger: A quick follow-up question. I wish you all the luck. If the company goes belly up, who's required to remove all of this stuff that's being put on the outside of the building?

Chairperson Speranza: I've got to believe that's addressed in the lease agreement. That it's their responsibility.

Mr. Alp: It's typically involved in the lease as part of the lease obligations. Then as to Mr. Koch's point, I apologize. I did not mention the points that he mentioned, and absolutely we did discuss those and those are concerns which we are seeking to address.

One additional item, in the spirit of kind of going back and thinking through things from the beginning. Because we were able to get hold of the older drawings, one of our discussions at the Architectural Review Board were some opportunities that are usually involved with more modern buildings, where you maybe have stacked janitor closets or some sort of chase where you're able to internally put the conduit internal to a building. Unfortunately, as an older building, I think the way it's designed it doesn't really have those opportunities. From our engineers' review of the architectural drawings that we saw from 1929, as well as the recent renovation, there was similarly no opportunity to do an internal mounting with that unless you start doing core drilling through office spaces and areas which, I think, is not what the Village is interested in.

Chairperson Speranza: Any other comments, questions, statements? Now we close the public hearing.

Board discussion: we have several actions if we are going to act on this tonight. Are there any follow-up questions or comments from the Board?

Boardmember Wertz: I wasn't here last time, but I have read the minutes and I've looked at the material and it looks like some very reasonable and beneficial changes have been made. The union of units that would be visually a problem have been reduced, the size has been reduced, the location has been made better. So all that seems very good. I guess the question to me is whether it's good enough, and whether the remaining visuals are acceptable.

I guess one question I have, and I don't know if you can address this or not -- and I

appreciate all the work you did laying out the visual aspects of the new configuration -- one problem I have looking at it was that the sky was white and it looks like these units are white. I had a lot of trouble seeing these units on the top of the building. I don't know what that amounts to, but I sure wish you'd had a nice blue sky so I could see these white units, rather than having the white sky and not being able to distinguish the units from the sky. I don't know if anybody else had that problem or not.

Boardmember Alligood: That's a good point. The last set of pictures actually highlighted the antennas.

Boardmember Wertz: Better. The first photograph, where we don't see the units, has a bluer sky. And then the one where we're supposed to be able to see the units, the sky's washed out and it's white. Then it becomes more of a problem.

Mr. Koch: Can I speak to that? Another point that I forgot to raise is the ARB asked them to submit photographs of actual installed antennas, the kind that they're proposing to use here, on real live buildings. I think we'll be able to get a better idea of what impact they have on the building at our next meeting and we'll make a report to you, of course, based on that.

Boardmember Wertz: Thanks. That's what I'm thinking about. I'd just like to have a better view of what these things are really going to look like.

Mr. Koch: These little things are PhotoShop'd in and it's very hard to tell what it really is.

Chairperson Speranza: No, you're right. I hadn't noticed that until you pointed it out.

Boardmember Logan: It looks like AT&T already has its cabinets on the northwest corner. I don't know if anybody has studied the possibility of putting these cabinets in the same corner so they don't loom over the more prominent façade on the southwest. It looks like you could get some diagonal dunnage in the northwest corner rather than have to put this thing into a more prominent view. Put it on the back side of the building. Just move the cabinets so they're not looming over the front of the building, but in the back by the fire escape. There is a hatch there which, I guess, we have to keep accessible. But it looks like these cabinets actually aren't all that huge and why don't we stick them where they're less conspicuous.

Mr. Alp: I think our engineer's problem with that other corner was precisely what you mentioned, that there's the fire escape over on that side as well as the hatch, the access hatch that goes up to the roof. Bringing them across that corner, I think, was going to block that hatch. I just went through it the other day. I think it's right in the corner there.

Boardmember Logan: It looks like you have a space to scale even clearing the hatch; just taking the dunnage diagonally across the parapet walls, but just doing it in that other corner. Right now you're cantilevering it over the dunnage, so if you could do it there why couldn't you do it by the AT&T cabinets. You know, less stuff to look at. We have this nice building façade that we just cleaned up and lighted and everything. Why are we putting this cabinet right on the primary façade of the building?

Mr. Alp: Right. But again, I think when our engineers looked at that corner it wasn't feasible to try to even squeeze anything in there and make the hatch accessible and safe. And in addition, I think what we've done is tried to reduce this in a way that you're not going to be able to see the cabinets.

Boardmember Logan: What is that parapet height now? Do you know?

Mr. Alp: The parapet height is approximately 5 feet, so the roof . . .

Boardmember Logan: The parapet height above the roof is 5 feet?

Mr. Alp: Right. The roof height, if I recall, is about 29 feet above grade level. The parapet comes up to approximately 34 feet above grade level.

Boardmember Logan: And your cabinets are 6 foot 10 above roof. That's according to your drawing detail 4 on Z-3.

Mr. Alp: I think the highest cabinet . . .

Boardmember Logan: It's 6 foot 10, and then the parapet is 5 feet? So maybe you don't see it.

Mr. Alp: That was the endeavor.

Boardmember Dale: It seems to me the antennas are more the issue. I didn't realize there were any there until this issue came up.

Chairperson Speranza: You never saw the AT&T antenna?

Boardmember Dale: No, I didn't actually notice it was there. And then I went to the market on Saturday and walked my way back. I walked up Main Street, turned around, and looked back and I was amazed at how much is there already. So it really becomes a question of is the additional amount too much, or whether we're living with what we have and we're just adding these additional amounts which will not make that much difference. So there's a question of is there a need for them for the Village's position, and whether the additional antennas are more. The forest becomes too thick.

Boardmember Logan: I have a solution for that. These are fiberglass, right? We should mold them like Greek statues, like architectural features.

Boardmember Alligood: As long as the signal's the same.

When Bill came up with that idea it pointed out a thought to me . . . back to the question of do we want our engineer to kind of give us guidance. I'm cutting myself off, but I do think this is a vast improvement over what you presented last month. But whenever we have this conversation I think, well, have we exhausted all the possibilities and, engineering-wise, what's possible. I mean, it may not be ideal for the applicant, but it might be a better solution for the Village in terms of view preservation and other issues. I don't have a clear answer on that one, but if we're struggling whether this is too much are there other possibilities.

Building Inspector Sharma: Let me just say one thing. To see all the antennas that are going to be over the building, and the cabinets, I think the cabinets are going to be a lot less obtrusive or obvious than the antennas themselves. So once we accept the fact that that's the

way the technology's going, and it works, see, from every angle -- the technology benefits, financial, whatever -- we're just going to have to limit those antennas. All you do is repaint and camouflage them as much as we can. But as to the cabinets and the location, the first thing I did, was go up on the roof. If any of you want to come up on the roof, you're welcome. I took Susan up. In that corner where we come up, the corner, the beams, the dunnage for the AT&T comes out that far. There's not much room left to put up another . . .

Boardmember Logan: Well, these are only 1 foot 10 above the parapet. I don't think that's an issue there.

Building Inspector Sharma: It's not the height. I personally couldn't find anyplace where we could put it. If we must hear from another engineer, I would definitely try to get something to the Board -- and it can happen contingent on that report -- on what would give you a comfort level. There really isn't any other location. There is that corner, and all the other corners would bring it closer to the street. The corner is towards the front of the building, but it's still away from the sight lines of the building.

There wasn't any possibility to do it in the middle of the floor because -- as Dan said, and I looked at the plans before, they looked at the plans independently and together -- there are no structural elements in the middle of the floor on which we can build the structure up. Being an architect, it just happened. It's not just intuition, you know. Otherwise, if we're doing an engineer's report I can definitely, before the end of next week, have a report with any criteria you would like this engineer to address. We can do that.

