

**VILLAGE OF HASTINGS-ON-HUDSON, NEW YORK
PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARING
MAY 20, 2010**

A Regular Meeting and Public Hearing was held by the Planning Board on Thursday, May 20, 2010 at 8:15p.m. in the Municipal Building Meeting Room, 7 Maple Avenue, Hastings-on-Hudson, New York, 10706.

PRESENT: Chairperson Patricia Speranza, Boardmember William Logan, Boardmember Jamie Cameron, Boardmember Eva Alligood, Boardmember Bruce Dale, Boardmember Rhoda Barr, Village Attorney Marianne Stecich, and Building Inspector Deven Sharma

I. ROLL CALL

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

April 15, 2010

Chairperson Speranza: Comments, modifications? No? Wow.

On MOTION of Boardmember Logan, SECONDED by Boardmember Alligood with a voice vote of all in favor, the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of April 15, 2010 were approved as presented.

III. NEW BUSINESS

- 1. Public Hearing on the application of Barbara Pichler for the renewal of Permit for Accessory Apartment at 33 Devon Way-Sheet 43A/Block 766/Lot 10 &11.**

Chairperson Speranza: The next order of business is an accessory apartment renewal for property located at 33 Deven Way. As I said, it's a renewal and there are no waivers required. Deven, are all the mailings in order?

Building Inspector Sharma: That's what I've been given to understand by my office, yes. All the mailings are in order.

Chairperson Speranza: Mailings in order, and there have been no complaints or changes?

Building Inspector Sharma: I haven't heard any. We haven't recorded any complaints.

Chairperson Speranza: Is there anyone here who wishes to speak about the application? This is a public hearing. We are in a public hearing right now. No? Then we'll close the public hearing. Boardmember comments or questions? No? Then is a motion for action on the renewal?

On MOTION of Boardmember Dale, SECONDED by Boardmember Cameron with a voice vote of all in favor, the Board resolved to approve accessory apartment renewal located 33 Deven Way

2. Review and approval of Steep Slopes application of Mark Vandersande for a new house to be constructed at 31 Brandt Street.

Chairperson Speranza: The next item on our agenda is the review of steep slopes application for property at 31 Brandt Street. This is for a new home to be conducted there, and is before us in accordance with the steep slope ordinance in the Village. Deven, do you want to speak on this or introduce this?

Building Inspector Sharma: There's not much to say. It's a steep slope application for a new home at 31 Brandt Street. I reviewed the documents and found them to be substantially compliant. That's it.

Chairperson Speranza: OK. Who's here to speak on this? You have a presentation? You'll walk us through what it is you intend to do.

Frank Visconti, architect – 31 Brandt Street: I have Mark Vandersande, who's the owner of the property.

Chairperson Speranza: Hi. Welcome.

Mr. Visconti: And I have Peter Gregory, who's our civil engineer, also attending. Should I put them over there, or bring that over here?

Chairperson Speranza: Yes. We have copies of the plan, so you can put them on the easel so the folks in the audience...

Building Inspector Sharma: Hold on. We're going to give you another microphone. It's very important that you speak in the microphone so everything gets recorded.

Mr. Visconti: I guess it's working. This is a 100 foot by 150 foot lot on Brandt Street. It's actually uniquely empty ... is this good?

Chairperson Speranza: Can we raise up the feet, the holders?

Boardmember Cameron: You could just put it back in the corner, though.

Boardmember Dale: Push it further back.

Mr. Visconti: I know what these look like so I don't need to look at them. Anyway, this is a 100 foot by 150 foot property on Brandt Street. It's a uniquely empty lot that has no structure on it right now. And it has a 24 percent slope from the street straight up to the top of this. North is actually in this direction on here. So it's sloping east to west, and it has a great view down towards the east. What we are proposing is a 2,000 square foot house. That's basically a 30-foot by 30-foot footprint on the lot. The site plan shows the footprint of the house here. It's 31.5 feet by 32.3 feet. It has an existing driveway, which we are planning to retain, with a parking area here that presently has an open car port which we're proposing to demolish. Then the house is sited up here behind this tree that exists. The only things that we're proposing on the site other than the cube of the house is a set of stairs that go up and into the entrance here. The disturbance is then limited to 10.7 percent, which is what I had here in these calculations. The building coverage proposed is 6.7 percent. The development coverage, including the driveway, is 14.5 percent. And the steep slope disturbance – which I'm excluding the driveway because it's already there, it's not going to be disturbed – is 10.75 percent. In the end, it's well below the maximum allowable disturbance of 35 percent.

Chairperson Speranza: You said 10.75 percent?

Mr. Visconti: Yes, and that excludes the driveway. With the driveway which, again, is existing, it's 14.5 percent. This is an impervious set of steps that goes up to a little landing up here, and the house is situated there. The idea of the house is to provide essentially two floors, with a full basement below. We did some soil borings on the site to determine where the rock might end, because there's always rock under the soil, which was about 4 feet below in most of the cases. But we located the house in a certain point where we feel that the ledge dropped off to minimize the amount of harsh excavation underneath the house itself. But it has an 8-foot finished ceiling basement. Then we're proposing a wood deck that is at the front of the house facing east. It has an inverted roof that collects water at the two ends. Peter Gregory's office, from Keane Coppelman, submitted the stormwater management plan that shows that we would be ... actually I don't show it on this drawing, but he's showing two drywells that collect water at the more accessible part of the site, which is off the street, collecting. And if you'd like him to explain that, I think he would be better than I would. But it's collecting the rainwater from the site as well as from the building. We did a section here which shows a section through the stairs. This sort of

bold line is where we did some probes to find some of the bedrock, or the ledge below. And the basement is basically shown with this dotted line here. Then we're proposing two stone landscape walls here. We had decided that it would be more appropriate to do a dry stacker, just a mortar sort of landscaped stone wall, rather than concrete retaining walls. We just did it in a gentle way to try to bring the grade down a little bit more towards the back of the house. It's uniquely a house that's proposed to be built out of SIP Panels, which is a structural insulated panel system. Every component of this modest house, which is a four-bedroom house, has been approached in a green manner. I know that's something that you guys will be talking about later on. The systems for construction of the building are all in that vein. And in the same way, we're proposing a very small footprint, very little disturbance in terms of square footage, and a very simple building to build; which is supposed to be basically erected in a week or less. Because these SIP Panels are actually made in a factory, with all the windows cut out, including the roof panels, and then they get shipped to the job and then put together in a matter of days. So it's an interesting project, a unique project for Hastings, and a modest project, too. Which I'm actually really excited about because I think it really fits in with the scale of the houses in the neighborhood. As far as the site goes, we're minimizing the footprint within the 100 foot by 150 foot lot. That's what I can say. If you have any other questions?

Chairperson Speranza: I'd like to hear a little bit more about the stormwater, how the stormwater is handled. Traditionally – well, actually it's required by our code – there is a statement from the licensed engineers stating that the slope is being disturbed to the minimal extent possible. So there are some things which we would need before this could be approved.

Peter Gregory, Keane Coppelman Engineers, PC: I can provide that to you. Basically, we have developed a stormwater pollution plan in accordance with your section, I believe it's 250, in your town code. And we've looked at trying to treat and mitigate the stormwater runoff that's being generated from our new impervious surface. It looks like, from what we've calculated here, that there will be an increase in the impervious surface on the site. It's approximately 1,100 square feet, almost 1,200 square feet. Our stormwater system will capture and convey into a subsurface system approximately 1,400 square feet of impervious surface, which will account for the new impervious surface associated with the roof and the walkway that's going from the driveway up to the side of the house. The idea is that we will have a direct connection from our downspouts into our infiltration system. And the infiltration system will be preceded by a pre-treating basin which will allow for settling of any debris or sediment that may be captured between those two points – between our structure and our infiltration system. The idea would be that that subsurface system will be able to handle our storm events for both a small event for water quality, 98th percentiles, and we've also sized it to accommodate a 100-year storm event. So we are capturing the differential increase in the stormwater runoff, considering our predevelopment condition into our post development condition that we have. To help minimize the amount of water that we'll be contributing into our system, we are

proposing that a swale be installed uphill of our proposed retaining walls that will divert any surface runoff that is passing through our area that will divert around so it won't have an impact on our house site and our stormwater system. In the event that our system is inundated and can't handle the storm event, then there would be an overflow – high-level overflow – that will be treated with some form of a dissipater which will break up the flow if our underground system can't handle that discharge amount.

Chairperson Speranza: I'm looking at it, and I can see the diversion swale on the plan. It looks like it crosses over the property line. I just want to make sure that...

Mr. Gregory: It's going to turn, and we're going to show it turning and coming down at the property lines. Nothing that we're proposing will be directed onto adjacent properties.

Chairperson Speranza: OK. Because you do have ... it is shown...

Mr. Gregory: There's another arrow right there that's showing it. This is the property line over here. These are our setback points.

Chairperson Speranza: Got it.

Boardmember Alligood: Can you clarify ... when you say underground system, you're planning to take all the runoff and treat it on-site, or you have something underground?

Mr. Gregory: It will be subsurface. There will be seepage pits or drywells that would be installed toward the front of the property at a relative low point on the site. And then from our drain system, it would be conveyed into that underground system. It would be redirected back into the ground. And in the event that it can't handle what's coming through there, there would be a high-level overflow that would let it pass through and discharge out to the street.

Boardmember Alligood: Out to the street. And what are the chances that that would happen, in your calculations?