As Dan was saying, if that's the only thing -- my permitting and my inspections during the construction -- I'll take up a lot of things that perhaps were not done when there was a different cast, or character. The AT&T installation is huge and dirty. We're going to get back in touch with AT&T in a friendly sort of way. With the technology, things are becoming smaller. We're being able to do so much more with small, and less, equipment. We're going to try and see if we can influence AT&T to maybe re-look at some of the things: reduce the number of cabinets, make them smaller, even why they're kind of hovering over the parapets. We can do something, we can work on some kind of arrangement with them to maybe revisit and make AT&T's installation stand out a little less as a sore thumb. By comparison, yes, it will be there in addition, but a lot less visible. If you're looking for it you'll definitely find it, but it will not be that obvious as you walk by from different visual vantage points.

Mr. Alp: One of the concerns that you raised was what other options are available. I have to say I'm very impressed by something the gentleman was saying before in his introductory remarks about the Village. Not to abuse the term, but there seems to be a very keen wavelength that everybody's on. I think something about Greek statues was mentioned in the Architectural Review Board as well. So it was thought of.

But I should mention, on a serious note, that historically, for AT&T's application, I know that as part of that process there was consideration. There are certain ways you can actually build radio frequency-transparent structures around antennas. And you could try to incorporate them as structural elements into a building. You do see that on some sites. At this site, however, when AT&T proposed that, SHPO, the State Historic Preservation Office, rejected that prospect because they don't want the building to be significantly architecturally changed. Having some municipal whips and sirens and antennas on the building is one thing -- it's functional, it's got a purpose -- but starting to try to put up . . . even if it would be Grip Brick to match, maybe with another balustrade or something . . . and I think that even started a whole debate whether SHPO wanted the eagle replaced back up on the top with the old balustrade. That started going down the wrong hill.

But in short, I think the problem was that in trying to look at another alternative solution which is sometimes available on other sites wasn't available on this one.

Boardmember Dale: The total number of antennas you're going to add is four?

Mr. Alp: It's six. That's three sectors of two each. AT&T currently had three, but I believe they're approved for a total of six.

Boardmember Dale: And you're going to install six?

Mr. Alp: Yes.

Boardmember Dale: Two in the front of the building, two on the east side. And then where are the other two?

Mr. Alp: I think you have two antennas on the north, east, and south -- if I'm doing it right, if I've got my directions right.

Chairperson Speranza: We have some decisions to make. I'm not sure if people are ready to move forward on this. We can handle it a couple of ways, but let me run down the actions we have to take. And Brian, if I miss anything you'll let me know, right? Our notice of intent to be lead agency was sent out, I believe you said, August 20th. August 25th, okay, so we're not quite through the 30-day period yet to be able to take environmental action on. But we have to go through an Environmental Assessment Form, which the applicant has provided the information for in our packet. I don't know if you would have gotten the background.

Boardmember Dandridge: I think I did get some material just yesterday.

Chairperson Speranza: We also have to make a recommendation for view preservation and special permit for the Personal Wireless Overlay facility to the Zoning Board of Appeals, and we have to approve site plan. That's correct? Yes? Good.

I think we can do this a couple of ways. If we want to wait until we get additional information -- the Architectural Review Board completes its report, the engineering assessment is done confirming that that's the best location -- we can take our action contingent upon all of that. Or we can wait.

Boardmember Alligood: Can you explain? You said “contingent on the Architectural Review Board’s” . . .

Chairperson Speranza: That the recommendations of the Architectural Review Board be addressed. Essentially, we’re handing it over to them to work out the details or we can wait until it comes back to us. I’m trying to gauge, because we haven’t concluded the 30-day environmental review at this point.

Village Planner Witkowski: I was going to suggest, the next Architectural Review Board meeting is the first Monday of the month. Then the Planning Board would be meeting the third Thursday, and it has to go to the Zoning Board of Appeals after that. So the timing might just work out best where they could get the engineering review done and the architectural review and everything in time for that next meeting. And then you can go ahead and take your actions, and then it would go to the ZBA. So it wouldn’t lose any time, and they can get everything together.

Chairperson Speranza: Does that give everybody a good comfort level?

Boardmember Alligood: I always have trouble [crosstalk] with the information, especially if we’re not holding anything up anyway.

Boardmember Logan: I think there may be ways just to tweak the antenna placement. I think the normal process for evaluating this type of thing is to do a mockup. You set up a plywood version of it, put it up, put it here, and then you move it back a foot and look at it. You test it and you try to optimize it. It looks like there is some flexibility. I realize there are line of sight issues with these antennas and where you’re going to optimize it. But the further these things get set back, I think the less impact they’ll have architecturally; even if it’s 18 inches or 2 feet, and if the pole goes up and makes an L-turn. If we can move these back a little bit I think it’ll help, rather than have these so much in your face and looking like part of the architecture. So I would recommend that the ARB focus on -- maybe you have already, Mitch -- but maybe ways to fine tune this a little bit so we accept this in principle but we really drill down on the final appearance.

Chairperson Speranza: For the details.

Boardmember Alligood: Can I just make one comment? I want to thank the members of the Architectural Review Board for coming tonight. That was very helpful to have direct interaction with you on something that we’re both reviewing.

Mr. Koch: I’d like to just address one more point. I want to say that we’re going to make this a regular event because we need to work more closely. Secondly, something else that I think we would like to consider, and ask you to raise, for our next Architectural Review Board meeting, I think we would like to see -- a review of the option of running the conduit actually through the building with an eye to not doing it on the outside and not contributing to the mess on the outside of the building, and look at that from a feasibility perspective. We know that you’ve accessed the building plans at this point, and I think we need to take a hard look at that. I think there may be some places in the building that we might find -- now having reviewed this -- an opportunity to run from the basement up to the roof. It would be

remiss if we didn't consider this before we just go ahead and pull the trigger on the exterior application.

I think the important thing would be to provide you with the drawings of the building which are coordinated. I don't know whether the architects, Gisolfi, have provided you with digital copies yet. And I also think there's some talk about getting the digital copies, which can go to your architects and they can do overlays and see pretty clearly what opportunities there might be to run it within the building; just to evaluate it, so that we don't overlook something that is a really good strategy. This is what I would ask, and I just wanted to raise it here. Then we'll make an effort to get those drawings to you ASAP.

Chairperson Speranza: Thank you. So we'll see you next month.

3. **Saw Mill Lofts. Request for Site Plan Approval - 12 month Extension for proposed mixed-use development with 54 live / work condominium units and 6 affordable residential condominium units on 7.45 acre parcel on Route 9A (Sheet 22, Parcels P4 and P4A) zoned MUPPD. Concept plan was approved by Village Board of Trustees on 6-20-06.**

Chairperson Speranza: The next item on our agenda is request for a site plan approval extension, GDC.

While Patrick is setting up, let me just let everyone know. There is a flier in our packets about a meeting of the Mobility Advisory Forum, which is taking place tomorrow morning, 10 o'clock, in the county center. There will be representatives from the New York City Department of Transportation concerning their new Select Bus service which they have running on some of the streets in Manhattan.

Mr. Normoyle, how are you tonight?

Patrick Normoyle, Community Development Specialist - GDC: A year has gone fast. First of all, my name is Patrick Normoyle. I'm with Ginsburg Development Companies.

I would like to give a recap in terms of where we have been. I am here tonight to request a 12-month extension to the site plan approval that was granted by the Planning Board last September 20th, 2007. For the benefit of the new Planning Board member, I'll just give a brief recap in terms of what was approved. I think the rest of the Boardmembers do have a pretty good sense. Essentially, we have gotten approval for 60 condo apartments that were live-work type units. Of the 60, six of those apartments were to be affordable. The remaining 54 market-rate units were a live-work type unit, which essentially was a pretty typical one-, two- or three-bedroom layout. But in addition to the regular apartment layout,

there was an additional 400 square feet that was designated as a work suite. And there were certain restrictions in terms of what that work suite could be used for. Essentially, it could not be used as typical living space. It was intended to be used by home-based professionals - whether attorneys, or consultants, or other creative professionals -- where they could have their living space, but then have a separate and distinct work suite. In addition to a direct entrance to the apartment, there was a separate entrance to the work suite. That only applied to the 54 market-rate units. The six affordable units did not have the work suite, but were essentially required to be comparable to the other two-bedroom units. All the affordable units were two-bedroom units. The living space of the affordable units needed to be comparable to the living space of the market-rate two-bedroom units.

There were a number of conditions as part of that approval, which I'm actually going to touch on later. Since we were here last September, GDC, our hope was to actually get shovels in the ground right away. As everyone knows, fall of last year the credit crunch started to become apparent. In addition, the real estate market continued its softening. We did have this unique live-work unit, which we thought would be a compelling option to potential buyers. However, when we were getting closer to beginning construction we decided to conduct several focus groups. We had four done in December of '07 -- two in New York City, two in Westchester -- again, trying to understand the target market, trying to understand what they wanted in these units and to understand what would move them. Unfortunately, what became clear after those focus groups was that this live-work concept which, to our knowledge, is a one-of-a-kind type of approach -- we have not found this type of unit anywhere, anywhere else -- there was just general confusion among potential purchasers of these units in terms of what a live-work unit was. I think once it was explained to potential customers they understood and got it.

However, during these focus groups there were additional concerns raised by potential purchasers; namely, just some practical considerations. Number one, we had screened the people we did the focus groups with so that they would fall into the right target in terms of being interested in living and working out of their home. One question they had was that if they did have a business and they did want to run it out of this unit, what happens if they wanted to expand. There were limitations in terms of the number of employees that could work here. Essentially, other than the residents of the unit, they were allowed to have one other employee. So if their business expanded and was successful, that was a constraint. I think a more important concern was for people who currently were working in their own consultancy or some other type of business of their own. They raised the question what if their business failed. Would they be forced to sell their unit; how could they use this work suite. The regulations are very clear. Essentially, the work suite could not be used for living accommodations. It needed to be restricted to a work situation.

In addition, they raised other concerns. Even though they themselves probably knew how they ran their business and who was visiting their units, they raised questions about their neighbors and security. And if people would have kids, their neighbors perhaps could have clients and other visitors coming to the building, walking through the hall. So there were additional concerns about how we would essentially manage these uses.

Nonetheless, we continued to try to refine this concept and somehow make it work. I came to the Village Board in March of '08 with an alternate proposal to the rec fee that was one of the conditions of approval. Essentially, with the 60 live-work units there was a one-time payment of a \$465,000 recreation fee. We had worked with Village staff, and then brought to the Village Board an alternative arrangement where we were actually proposing to create some ball fields or other types of amenities on-site as a way to provide some recreation amenity to the larger Village, but at the same time also potentially enhance the marketability of this project. The Village Board was not interested.

So after that meeting in March we had another round of focus groups; another two in May, again in Westchester County. We were tweaking the concept, but still trying to stay within the parameters of the concept plan approval. Unfortunately -- again, with the real estate market continuing to soften, and with this challenging, one-of-a-kind concept -- we just did not think it was feasible at this time. Then in July we started exploring the possibility of doing townhomes on the site. Now, townhomes are an as-of-right use allowed under the Mixed Use Planned Development District. I had made a submission, and then a presentation, to the Village Board in mid-August proposing 54 townhomes on the site. The density for both was approved -- the 60 live-work units as well as the townhomes -- and remains the same. We could, as-of-right under the zoning, get 60 townhomes. However, there is a site plan here showing a conceptual plan for the townhome development. At that time, in August, we were proposing 65 -- so a reduction of 10% from the 60 that were approved.

Since that time there were a lot of comments raised at the Village Board meeting. I'll list out a few. Since that time, we've actually refined that concept further. And now what we plan to resubmit to the Village Board is a plan for 52 townhomes, so a reduction of eight units versus what was currently approved. The Village Board and residents that night did raise a number of concerns. Again, for your benefit, this project has been going on for eight or nine years.

Unfortunately, we have an extensive record dating back to even before GDC was involved in terms of a number of issues that were raised. I'll just highlight a few. They won't be a surprise to anybody on the Board. Number one, in no particular order, was student generation. The previous studies for Saw Mill Lofts generally concluded that anywhere from 13 to 16 students would be generated by the previous concept. Trustee Swiderski did point

out that the townhome plan that we are proposing definitely does feel much different than the live-work units that were previously approved, which I think was a very valid point. One of the Trustees or one of the residents asked us to contact Ardsley schools, and since that time I have spoken with the superintendent, Charles Coury, and we will be meeting with him in a few weeks.

Since that time we've already authorized our consultant, RH Consulting, who had done the previous student generation studies for this project. We already authorized him to get the latest data from comparable townhome communities in the Ardsley school district. We're hoping to have that data before we actually meet with Ardsley schools. In addition to the superintendent, I know he's going to invite at least one or two of his boardmembers so we get the benefit of their input.

Chairperson Speranza: I was going to suggest you go through the DEIS because there were a couple of individuals from one of the committees in Ardsley, at Ardsley schools, who had a lot of information and we're very interested in this.

Mr. Normoyle: Joanne Souls, yes. And I think that is who the superintendent was inviting. That was one. So we're going to get the latest information, see what it is, and see how our proposal does compare to that.

Just as a point of record, the original proposal, the 60 units, essentially had six one-bedrooms, six three-bedrooms, and then the balance, 48 units, were two-bedrooms. Under the new 52-unit townhome scenario we're still looking at those numbers but, essentially, we're not going to offer any one-bedrooms. So the proposal to the Village Board essentially I think was proposing 42 two-bedrooms and 10 three-bedrooms. Since that time, that was one of the issues the Village Board had requested that we look at. So the number of three-bedrooms may, in fact, decline.

Another issue raised by Trustees as well as residents was potential traffic impacts. Again, Trustee Swiderski actually expected the traffic impacts to be lessened in some ways, but potentially exacerbated in others. So one intersection he drew attention to was Kent Avenue, Ravensdale and Kent, which was studied previously. That's, again, another one we're going to look at to see what kind of traffic may be heading towards the Village.

Chairperson Speranza: Have you had counters out there recently?

Mr. Normoyle: No.

Chairperson Speranza: I've seen some.

Mr. Normoyle: Not us.

Chairperson Speranza: I thought maybe they were yours.

Mr. Normoyle: We've contacted our traffic engineer, John Collins Engineering, who had done all the previous studies. So they will be updating the studies again, hopefully prior to us making our resubmission to the Village Board. But if not, it'll be covered as part of the

SEQRA process evaluating this new one.

Fiscal impacts were definitely mentioned as well in terms of both tax and cost to both the municipality and the schools. Again, we will update those studies based on the latest plan. As usual -- and everyone knows this -- obviously, filling in the floodplain, potential flooding, and stormwater management have always been critical engineering issues down at this site. I know Jim Metzger had brought that up at the Village Board meeting as well. Fortunately, as well with our Saw Mill Lofts concept, the mid-rise, the proposed plan reduces impervious area over what is there currently. In addition, what is there currently the stormwater does not get treated. It goes directly into the Saw Mill River. So both: under our previous approval, Saw Mill Lofts, we were reducing the area of impervious surface as well as treating the water going into the Saw Mill River. Similarly, the townhome concept, I would expect -- you know, we're still fine tuning it -- but I would expect it, again, reduced the amount of impervious area, which obviously we hope.

Since the time of that meeting we did some additional research, which I'll supplement. Last April, 2007 there was a pretty terrible storm and pretty extensive flooding. I spoke with a woman at the USGS service who essentially keeps data on all storm events. There is essentially a gauge just a little bit to the south in Yonkers, and there's another one to the north in Ardsley, which we're going to get data on. But according to the gauge in Yonkers, that storm event was the worst ever in the 45-year history of the records that they have, and it was the worst by far. I'll get further data that we can provide to the Village Board as well as your Board, but that was actually a 70-year storm event. I know many people say we're having 100-year storm events all the time. Again, we understand the concern -- it's flooding, what will happen to the people who are here, and we're looking into it -- but it's a fact that 100-year storm events are not happening all the time. Nonetheless, the issue is flooding and how we address it.