Mr. Gregory: Well, probably not very likely because of the capacity of the line that we're providing underground. I believe that for a 100-year storm event we would need to provide in the vicinity of 400 cubic feet of volume, and I think we're around 530 or 540 cubic feet, based on our calculations. So the idea is that whatever stormwater goes in on a regular basis would be infiltrated back into the ground. And the likelihood of that filling up to that extent and overflowing is probably not very likely that it's going to happen that way. In the event that it does, the system would have some sort of a dissipation structure that won't allow concentrated discharge that could scour and cause some sort of sediment transport out into the street.

Boardmember Cameron: I know the driveway and the garage are already there. You will be taking the garage down and, unfortunately, from my looking at the driveway it is a runway for water just to come right down the hill. I was wondering whether you would consider putting one of those built-in gutters in the driveway putting the water off to the – I guess it would be – to the side onto your property so it wouldn't go down the hill and into the street. That's the real source of, I think, what you're going to get on a continuing basis going down that street.

Mr. Gregory: It will.

Boardmember Cameron: Once you take the garage out – because I don't know which way the garage ... the shed is, I think, leaning backwards so it would actually presently probably put it onto your neighbor's property. But now it's going to be on your property. I think it's leaning back.

Mr. Gregory: We can take a look at that. And what we could probably do is create something that would intersect whatever it comes down to, a certain point, that would still allow us to direct it into our system.

Boardmember Cameron: Right. A diagonal – sort of one of those gutters going off to the right as you're going down the hill, and it sends it over toward your system. I think keeping the water on your property's good anyway. The other question I have, as part of your system you're putting this house – which I like the house – you're putting it just above this rather wonderful, unique tree. And I get a little worried that the water which the tree's presently getting, which is coming down the hill towards the tree, will be interrupted by this. I'm rather hoping you'll be able to take that center gutter or something and put a couple of drywells near the tree to get the water there. I'm worried for the owner that he'll see the tree die.

Mr. Gregory: There was some concern about protecting that tree. So we want to just be careful on what activity takes place around it so that we don't damage or compromise its root system. But if we can get closer, I would...

Boardmember Cameron: Or just get some gutters that end in there. Because otherwise, I think you're losing the natural downslope of the water by this house that's sitting just above blocking the water coming down the hill.

Mr. Gregory: We can definitely look into that, as well.

Chairperson Speranza: Right. But you can't have it coming down so fast.

Boardmember Cameron: No, you can't. I understand.

Chairperson Speranza: That's a good point.

Boardmember Cameron: Because the tree's rather wonderful. It's sort of a unique feature.

Boardmember Dale: Were there any structures on this property prior ... there was a house on this property prior to this that was demolished?

Mr. Visconti: No, there was actually a pool. This was a lot that was adjacent. It was actually one large lot that belonged to the house on the south side and they, I guess, after they ... well, anyway, they ended up selling that portion of their property off as a lot.

Boardmember Dale: So your client's buying it directly from the former owner?

Mr. Visconti: Yes.

Boardmember Dale: Because it's clearly been landscaped and improved.

Mr. Visconti: Yes, it's a pretty lot with a lot of exposure.

Boardmember Dale: It's quite beautiful.

Mr. Visconti: To even mention that the roof form, one of the major slopes is facing south so we actually have an 8 kilowatt solar panel that's already been designed on that roof. We've actually submitted it to NYSERDA and the whole thing. So it's got great exposure to the sky.

Chairperson Speranza: OK. Well, this is a public ... well, no, it's not a public hearing. It's a noticed hearing. Is there anyone here in the audience who wishes to speak about the application or has questions of the applicant? No? OK. Bill, anything? Rhoda?

Boardmember Logan: Well, I think this is a real exemplary design. I think it's excellent. It's got a minimum footprint. It also has a minimum surface area to volume ratio because it approximates a cube to take advantage of the south-facing exposure to get some solar radiation. That water's managed. It'd be nice if there were more houses in Hastings that had the potential to be as effective as this one.

Chairperson Speranza: Nothing else?

Boardmember Dale: Fully in agreement with what Bill just said. I know it's a beautiful site, and I think they've picked about the right spot to build, creating the minimum amount of disturbance and yet providing the proper environment and privacy for the owner.

Boardmember Alligood: I agree. I really like the designs. I wanted to compliment that. and also say that I thought the stormwater pollution prevention plan was very thorough. So I appreciate that.

Chairperson Speranza: Marianne, did you have anything?

Village Attorney Stecich: No. Just if the Board is disposed to give the approval today that you make it conditional on providing the certification in paragraph 6-A and -B.

Chairperson Speranza: Yes, the steep slopes ordinance.

Mr. Gregory: Yes. I reviewed that.

Chairperson Speranza: So you realize that you have to sign it. And what I would suggest is, take your original document of this, or on the plan, and make the statement and seal. OK? Then is there a motion for action on this application, steep slopes 31 Brandt Street?