Previously, with the Saw Mill Lofts concept, the 100-year floodplain elevation is 122 feet. We had raised the parking garages to be 2 feet over that level. They were basically at elevation 124. With the new setup we actually have buildings spread throughout the site. So in terms of the lowest elevation in any of our units, which are just probably a small handful, the lowest elevation will be 128 feet. So 6 feet above the 100-year flood, however probably anywhere from six to twelve units will be at that elevation. All other units will be at 130, 132, and 136. I know that was an issue that Jamie Cameron, when he was on the Board, was very concerned about -- potential flooding in the garage. Now we're raising the lowest floors significantly above that level of concern. Nonetheless, flooding remains an issue that, obviously, will be closely looked at.

Just back to the stormwater management, previously we had these decent-sized, long

buildings. When originally appropriated by the Village Board they were 75 feet wide by 320 feet long. They were two basically mirror-image buildings. Now we're proposing nine different townhome buildings that are spread throughout the site. So it actually lends itself to a more effective stormwater management. What we're looking to do is actually include more vegetative swales, which is a more environmentally sensitive way to treat the stormwater. Again, not designed, but that's definitely the direction we're going in. In terms of meeting all the previous criteria, we will meet or exceed what was done before. Again, a significant improvement over what was done.

In terms of what I think are some of the other benefits of this approach, I think aesthetically I'll show you one board that will compare. Actually, I'll show it to you. In terms of aesthetics, the previous plan basically had those buildings. In the end, the buildings approved by the Planning Board as part of the site plan approval were 300 feet in length and 70 feet wide. They're shown on the lower part of that diagram. To the south of the site is the parcel of land that GDC will donate to the Village, the 1.75 acres, so that's shown as open space. Then you come to the southernmost building and you do have a view corridor, an east-west view corridor, between the two buildings. Then you have the north building and then, again, a little view corridor to the north of that.

Comparing that to the townhome plan -- and, again, we're still tweaking the plan from the time this was created -- with the townhome approach we're going to be able to create many more east-west view corridors. In addition, even at the center of the site you can see that the central view corridor is expanded pretty dramatically so we can have a courtyard in the middle. Again, we think that aesthetically the townhome development will be an improvement over the two relatively long buildings we were proposing before.

In terms of being consistent with the previous approval, our aesthetic approach for the townhome design is basically to create modern, contemporary style townhomes. That would be consistent with the SOM buildings across the street. Again, we're working on that right now, but the approach would be to have a clean, sleek look that works with the buildings across the way.

In addition, just given the changes in the site, we will be able to preserve a few more trees. There were a few that needed to be removed because of where the entrances and exits from the site were. Since this is a different approach, we actually have more flexibility in terms of moving the entrances and exits. In addition, some trees were also eliminated because they ended up in our previous bioretention basins. I think we'll be able to save another one or two because those facilities will be placed in a different area.

Another significant advantage, I think, over the previous plan. Essentially we had, running

parallel to the Saw Mill River Road, an internal drive that was 24 feet wide with parking next to it. Between the Saw Mill River Road and that drive there was about 20 to 22 feet where we could do landscaping. We're essentially eliminating that parallel road, given our approach with the townhomes. So that results in a landscaping area of 45 to 55 feet along Saw Mill River Road. So we can actually do a lot more in terms of landscaping; make the frontage along Saw Mill River Road much more aesthetically pleasing. I know in one of the Planning Board's documents all entrances and exits from the Village and to the Village are important corridors. So I think our previous plan was a good one, but this new plan will obviously give us greater flexibility to do something nicer along Saw Mill River Road.

In addition, we are fewer units. You know that. And one final environmental benefit which Martin Ginsburg feels strongly about that I did not mention at the Village Board meeting, he feels strongly that we should introduce trout at the Saw Mill River at this location. So that's something that he wants to propose. The Saw Mill River at various points is stocked, so that is something we are interested in pursuing and proposing -- significant to Martin.

Anyway, if you have any comments I will dutifully relay.

Chairperson Speranza: Is that in place of the traffic improvements done at Ravensdale?

Mr. Normoyle: No, actually, and good point. I will note the traffic improvements. We had a variety of traffic improvements as part of our conditions.

Chairperson Speranza: And you would still be doing that.

Mr. Normoyle: Yes. I'll note a few of a most significant, but all of the previous conditions we would still uphold. One change: as part of our approval after this project was built we were supposed to do a traffic monitoring study at the corner of Lawrence at Saw Mill River Road. There is a fully operational traffic light in place already. So that was one of the conditions which is now, obviously . . .

Chairperson Speranza: The state DOT let you off the hook.

Mr. Normoyle: However, there were traffic improvements for the Ravensdale/9-A intersection. In terms of other important conditions, we did have this one-time recreation fee of \$465,000 to be paid based on the 60 units. With this new 52-unit scenario, depending on the numbers of two- and three-bedroom units, that would be reduced probably on the order of \$50,000. So somewhere around \$400,000 to \$415,000 would be the payment to the Village in payment of that recreation fee. The recreation fee is essentially \$7,500 per two-bedroom unit; \$10,000 per three-bedroom unit. So depending on the final unit mix, that will result in an approximate fee of \$400,000.

The pedestrian bridge is still shown here. That's one of the conditions, and something that's important to our plan. One change in terms of the number of affordable units, under the previous 60, six would be required; with 52, that essentially would reduce the number of affordable units from six down to five.

I did already mention the donation of the southern piece of land, the 1.75 acres. When we're done with it, at the end of construction, we would have to remove the asphalt parking that's there, plant it with grass, and then turn it over to the Village.

In addition, we're responsible for financially assisting with the trail connection from the Ravensdale Bridge to the South County Trailway. I know the Village had gotten funding through the New York State DOT, and I know that is moving forward at DOT's glacial pace. That will take some time, but we're still on the hook for that condition as well.

So this is essentially what we are planning to propose to bring back to the Village Board. We've been tweaking it, as I've said, since I presented to the Village Board, based on their comments. We're trying to get additional studies done in advance of returning to them just to inform them what we would like to propose, but then we would like to start the concept plan approval process over with the Village Board. As part of the concept plan approval process, the Village Board has the discretion to decide whether or not to set a public hearing on this application. If they do, they have the discretion to refer this matter to the Planning Board for your recommendation. If the Village Board does not elect to move forward with that, then we'll not be able to pursue this townhome project.

So the request tonight for the 12-month extension would essentially be to give us time to pursue this townhome development with the Village Board. The night I did present it they did say that they were open to seeing the proposal; did not make any commitments beyond that. So essentially our next step would be to pull together the concept plan application, submit it to the Village Board, and then let them take the next steps.

Chairperson Speranza: So your request of us tonight is a just-in-case to keep your initial approval alive.

Mr. Normoyle: Yes.

Chairperson Speranza: Questions?

Boardmember Logan: It seems like an entirely fair thing. Given the amount of work all the different boards have gone through to evaluate this thing and educate ourselves about the potential at the site, I think we should definitely provide an extension.

Boardmember Dale: Did you do any focus groups on this product as opposed to the live-work?

Mr. Normoyle: No. Basically, GDC's bread and butter is creating townhome communities in Westchester County. The live-work unit, or live-work approach, was a unique, one-of-a-kind type of approach which we were excited about. We had worked with the Village, obviously, for years in terms of crafting that zoning. But, unfortunately, I think the challenges of communicating this unique product became apparent at the end of last year. Again, we tried to work that and somehow make this concept work, but we're running into

serious challenges.

Boardmember Dale: And the cost of buying a unit in this project as opposed to the earlier one would be equivalent?

Mr. Normoyle: They would be equivalent, essentially, to make the economics work. Yes, they would be equivalent. Essentially we're going to be losing units here. But we do benefit from, frankly, cheaper construction costs with this versus doing a three-story building over a parking garage. That's a significant cost difference. But basically we're looking at the same pricing.

One other thing. We're much more confident in getting townhomes priced for the range we're looking at versus these live-work units which, frankly, were oversized for most people's benefits. Just to give some numbers, the typical two-bedroom unit, which was also going to be the affordable-size units, the living space was 1,326 square feet for the interior units. For the corner units they were a little over 1,400 square feet. That is an efficient and, actually, nice-sized unit for a typical two-bedroom apartment. For the market-rate units we essentially added on another 400 square feet, so our two-bedroom units were 1,700 to 1,800 square feet. The cost of building those units remained the same whether it was 1,350 or 1,750, but the perceived value of that work suite just did not generate a return. So that was another difficulty that we uncovered when we were talking directly with prospective buyers.

Boardmember Dale: And market concern at this point in terms of being able to build this and market it within the next year or so, or two years, of construction?

Mr. Normoyle: Obviously, everyone knows what's happening in the residential real estate market as well as the larger economy. So in addition to wanting to pursue this alternate, even if the alternate wasn't on the table I think we would be here making this request anyway just to basically try to outlast or get further down this market, hopefully to a point where things are starting to recover. But it's definitely a concern.

Chairperson Speranza: I want to make sure that I'm understanding you correctly. You said something that may not be the case, may not be what I was thinking. The site plan approval extension has nothing to do with it. It's the original, what we approved.

Mr. Normoyle: Right.

Chairperson Speranza: You are not saying the extension covers this because it's brand-new. The Board of Trustees accepts it as part of the resubmitted concept plan. Everything starts from scratch, that whole process.

Mr. Normoyle: Exactly. Yes.

Chairperson Speranza: Site plan goes, everything goes out the window. I wanted to make sure that we were clear that it's not [crosstalk].

Mr. Normoyle: Right. And it's possible that if the Village Board does not entertain this alternate next month, then our only option would be to return to this live-work unit, which we have ideas about how to potentially make it better. But we basically would like to preserve this approval so that we could have more time to make that work if there are no

alternatives.

Boardmember Wertz: Let me see if I understand that. Our decision tonight has to do with whether we grant the extension, and the extension does not concern this new project in any way whatsoever. It only would be granted for the provision that if this doesn't work out you'd have an opportunity to go back to the old plan and then continue to pursue that.

Mr. Normoyle: Correct.

Boardmember Dandridge: I have a number of questions. I guess the first one I would have just goes to methodology and why GDC chose to use focus groups to test the viability of this plan.

Mr. Normoyle: I think Martin Ginsburg had certain beliefs in terms of what we could price and sell this for, and the perceived value. Other people within GDC, namely the head of sales and marketing, was throwing up red flags, saying, "I don't think we can sell this at the levels you want. I don't think it's perceived in the way you want." So essentially at that time we reached out to potential buyers in our target market to see whether or not they perceived this product in the way we had hoped. And the conclusion was it was not.

Boardmember Dandridge: Okay. The reason I ask that question is that I am somewhat aware of the amount of time and effort that this board and others in this town have dedicated towards trying to make this site viable. So I'm always interested in once we get to a point of yes, getting shovels in the ground as quickly as possible. The focus groups concern me because they are strictly a qualitative tool. That is, they don't tell you the "if," meaning the viability. They only tell you the "how." It's a sales tool. So what seems to be missing is the deeper, more probative economic analysis that would look at the tri-state area, would look at density patterns, would look at vacancy patterns, would look at household income, and determine whether or not there was a market demand for that type of product in that facility. The focus groups would then tell you, if there was a market demand, how to sell it. It seems like that step was missing, and I would hope that whether it's in this year extension, or however you move forward, that this board and perhaps the Board of Trustees gets that information. Because that speaks to the issue. If there isn't a market demand it doesn't matter how you try to sell it because people just aren't going to buy it. It seems like that's where we are some eight years into this process.

The good news for you guys, and somewhat bad news for the rest of us, is that we are facing a credit crunch. And I guess I want to know, is a year enough? I mean, do you know something I don't that suggests that a year from now the economic environment's going to change to a point that you'd have a greater chance of moving the original, assuming that you're not able to reach an accommodation with the Village Board?

Chairperson Speranza: We can only extend it by a year.

Mr. Normoyle: And if I could have asked for more I would have.

Chairperson Speranza: He's asking another year.

Boardmember Dandridge: I'm asking a deeper, existential question. Because I think what

we don't want to get into is a situation of just an open-ended revolving series of annual extensions, which is just really not cost-effective for us.

Mr. Normoyle: You bring up a good point. The concept plan approval for the live-work units expires June 20th, 2009. Essentially how the zoning ordinance is written, it basically conveys that the project needs to be moving forward -- that's not the exact words -- but let's say I'm back here in a year's time. It would be beyond that concept plan approval date, the June 20th, 2009, and if we are not making essentially beneficial progress we're not entitled to any further extensions.

Boardmember Dandridge: And I appreciate that, although I think that would be to all of our collective loss of opportunity.

My whole point here is that people who are on this board who preceded me, and certainly the Board of Trustees made a decision in their best judgment to try to move forward. So my whole focus now is how do we deliver on the spirit and the intent of other decisions to get something built right away.

The next point I have is that the proposed plan that you're thinking about -- moving to this sort of loft/townhouse concept -- you described in several instances as being a superior concept. I guess I just wonder why we didn't start there eight years ago.

Mr. Normoyle: That's a great question.

Chairperson Speranza: You want to tell him? We did.

Mr. Normoyle: Well, that's even before.

Chairperson Speranza: You weren't involved.

Mr. Normoyle: Of course not.

Chairperson Speranza: It was townhomes.

Boardmember Dandridge: So why aren't we . . .

Mr. Normoyle: That's a great question. But if I could go back, I didn't address earlier, just as far as the market studies, Martin Ginsburg's been doing this for 45 years. He essentially has built in places where people would call him crazy, and essentially has never relied on market studies or market reports. So it basically goes back to gut feel. More recently, I think, some other people in the company have advocated this approach, but basically we don't do market studies on most projects. It's basically where we think we can deliver a superior product. We have a track record, we have a reputation for excellence, and that's usually what is enough.

Now in this case we were faced with something we had never built before, nor has anyone else to our knowledge. So that's what led to us reaching out for focus groups. But just as a general practice, GDC does not use market studies to evaluate whether or not there is enough demand or not. And, fortunately, GDC's been very successful for many years.

Back to the last point. GDC's original proposal on the site was a 157-unit townhome and some mid-rise apartment scenario. Before my time -- but I know that generated significant resistance in terms of the potential effects that development would have on this site -- that was following a proposal by ShopRite to locate a fairly significant supermarket on the site, which was rejected by the Village prior to us coming on the scene.

Boardmember Dandridge: Scope and scale clearly were an issue there.

I guess the last point I would make is, I want to see something there. But you alluded to the fact that this storm we had back in April was a once-in-75-year event. I mean, we're talking about an economic environment that you'd have to go back to the Great Depression to parallel. With all due respect to Mr. Ginsburg, and I think he's a genius, it seems to me that it's time to try something new here. And we really, at least from my standpoint, would want to be more educated to know that there is a demand in the marketplace for whatever it is you're considering so that we're not in a perpetual hold until the economic environment changes.

Mr. Normoyle: If I could also address that, with our new proposal -- as far as this townhome proposal -- I do think it's far superior to what we had proposed before. I think the market for a townhome community in southern Westchester, in close proximity to New York City, there's always going to be some demand for that product. In addition, I'm not aware of any other new product, new townhome communities, that are coming online anywhere in the southern Westchester area. So I think right there this new approach, if we do get approval for it, inherently has some critical advantages and strong points going for it immediately.

In addition, in terms of just making the finances work, building a townhome community, we have nine buildings ranging probably anywhere from three or four units up to eight or nine per building. The economics associated with building those sequentially versus building one big building that has 30 units in it has a much different cost structure and . . .

Boardmember Dandridge: You've got pre-sales and . . .

Mr. Normoyle: And debt service implications. Because if we can basically get through a small townhouse building in about nine months, and already sell and move people in, versus a mid-rise building we're looking more at a 15-month time frame where you're building an entire building before you can move the first people in. So just debt service alone right there is a significant difference, never mind the differential and cost of building three stories over a parking garage versus townhomes.

So our hope is that we can get this townhome proposal approved, and that would definitely address many of the financial issues you're talking about. Again, would we choose to be building this in 2004 or 2005? I'm sure we would.