On MOTION of Boardmember Cameron, SECONDED by Boardmember Dale with a voice vote of all in favor. The Board approved of Steep Slopes application of Mark Vandersande for a new house to be constructed at 31 Brandt Street.

Chairperson Speranza: Thank you.

Mr. Gregory: Thank you very much.

3. Review and approval of Steep Slopes application of Mary Lambert & Nils Boelset for the additions of a deck and a patio/terrace at their house at 16 Croton Avenue.

Chairperson Speranza: The next application is another steep slopes application, this one on 16 Croton Avenue. Deven, is there anything you'd like to share with us about this one?

Building Inspector Sharma: No, nothing that I need to point out or highlight. There was one neighbor to the left of them, they came to my office with some concerns. But after I explained it to them, it was OK.

Michael Lewis, Michael Lewis Architects, PC: This is a modest addition and deck reformation at the front of the house at 16 Croton. You can see the area here that's shaded in orange is the actual addition. It's very small. It's really just an entry.

We're also enlarging the deck somewhat, and that's occurring at the first-floor level. So as you come up to the site, there's steps up to the first-floor level so this is sort of like a front porch and front entry. And then down below that, at the basement level, we've terraced out to make a level terraced area.

Village Attorney Stecich: You're standing right in front of it, so why don't you go over to the side. Because you'll be blocking it.

Mr. Lewis: Sure, no problem.

Village Attorney Stecich: The other side, and that way the Board can see it and the camera will pick it up.

Mr. Lewis: Sorry about that.

Chairperson Speranza: We always have a problem.

Mr. Lewis: So the terrace here is at the basement level of the house. You can see the shaded green area is the steep slope portion of the lot, and it starts from about 6 feet to 12 feet in front of the house and slopes down to a retaining wall. And then there's a level driveway here, and then some additional steep slope down below.

So this terrace is basically coming straight out from the basement and sort of converting it into a walk-out basement, and breaking level with the grade somewhere about here. This terrace is specified to be pavers set in compacted stone dust and gravel so it's permeable. The idea is that the rainwater can go through it.

The deck however, over the terrace, is not. The owners wanted the deck to shelter the terrace below and not have the water drip through the deck. So that's an impermeable surface under the design, and that's really what's triggered the need to deal with some additional impervious area. The total area of the deck and the addition is 360 square feet, and that's what we've designed the water retention system for.

In fact, we're removing a roof that exists there that was 83 square feet. So, in fact, we're really adding only 277 square feet, however we've designed for the full 360 square feet because we thought that was the prudent thing to do. The retention system consists of a polyethylene culvert that's set up to capture the rainwater during a storm event and then release it slowly so it becomes a level spreader. It allows the water to dissipate slowly down through the site.

I should mention that we're fortunate in that the site appears to be a well-percolating sandy loam. There haven't been any problems on the site whatsoever, in spite of the fact that there's no water retention system in place now. Right now the water from the house basically drains onto the site and seeps into the ground and hasn't caused any

problems even in the recent heavy rains we've seen. I think there was a 2-1/2 inch event not that long ago. No real problems. However, we are putting in retention for all the added water that would be generated from the impermeable deck.

So there's this culvert, this culvert, which receives the water and then lets it percolate out slowly over a 12-hour period across a level area and into the groundwater system. Basically, the same water that's entering the groundwater system now will continue to enter the groundwater system, although it'll do it in a retained way and a slower way so if there's an event it won't cause any deleterious erosion or heavy water flow.

I guess that pretty much explains it. We have the calculations for the steep slope areas and the amount of water and whatnot. Again, this is designed to percolate for a 25-year storm. That's 6 inches of water; a very conservative design, in that recently I think we had 2-1/2 inches and it was like a calamity. Six inches is the biggest storm that anybody could remember. Six inches, of course, would be huge.

So that's basically the design parameters. I think that's about it. Tom Goodwin from Paul Petretti's office is here, as well, if there are any questions for the engineer. I think that's it.

Chairperson Speranza: OK, thank you. Questions? Rhoda, Bruce, Eva?

I have a question about the stormwater calculations. The techniques that are shown in the engineering memo are very standard. There's one section in here that's a bit of a concern to me because it implies that not all of the stormwater is being captured post development. It notes 108 cubic feet in the pre-development condition, but as improved there's going to be 180 cubic feet. So I don't understand how that additional volume is going to be handled.

Tom Goodwin, engineer - Paul Petretti: The goal was to maintain the current level of impervious surface. So we accounted for the difference between the additional impervious surface that we're adding. That would be calculated by subtracting the predeveloped condition from the post-developed condition. So that would give you 72 cubic feet of capacity, which we then went on to size the retention system greater than.