Boardmember Dandridge: No, I'm with you.

Mr. Normoyle: Right. But we can't do much about it. And we have purchased the land, we have spent a lot of money in terms of the design and approval. So those are sunk costs that we hope to recoup and make some profit on if possible.

Boardmember Dandridge: My last point would simply be that you made some very compelling arguments about the economic flexibility of building nine structures as opposed to two, which basically you can pay as you go because you're building the next one off the one you just sold. That makes a lot of sense, and I suspect the model works in different places. I also suspect that there probably are not very many projects of this scope and scale in southern Westchester.

I would come back solely to the point that I think -- whether it's this body or the public at large or the Trustees -- there is going to have to be a deeper economic analysis. Because you earlier alluded to the fact that you wanted to make sure the buildings were consistent with SOM across the street, that they were going to be sleek and elegant. I think that's a great thing to shoot for. I also know how this works in a down market: where the first thing to go is the aesthetics, the second thing to go is the quality. So I just don't want to see us in a situation where we're dealing with that.

Somehow we have to get to some sort of really, really candid conversation about what that price point really looks like in terms of market viability. Because I have no doubt you can build something there, I have no doubt you can sell something there. The question is, is it what we want.

Boardmember Alligood: There are really two issues before us. One is to comment on the concept of extending your site plan approval on the previous proposal, which was vetted intensively and went through a very long process. The other one is, I think, your goal tonight to gauge our reaction to this new proposal. So two separate things.

On the first one, you were asked at the Board of Trustees meeting . . . you stated that economically this wasn't going to work. And you were asked have you gotten an answer directly from Martin Ginsburg about whether he would go forward with this at all. You said you weren't sure, and you'd get back to the Village on that. So I'm curious about that answer. Because there's no point in us extending this if there's no way you can make this economically work and Martin Ginsburg really doesn't want to go forward with it. Then we should just shut down that project and start all over with something else. That's one question I have for you.

Mr. Normoyle: Let's see. I think that's a difficult question to answer. We obviously have a preferred alternative, but if we're not able to pursue that one we will attempt -- and we'll come back to this board probably with some minor site plan amendments to the plan as approved -- to try to tweak it to make it work better. So I think the answer would be if we

can't pursue the townhome project we will pursue the mid-rise. But again, it's not my call. And Martin can say one thing today, given economic conditions today or last month, and in a month's time it could be a different answer. So that's all I can say tonight.

However, on the point of the site plan extension, if it's not granted and if the Village Board doesn't approve this townhome plan, I could come back in in November, resubmit exactly what was approved in September of '07, and you could reauthorize that site plan. I mean, we could do that. If I waited until January it'll be after the assessment date, I think, for the Village. And actually we could potentially get a reduction in assessment, but I don't think we want to jump through those hoops unnecessarily.

Boardmember Alligood: Then on the other piece -- in terms of just giving some feedback on this concept -- I guess I just have one main question for you, which is, as part of your concept plan submittal you need to provide some rationale for how this fits into the legislative purpose and intent of the MUPDD zone, which is -- I'll just briefly put out the one sentence that summarizes it -- "*to achieve environmentally sensitive, economically beneficial, and socially desirable development that is more creative in its mixture of compatible land use and design than is possible under more rigid, conventional zoning regulations.*" So I guess I just go back to that basic question: how does *that* proposal fit that legislative intent. There's not a mix of uses.

Mr. Normoyle: Oh, yes, I think there is.

Boardmember Alligood: It's not particularly creative. I'm not sure if it's socially desirable I mean, I'm not saying I'm against it. I'm just saying you have to go back to square one in terms of how do you make your case.

Mr. Normoyle: Yes, right.

Boardmember Alligood: You know, I haven't heard that piece.

Mr. Normoyle: I'd love to gauge your reaction tonight but, truthfully, my request was to get the 12-month site plan extension. The Village Board, if I can get their acceptance of this, then I would be back in front of you.

But if I could just comment on that, there's a few adjectives there. "*Environmentally sensitive*": I think I highlighted a number of ways where this will be superior. The stormwater management obviously is a significant improvement over what is there currently. When we institute the traffic improvements, dramatic increase in terms of the effectiveness of the Ravensdale station. Currently, according to the SFEIS from 2006, there was basically a 5-minute wait coming westbound down Jackson Avenue. With the traffic improvements, that would be reduced to 70 seconds.

In terms of other beneficial environmental impacts, as you approved -- I know you were particularly interested in the vegetative plantings along the Saw Mill River bank, where we plant fruits and berries for small woodland creatures and birds and bees -- we're doing that.

In addition, I think we maintain that with this proposal. With the townhome proposal we also create a 45- to 55-foot band of landscaping along Saw Mill River Road, which again is a very significant entrance to the Village. I think that's a significant improvement in terms of the frontage over what's there currently; even over what would have been done as part of Saw Mill Lofts. In terms of other environmental benefits, I think the new approach with our stormwater management -- trying to use these vegetative swales -- will be an improvement over what we had proposed as part of the Lofts concept.

Boardmember Alligood: It was the mix of uses and creativity. To me, the environmental piece, that's going into the technicalities.

Mr. Normoyle: Right. Then in terms of mix of uses, previously we had residential, work, and recreational uses. Here, we basically have eliminated the work use from those three uses. So essentially you have a residential community as well as the recreational benefits of having a new trailhead. As you all know, if you go down to Farragut Avenue there are 11 spaces. They're packed Saturday and Sunday mornings. People are parking out on the street. This will create a new trailhead with 10 spaces; the pedestrian bridge, another linkage to the trailway; the dedication of 1.75 acres of open space, which is up to the Village to program. So those are all, I think, significant recreational benefits, in addition to our contribution to the connection from the Ravensdale Bridge to the trailway.

So I think we have significant recreational benefits, too, and those would be the two uses I point to. Essentially, the only one we're eliminating is the work use.

Chairperson Speranza: I want to stop this piece of the discussion because should this plan move forward I believe we're going to have lots of opportunities to ask the questions.

One thing, just as you move forward with this, pull out the chart that was done.

Mr. Normoyle: Oh, yes. I've already looked at it.

Chairperson Speranza: In the environmental review for all of the different scenarios, certainly that was something that helped in the decision-making process.

Mr. Normoyle: Yes. One last point. Eva, you mentioned -- as far as the mix of uses and how this proposal was appropriate -- and I was asked the same thing at the Village Board. Numerous residents mentioned it. Townhomes are allowed as-of-right as part of the zoning, so I think that would be a good question back to the Village Board. You know, they had the legislative intent of the zoning. One of their allowed as-of-right uses was townhomes; nothing more, townhomes. I'd love to hear their rationale for why they approved it because, clearly, they thought it fit.

Boardmember Dandridge: Can I just make a follow-up point? This really does strike me as an issue of first impression, the same time that you want to gauge our response to this, you also want to sort of preserve your ability to go forward. I think at least from my end, and maybe a little for you guys -- I certainly can't speak for anyone else -- our first impression is that this is significantly different than what a lot of time, money, resource, and rationale was

built in to approve. And that we're in a significantly different economic environment.

So I think, at least -- from my very superficial analysis at this stage, given that I'm the newbie here -- the first impression is, from my standpoint, we're dealing with a whole nother level of transparency and information that needs to be presented, starting with whether or not Mr. Ginsburg, the principal, is prepared to do this project as originally zoned and approved. And if the answer to that is no, given market conditions or others, that's the first impression at least I would like to hear. Because, you know, being put on this board I'm accountable to the Trustees, I'm accountable to other taxpayers -- least of whom is my wife, who's going to sit there and say, "Why would we spend another dollar, or why would we spend another moment of time, going through this if it's a 'no' from the developer's point of view, given the economic environment?" So I feel like the first impression is we need to know what is "yes," what is "no," and what you think you guys can actually do.

Chairperson Speranza: I think that we need to make a decision on granting the extension -- whether or not we're going to do this. Because at this point, it expires before the next meeting. So that's the first decision that we, as a board, have to make.