Chairperson Speranza: OK, so the improvements that are shown on the document will handle that difference.

Building Inspector Sharma: The retention system, Patty, holds the excess.

Chairperson Speranza: Yes, it's just not clear in here how it's being handled.

Boardmember Dale: I thought he just said that you added them together without including the roof that was there instead of subtracting it. You actually added it, and now I'm hearing that you're subtracting it.

Mr. Lewis: Well, not exactly. What we were saying is that when we counted the excess we were taking into account this whole area. But we were just counting the excess for the area. We're not counting ... originally, if that weren't there, the rain still falls on the site and generates a certain amount. And then now that we've fixed it, the difference in the amount of runoff – because it's impervious – is what the system is based on which, again, is standard practice.

Mr. Goodwin: Yes. The calculations are meant to show the difference between if it was undeveloped bare earth or if it was impervious surface.

Chairperson Speranza: Right. I realize that. We just need a closer tie-in for the future. A closer tie-in between the calculations and what the solution is I think would be very good.

Village Attorney Stecich: I just wanted to also say – I'm mentioning it because this is the second application from this firm – that I could not understand ... and it's not ... the Board, about a year ago, went through and spent a lot of time on its Steep Slopes Law and decided that the Board wanted to review it. They didn't want it reviewed by engineers, they didn't want it reviewed by the Building Inspector.

I look at these things all the time. I could not understand it. It's not enough to say, "We're compliant, just look at the plans." Your narrative is supposed to show how it's compliant. Your narrative refers to a steep slopes analysis map. I don't think there was a steep slopes analysis map in here, was there?

Building Inspector Sharma: There was an analysis. We do have it if you want to see it.

Village Attorney Stecich: Yes, but it was not in the submittal. So you might want to be careful on the next application you submit.

Mr. Goodwin: OK.

Building Inspector Sharma: What's the volume of this retention system? Hold the microphone closer to your mouth.

Village Technology Assistant: It's off. Your microphone's off.

Building Inspector Sharma: What's the capacity of the retention system, by the way?

Mr. Goodwin: The capacity of the pipe we calculated to be 64 cubic feet, plus the drain inlet which provides an additional 35 cubic feet, which is over 100 cubic feet, which is larger than the calculated difference between the predeveloped and post-developed condition.

Building Inspector Sharma: So the pipe itself is 64 cubic feet.

Mr. Goodwin: Yes, and the drain inlet...

Building Inspector Sharma: Gravel below?

Mr. Goodwin: Well, not including the voids in the gravel surrounding the pipe, the drain inlet which is shown in the detail and plan on the sheet that's there.

Mr. Lewis: Collection box.

Mr. Goodwin: Yes, it also provides 35 cubic feet of storage.

Village Attorney Stecich: Does it say it on there?

Mr. Lewis: These are the details here in this area.

Village Attorney Stecich: Yes, but does it have the capacity? Because I tried to find the capacity on there and I couldn't find it.

Mr. Lewis: It just has the size.

Village Attorney Stecich: See, that's the kind of stuff. That's a pretty important missing link here.

Mr. Lewis: OK, sorry about that.

Basically, the size that's on there is a 2-foot diameter pipe by 20.5 feet long, and the calculation's 64.4 cubic feet, I think, or 64 cubic feet. And then the collection box, which is a cube, adds another 30 cubic feet – adding up to just under 100. We were looking for 72, I think, cubic feet of capacity. So it has more capacity than is required. And you're right. We should have gotten that more clearly in the documents.

Building Inspector Sharma: You should have provided it, and I should have made you provide it perhaps.

Mr. Lewis: I can't say it's your fault though.

Chairperson Speranza: OK. And we do have the statements that we require on the engineering report.

Boardmember Alligood: There is a statement that says, "*It is perceived that there will be no long-term negative impacts from the improvements to be situated on the premises.*" I'm wondering why it doesn't just say, "The calculations show that there will be no long-term negative impacts."

Chairperson Speranza: Is there anyone here from the public who wishes to speak on the application before we close Board comment?

I don't think that there is going to be any kind of impact, but I think we just need to tighten up, should there be a next application, so that the engineering reviews match the plans. I think that's fine. Is there a motion for action on the steep slopes request for 16 Croton Avenue?

On MOTION of Boardmember Logan, SECONDED by Boardmember Dale with a voice vote of all in favor, the Board resolved the approval of Steep Slopes application of Mary Lambert & Nils Boelset for the additions of a deck and a patio/terrace at their house at 16 Croton Avenue.

4. Public Hearing on the application of Sprint/Nextel Corp. for the addition and alterations to an existing antenna system at Andrus Home.

Chairperson Speranza: The next item on our agenda is the public hearing on the application of Sprint/Nextel for addition and alterations to an existing antenna system at the Andrus Home. I know there are antennas already up there, and this would be a change to some of them.