Mr. Metzger: I was at the Trustees meeting.

Chairperson Speranza: Can you just keep your comments to the extension?

Mr. Metzger: I'm going to keep it strictly to the approval of the extension.

Chairperson Speranza: Excellent, thank you.

Mr. Metzger: At the Trustees meeting -- and I am not reading quotes, but this is pretty general -- what Patrick presented was "we struggled to make the original plan work. We did six focus groups. The reality was, it was not pragmatic, the target market was not interested. We have concerns about future marketability." Who's going to want to buy these units if you decide to sell? And then how would other users use those live-work units, and how would that impact other people in the building.

It was pretty clear that there was never an intention to move forward with the original project. I just present that to you as a basis for what you are about to make your decision on. At the last meeting it seemed a lot more definitive that that project never had an intention of moving forward. Thank you.

Mr. Normoyle: If I could respond, I spoke with Marianne Stecich in June -- and Patty, I'm not sure if we ever did connect -- about coming to the Planning Board with a site plan amendment with the prior.

Chairperson Speranza: Yes.

Mr. Normoyle: Essentially, I have a list of site plan amendments against the original 60-unit proposal that if this townhome concept does not go forward that's what I would bring back in. Basically shifting . . . you know, as part of these focus groups people commented that the parking basically faced into the building. They thought it looked like a motel or a hotel. That was one of the, I would say, minor site plan changes we were going to do. We

were going to shift the parking away from the building so they'd actually face Saw Mill River Road. There were some other minor site plan amendments like that, as well as a different configuration within the building -- which is, frankly, not a site plan issue, but does pertain to the façade and elevations. But we had some other changes planned for the interior of the building that would address some of the comments that were raised.

So we had every intention of moving forward with the previous plan through June -- it was July, as I stated earlier, where . . . I had proposed doing townhomes to Martin in June. He said no. A few weeks later, with the market continuing to decline, is when he agreed to consider exploring this as an option. So we had every intention of making this work. That's why we did six focus groups; that's why we did two as late as May of '08 -- really struggling trying to make this work. So again, when faced with . . . if this townhome development does not go forward, then we would move forward with the mid-rise.

Cindy Travis, 427 Warburton Avenue: I'm a little torn myself because part of me thinks that giving this extension is a little bit of a reward for some failure. And I'm not really sure why that would be the best intent here, except one of the things about this possible future project is that it doesn't address where all these people are going to drive to to commute and how they're going to deal with where they're going to park somewhere on the riverfront to get on a train. The whole reason I think the first project was moved where it went is because these people were going to stay where they were and not create a battle zone down at the train station.

So part of me thinks give them 12 more months to make it work because otherwise we're going to have 50, 60 cars playing road warrior down at the riverfront trying to park. I don't really know what the answer is because the second version is going to really make a mess. Unless there's no gas, and then everybody has to work out of the home anyway.

Chairperson Speranza: Remember, we are not at a point where we are giving any kind of approval whatsoever to a townhome. So it doesn't necessarily mean the alternative . . . that those are the two choices.

Ms. Travis: No, I understand. But -- in answer to maybe your question or somebody's question, maybe Eva's -- the reason I thought this person went ahead was because it kept people in a location and didn't create more commuter traffic. That's why the work was so viable. So I don't know what you're going to vote on, but I just think this is a real big dilemma.

Mr. Normoyle: I know you just want to deal with the extension, but that was one of the issues that was raised at the Village Board: parking at the railroad station. I mentioned traffic impacts, subsumed under that. Susan Maggiotto was working on a Saturday. I had already inquired with her about what the status of the parking is down at Hastings station. We heard it was one of the chief issues with moving to a townhouse development, so it's something that if we do move forward it's clearly one of the issues that needs to be

addressed. The previous proposal, the live-work units, was definitely billed as a zero-commute. Obviously this would be different. So we do want to know where those commuters would go. Some, obviously, would go to the railroad station, some potentially other locations. I've already started pursuing that. Again, I know that's not on the extension, but just to know that that concern registered and we're trying to address it as part of the new proposal.

Boardmember Logan: Patty, could I just add one thing before we ask for a vote? I have been looking at this thing for eight years, and some of us have been doing it more than that. And we remember the big box, and ShopRite. We also remember all the time that the residents have put into critiquing this. There's the traffic studies, the time the Board has put in it, the Village Board, ourselves. I'm not saying this is where we should go or should approve it or anything. But I think in terms of the extension, we have so much invested and there's so much benefit potential to the Village in terms of affordable housing, which we've struggled to get in this Village. We have five or six units of affordable housing here, we have a ball field, we have a recreational fee, we have a bridge, we have access to the trailway.

I would just caution anybody here about to vote to not shoot from the hip on this thing, to duly deliberate. I think we should err on the side of giving additional consideration to this rather than just sort of killing this tonight. I think that would be a real mistake. There are, possibly, many flaws with this project. I don't like the fact that it doesn't have a mix. But I don't think we're here to critique this particular plan right now.

Chairperson Speranza: That's right.

Boardmember Logan: We're here to give this due consideration over time, and really vet this thing thoroughly. So I would encourage us all to approve this extension.

Boardmember Dale: I would add that to force the developer to make a decision to go forward with a project that they have serious concerns about at this point, and end up having a project that doesn't sell and becomes a ghost town sitting on the edge of the Village, is worse than giving them the opportunity and the time to reconsider how to either make that project better or to come up with an alternative that is acceptable to the Village. I think the extension is really necessary and in the best interest of the Village.

Chairperson Speranza: We can move if anybody's ready to move. Or you want to still speak?

Boardmember Wertz: I would be ready to do that. I'm prepared to vote to grant the extension. As you will remember, I was not greatly in favor of this project in the first place and I'm not sure I would be in favor of the new proposal that's being considered. But I agree with what everybody said. That this board, and even the Village Board, though through a very difficult and divided process, has committed the Village to this project. And at this point, given the expenditure of time and effort and money and everything else, I think it deserves the opportunity to be played out over another year. I think that's nothing, given all

we've been through. So I would certainly be prepared to give the extension.

Boardmember Alligood: I don't understand what purpose granting the extension has in terms of either enabling this project to move forward or not.

Chairperson Speranza: Because if the site plan lapses it's over, it's done. It doesn't exist anymore. To do anything, you go through the entire process again. To do anything. I think that's a downside.

Boardmember Alligood: But I guess I'm struggling with what message we're getting here. A big part of the presentation is about how that concept is not going to work. It's not going to work, so no matter what the applicant is saying they need to make some significant changes to the project. Whether it's still going to have some work component but be configured differently, no matter what they are going to have to significantly change the project. I mean, that's the message I've gotten, based on the presentations you've made over the past month. I guess I'm just wondering what is the purpose of extending something that we all in this room and beyond have now been informed is not going to go forward as presented. No matter what, it's going to have to go through a whole vetting process because it's going to be significantly changed.

Chairperson Speranza: I think it's Board deliberation.

Boardmember Alligood: I guess that's my comment.

Chairperson Speranza: My sense of it is if this lapses everything starts from scratch. I'm not sure that this revised plan is the way to proceed. I would like to think that there is still the opportunity for a great deal of the original Saw Mill Lofts concept to remain, given the economy the way that it is right now; given the initial focus groups. Do I think that it's going to come out as exactly the site plan we've approved? No, but I'm not ready to give up on all of the work and everything that was done to begin a process anew for something that I'm not real keen on initially. I don't know if things will be any more confident, but I don't know that it's a decision that can be made. It's a decision that has to be made tonight. Whether or not we approve it or whether or not we grant the extension, it has to be.

Boardmember Dandridge: I would just make two points. I don't think we have much choice here, given all that you've said. But my concern, the reason I asked those questions, is that I suspect we're in this position because of what I can see again are some idiosyncratic, methodological approaches to development which work most of the time but didn't work in this case. So I think we as a board need to speak with one voice because this is going to raise a lot of questions across town and I would hate for us to be divided on this.