Stephanie Bortnyk, representative - Clearwire: The application proposal is for an upgrade of the existing antenna located on the Andrus house. I have a couple of photo simulations just to identify where those antenna are actually located. It's on the lower rooftop as opposed to the higher rooftop, but it's the antenna array here. I don't know if you have that in your written teaching materials.

What we're proposing to do is an upgrade to the existing antenna to be compliant with the 4G network. The upgrade will include a replacement of the three-panel antenna. So it'd be a replacement in-kind. It's like-size and -shape of what's already there. In addition, there will be four dish antennas placed on the structure, three below and one above, and there will be a small GPS antenna as well as an additional cabinet in the existing equipment room.

We understand that the application is supposed to be treated as a new application, so tonight we have an architect, emissions engineer, and planner available to speak and elaborate on any particular part of the presentation that the Board might want to hear about. I don't know if you have any particular questions that you might want to go over.

Chairperson Speranza: Let me just say, it's a public hearing first. Is there anybody here from the public who wishes to speak? Jamie?

Boardmember Cameron: Since you actually did site it in your application, I'm sure you're aware of the fact that these antennas are supposed to be painted the same color as the building.

Ms. Bortnyk: That's an omission that we noticed upon going back and reviewing the existing site. So it's our intent to paint them a color that is consistent.

Boardmember Cameron: It was also noted when you got your original approval in 2000 that you would do it, but for some reason they never got around to doing it.

Ms. Bortnyk: Right.

Boardmember Cameron: I think that's an enforcement issue we have.

The other question I have is the antenna going up. Is it actually the same size, or is it a little bit bigger than the antenna that's there right now? It looks like it's bigger.

Ms. Bortnyk: It's a smaller antenna.

Boardmember Cameron: The picture is bigger, so I was trying to figure it out.

Ms. Bortnyk: The dishes are 24 inches wide, and the panel antenna is a like size but slightly smaller; 43 inches.

Boardmember Cameron: Narrower, or shorter?

Ms. Bortnyk: Shorter and narrower.

Boardmember Cameron: It's not narrower. Is it wider? I bring that up because we had another applicant on this building come in here to talk about putting up and substituting antennas. One of the things we extracted from them, and they agreed, was that they would replace their current stuff with the most modern stuff available, particularly if it was smaller. Because that's the problem we have. We have this graffiti on our rooftops and our buildings, and we really need to get it smaller.

I'm asking the same question of your engineer. Don't you make smaller versions of those antennas now?

Building Inspector Sharma: They were just about 10 inches wide. Are your antennas going to be 10 inches wide?

Boardmember Alligood: Can I just clarify? In the information that was submitted to us, on page 2 – no, actually, the application for site plan approval, on page 2 – it says, "*The new dish antennas will only exceed the height of the existing Sprint panel antennas by 4 feet when measured to antennas' center line.*"

Ms. Bortnyk: I know this is a little bit difficult, but in your site plans you're going to see the dishes. It's the addition of the dishes – three above, one below – on the existing structure. So the dishes protrude above the rooftop by what we think is 3 feet, not 4 feet. We were a little conservative in describing it. And the dishes are 24 inches in diameter, so the center line will be approximately 2 feet above – and then the top of the dish will be about 3 feet above – the rooftop. Again, this is the lower rooftop, not the upper.

Boardmember Alligood: So you're talking about the height above those antennas that the dishes would be placed.

Ms. Bortnyk: Right.

Boardmember Cameron: If we can get back to the topic we went off, which is whether they make smaller versions of those same antennas now, one of your competitors very nicely gave us smaller antennas on top of this.

Jheng Li, IF engineer - Clearwire: Actually, the antenna we will replace on this building both in weight and mass. So it's shorter and narrow.

Ms. Bortnyk: You're talking about the panel antenna.

Boardmember Cameron: You're talking about the one panel antenna you're replacing, and I'm talking about all four.

Mr. Li: No, we only replace one.

Boardmember Cameron: I understand that. But when – it was AT&T, I believe – it was when they came here and they wanted to put up another antenna they replaced the existing ones with smaller ones since they understood how much I will refer to it as "building graffiti" we were building up on top of the buildings. We thought it would be a wonderful opportunity because usually, with more modern technology, you will have a stronger signal with a new antenna. Or maybe you're just using the old equipment. I don't know.

Ms. Bortnyk: I believe that the panel antenna is new and smaller. It's the dishes that are being...

[crosstalk]

Boardmember Cameron: I'm talking about the three that you aren't replacing.

Building Inspector Sharma: Take the microphone.

Chairperson Speranza: Given that you're replacing some of them, can we replace them all with smaller?

Boardmember Cameron: I think you're putting in a different kind of antenna. That was the follow-up question.

Mr. Li: Because we are using now the new service we're proposing called "fourth generation wireless, high-speed wireless data," which is called WiMAX, we're using the licensed FCC bandwidth from 2.5 gigahertz all the way to 26 gigahertz. The antenna is different from the current Sprint/Nextel antenna. That's the reason we only replace one antenna per sector on this site, and not really touch the rest of the antennas over there.

Boardmember Cameron: Well, I'm sure you can see from your nice pictures you leave us the visual analysis does not look very good because of these very bright silver-white things on the building. Whereas your competitor is immediately above and, actually, they're doing a rather good job in making theirs invisible by painting them. You might look at the color they chose and go along with the same one.

Building Inspector Sharma: What if you take the microphone and you come here, please. Much better.

Ms. Bortnyk: We can certainly paint them whatever color the others are.

Chairperson Speranza: And now that we're really aware of it, we're going to be watching to make sure they get done. Anyone else have any questions or anything that needs to be looked at further?

I'm sure you're familiar with the overlay district and how this works. We've gotten your materials now, particularly with respect to the radio frequency. Although I looked through here and didn't see anything about having a statement of non-interference, we have a radio frequency engineer who will review this on behalf of the Village, review your report to make sure everything in here is true. Because I dare to say that none of us up here are radio frequency engineers.

Boardmember Barr: If we are requiring them to paint it, maybe we should put a time on it. You know, "We're going to paint it" – but is it in 30 days, 60 days, or 10 yearwith?

Chairperson Speranza: That's a good point.

Boardmember Dale: With consequences.

Ms. Bortnyk: It's at the time of construction that it will be done.

Boardmember Cameron: And we're going to get the dishes painted, too? Because I don't want big dishes up there.

Ms. Bortnyk: Everything.

Boardmember Cameron: Are any of those whip antennas yours up there, or do they all belong to the town?

Chairperson Speranza: Yes, we will do that.

Boardmember Dale: Set a time.

Chairperson Speranza: For the approval.

Boardmember Dale: For compliance.

Village Attorney Stecich: Patty, two things. One is, you have to acquire the escrow for professional fees.

Chairperson Speranza: Right. That goes along with it, to be able to hire the radio frequency engineer.

Village Attorney Stecich: And to pay for all professional fees on it, they have to do the escrow.

And then the other thing, just so you know, the statement that you're missing – the statement regarding non-interference – is paragraph 12 of section C, not the personal wireless law. That was the one thing that seemed to be missing. I don't know about any other stuff, but at least that part is missing. So that's got to go in there.

Ms. Bortnyk: Is there a statement that he can make right now, or do you want to amend the report?

Village Attorney Stecich: It needs to be a written statement.

Chairperson Speranza: We'll wait for the report. Get the money in the escrow, we'll hire the radio frequency consultant. Assuming there are no problems, you'll be on the agenda next month.

Ms. Bortnyk: OK. So that's something that he would review within the month? So this is an adjournment of the public hearing, or is that something you can do a conditional approval based on their review?

Chairperson Speranza: No. We don't do a conditional approval. We read his reports.

Village Attorney Stecich: Patty, SEQRA.

Chairperson Speranza: I was going to ask that, do that next. If there's nothing else, we do have the SEQRA information. My take on this is we have to do special permit and site plan, and we are the only approval agency.

Ms. Bortnyk: That's my understanding.

Chairperson Speranza: OK, great. Then that should be very simple to do. Again, I'd like to do it all at once, particularly after we get the analysis from the engineer.

Ms. Bortnyk: OK. Is our ability to be on the next agenda based on how quickly we submit the escrow check, or what would the process be?

Chairperson Speranza: The quicker you do that, the quicker we can hire the engineer, the quicker we'll review your report.

Ms. Bortnyk: So there's no guarantee that we would be on the next agenda.

Chairperson Speranza: As of right now, we have no issue. It's not like our agenda is full.

Building Inspector Sharma: There is no reason why you can't be. We'll contact you tomorrow, or you contact us, and we'll tell you the escrow amount. We'll get our engineer to send a copy of what we have already. In the meantime, for the next meeting you prepare another set of documents with all the things that were mentioned: painting, make a notation, and the certification.

Boardmember Cameron: But it's up to your accounting department.

Chairperson Speranza: And let me just make sure. There is no information that's requested of the applicant at this point by any of the Boardmembers. So that'll be it. There are no other outstanding items.

Ms. Bortnyk: Who would you like to appear at that meeting? Would we get a copy of a comment letter from the consultant ahead of time so we would know how to address it, if need be?

Chairperson Speranza: Especially if there's anything that you want to address.

Village Attorney Stecich: He's not just a radio frequency engineer. He's a telecommunications engineer so he looks at the other stuff, the interference and stuff like that. So it's not just radio frequency he looks at. But if he doesn't have any issues, I don't think they would have to have their engineers at the next meeting. Correct?