I would also say I feel like we were backed into a corner here and I don't think that's really going to carry much water moving forward because there are some things with respect to traffic, Village resources -- some real basic issues that are a part of every development project that I've ever been involved with, starting with the market analysis -- that just weren't here that would have sent up a red flag sooner. So that's my view. We don't have a choice. We need to do this no matter what because of all the time that's been invested. But if we

don't impose some greater rigor and structure, we're just going to be back here for a different set of reasons later. And then I think we won't speak with a unanimous voice, is what I'm trying to say. It would be divided in our vote as well as in how some of us may feel right now.

Chairperson Speranza: So is someone ready to make a motion?

On MOTION of Boardmember Logan, SECONDED by Boardmember Dale, the Board resolved to approve a 12-month extension plan.

ROLL CALL VOTE:	AYE	NAY
William Logan	X	
Bruce Dale	X	
Fred Wertz	X	
Eva Alligood		X
Ed Dandridge	X	
Patricia Speranza	X	

Chairperson Speranza: Come back soon.

Mr. Normoyle: I hope to return. Thank you again, and we'll see you hopefully.

4. Urban Green. 422 Warburton. Update on construction progress.

Chairperson Speranza: Urban Green, 422 Warburton Avenue, they're not coming.

Mr. Metzger: Warburton Avenue, 422, has been refusing to show up at meetings. They haven't been to Trustees meetings, they now haven't shown up at this meeting. I managed to corner Steven Tilly, and his best guess is we're now looking at November for the affordable housing. It would be nice if somebody in the Village could actually get an answer on that.

Male Voice XXX: Jim, that's not true. They told the tenants that they're still on . . .

Mr. Metzger: That's not what Steven Tilly told me the day of the flooding.

Male Voice XXX: If you talk to [off-mic] downstairs, they're about to give them a CO.

Mr. Metzger: I hope so. It would be nice if we actually heard from 422, from Eric Anderson. Thank you.

VI. Discussion

1. River Town House LLC. Peter Wolf will make a preliminary presentation of proposal for two fee simple lots at 433 Warburton Avenue.

Chairperson Speranza: We were asked to have a preliminary presentation. You really

took your chances coming in as the last agenda item, but come on up here. I know you wanted to just run an item by us. This is a property down on Warburton Avenue which we're familiar with. It backs up on Ridge Street. You've heard about this before.

Peter Wolf, 1 Scenic Drive: Good evening. At this late hour I shall be mercifully short. We're here to have permission to make two fee simple lots. If you'll remember, we have a two-family home on two tax lots, and what we're trying to do is to accomplish going from one owner to two owners. We came before this board, obtained approval to rehab the two-family house, making two dilapidated fire trap railroad flats into two duplex townhouses.

The project's moving along to fruition. It's now framed, we're about on the roof this week. We're now requesting that each unit be made a single-family fee simple lot. There's strong precedent for this in the neighborhood. There are four units at Ridge Street which were granted a few years ago. And more recently four units at the Warburton Avenue site, 491 to 493, were also granted to be single-family fee simples. Incidentally, it is also consistent with the Village policy to prefer fee simple lots. The advantage for the Village -- well, the biggest advantage -- is that they'll get much more tax revenue from two landowners than they will from one. The building will be appraised as two separate homes instead of one two-family house. Value, presumably selling price, will be higher for the two fee simple lots and, consequently, the taxes for the Village from this particular structure will also be higher. And, of course, the Village will get this increased revenue every year. It should be noted that this would not involve anything to do with any of the density, it will not change. And there'll be no additional Village services that will be rendered for the increased taxes.

We've had a surveyor come to this lot. If you'll remember, it's a double lot vertically. The lower lot will be 81 by 25, the upper lot will be nearly 72 by 25. This is a preliminary meeting. We will supply you with all the data and all the plans well in advance of next month's meeting. So we're here as a preliminary request for making this into two fee simple lots.

Chairperson Speranza: There's no way this property complies as two separate lots within zoning. It requires a subdivision.

Mr. Wolf: Essentially it is a subdivision. In other words, it originally was two lots -- it's listed as two tax lots -- but when there's one owner it gets merged and is looked upon as being one lot, even though it's listed as two. So we're going back to the two lots. We're moving the property line about 6 feet, so that instead of being 75 and 75 -- or it's actually 152, say 76 and 76 -- moving it about 5 or 6 feet so it's 81 and 72. Because that's the way the structure is.

Chairperson Speranza: Okay. But it won't be compliant with the zoning requirements, the minimum lot area.

Mr. Wolf: No.

Chairperson Speranza: That's something that we would have to . . .

Mr. Wolf: Well, neither do any of the others.

Chairperson Speranza: I know.

Mr. Wolf: And neither does it exist . . . as it is, it needed variances.

Chairperson Speranza: So at our next meeting you certainly will need . . .

Mr. Wolf: A full set of plans, and we'll have that done. It's being done by the surveyor now. They'll be submitted well in advance of the next meeting. Any questions?

Mr. Metzger: First, on the outset, I love the idea of the Village getting more taxes. I think it's a great idea. I'm curious to know, the other buildings that Peter referenced are all done vertically front to back on the site, and this building is done horizontally. I don't know if there's any difference in terms of how the property gets subdivided in that respect. It's just something I'd be curious about.

But I also have a question. Was this discussion noticed properly? I got an email this afternoon.

Chairperson Speranza: No, there's no action. We had a little space, once we heard Urban Green wasn't going to be here. We had some space.

Mr. Metzger: I also want to say that the building is looking very handsome on the lot. I'm very happy with the changes that are happening on the lot so far, and I wish that there were more people taking this sort of care in design in proposing new structures in the Village. I'm assuming that it's going to look beautiful when it's finished.

2. Miscellaneous

Chairperson Speranza: Two positions that I need to talk about. Since Dave Hutson is no longer on the Board, he was our liaison to the LWRP, Local Waterfront Revitalization Plan, so we will need someone to take on his role as the Planning Board member to that committee.

Also, the Comprehensive Plan Committee. The Board of Trustees had requested, or had approved, a non-voting member from the Planning Board to that committee. Now my understanding, Angie, is that it's got to be a full committee member.

Village Planner Witkowski: In the state enabling legislation it says that a special committee can be established to do the comprehensive plan and that it should include at least one Planning Board member. So that's why there needs to be one that's actually on the committee.

Chairperson Speranza: We had been kind of tag-teaming the coverage of the meetings for awhile. If anyone is willing to take it on, they meet essentially two Wednesdays a month.

Trustee Goodman, 28 Ashley Road: I think the Board of Trustees is reserving the right to further discuss this in personnel. So before you make any decisions, I'm respectfully requesting this be hashed out amongst the Board.

Chairperson Speranza: That's fine. Okay, so we'll just keep trying to cover them as we can.

Boardmember Alligood: Are you asking for expressions of interest in either one?

Chairperson Speranza: Yes, so think about it.

Boardmember Dale: How often are the meetings?

Village Planner Witkowski: The LWRP has not been meeting a lot. We've been at kind of a standstill because there were some things that are being reviewed up at the Department of State. I think they will probably start up again fairly soon, but I can check with Phil Karmel. When the LWRP committee was meeting, it was like once every couple of months most recently. So it's not like a monthly meeting. It's about once every two months.

Chairperson Speranza: Anything else going on with affordable housing?

Boardmember Dale: Not really. We're basically focusing on the choice of residents and getting the residents in. Then there's the fact that the Town of Greenburgh hasn't made its decision yet and doesn't even have a process in place yet, which is a concern because it's lost income to the property. They're just pursuing the other sites that we've been looking at, but there's really no forward movement on anything.

Chairperson Speranza: Anything else, anyone? Ed, I hope we didn't keep you too late tonight, first night.

Boardmember Dandridge: No, and I suspect that the late hour is somewhat my fault. So I look forward to getting up to speed.

Chairperson Speranza: Okay, nothing else?

VII. Adjournment

On MOTION of Boardmember Alligood, SECONDED by Boardmember Dandridge with a voice vote of all in favor, Chairperson Speranza adjourned the Regular Meeting at 11:30 p.m.