Chairperson Speranza: I would say no.

Village Attorney Stecich: If no issues are raised, and if nobody has any tonight. But we'll know when we get his report.

Chairperson Speranza: You'll have that when we get our packets.

Village Attorney Stecich: If there's something in the report we'll talk, and would let them know if they needed to have anybody.

Chairperson Speranza: And he does speak with the applicants also.

Ms. Bortnyk: Who is the consultant? Do you have somebody in mind, or no?

Chairperson Speranza: Yes. Who handles these applications on behalf of the Village, his name is Richard Comi, if he's all set. I don't know if he's on vacation right now.

Ms. Bortnyk: Great. Well, thank you very much for your time.

Chairperson Speranza: So we'll do the special permit, the site plan, and the SEQRA. Did you want to say something?

Boardmember Cameron: I was just going to say we should look at who has all those whip antennas up on that building because they're supposed to also be painted.

Chairperson Speranza: That's true.

Boardmember Cameron: It would make a lot of difference, actually. If you go and look at the competitor's antenna higher up, you can barely make it out. They're quite good. But then theirs – well, their pictures tell it all.

5. **Public Hearing on the application of Christina Griffin and Peter Wolf for an amendment to previously approved site plan for 433 Warburton Avenue.**

Chairperson Speranza: OK, next application. We have a request for site plan approval for 433 Warburton Avenue, River Townhouse, LLC.

Village Attorney Stecich: I just wanted to say something preliminarily on this about the Board of Trustees. Just to let the Board know, besides the Planning Board approving this it has to be approved by the Board of Trustees. Because what they're seeking to do is improve a portion of Ridge Street. They came before the Board of Trustees on Tuesday.

I drafted a license agreement for the Board of Trustees. Here's copies I'll pass out. It's up to them to enact it or not, or to approve it or not. But you'll see some of the issues that it covers, some of the issues you may have. The Board didn't make a decision on Tuesday. It didn't have a situation again, one board wanting one thing and one wanting another. The Board, while not committed to it, said that they were favorably disposed to this plan, to this extension of Ridge Street.

I think their main concerns were actually things that maybe the Planning Board is better suited to address: how far back, how far into Ridge Street the improvements should go, and whatever. But they understood that it was going to be coming before you tonight, and that this board would understand that if you did give any approval to it, it would, of course, be subject to the Board of Trustees approving a license agreement that would permit them to use that part of the street.

Chairperson Speranza: Welcome back. And I'm going to just say I'm glad to see that you're back with parking off of Ridge Street.

Christina Griffin, architect/applicant - 433 Warburton Avenue: Actually, I would like to pass out some plans because since I submitted this we made a slight adjustment to the size of the parking area. Deven Sharma met with us and recommended we make it 18 feet wide instead of 16.

I would like to give these out just so you can have our amended site plan and the original submission that we had made in '07 so you can compare the two. We went back to three years ago, in '07, right here. We were planning to have a parking area in the rear yard of our property, and extend Ridge Street and add a turnaround. We've downscaled that. Instead of having a paved area with drainage, we're having a pervious gravel driveway. We're asking the Trustees if they could give us like a license agreement to create this driveway just so we can have access to these two spaces.

We're also planning to have some kind of removable bollard because this new scheme is not as extensive and we are not providing the turnaround, turnaround on Ridge Street up here. So this turnaround is just for the cars coming to 433 Warburton. And it's also really because if we have to do the turnaround for the entire street it's just a bigger project. So now we have a smaller driveway, a smaller turnaround just for these two spaces.

We have looked into electronic bollards that can go down when somebody comes through here. There's already a depression in the curb at the end of Ridge Street to allow a car to pass. Then we'll recreate the bollards on this end, and then a safety rail around it.

On our property, we would like a small parking area that will be 18 feet by 17 feet. If you look at these two plans I just want you to see the difference between the submission we made in '07 compared to what we're doing now. The area that's yellow and highlighted was a paved area, and we also were giving 10 feet of our property for a turnaround for Ridge Street.

The new plan is to have a gravel driveway. This is a reddish-brown colored gravel, the same gravel we're using at the patio of the house. This will have a stone edging, and that will allow access to the two spaces that we would like to put at the end of the property. The original plan had a larger area that was all paved.

The Village is now interested in this proposal. They seem to be favorable. They seem to be open to the idea of pervious surfacing which is, of course, more green. This very important to us because this is a LEED platinum-rated home now and, of course, we want to get as much greenspace as possible. That is another reason for limiting the depth of this.

Now, in '07, when we originally submitted this, the Planning Board and the Zoning Board approved it on the condition that we got approval for the Ridge Street extension. After so many meetings, we gave up and we decided to take it off the plan. We had our site plan amended, with no parking. The buildings we built, we had the C of O. And now we're coming back to amend that site plan so we can add this parking space.

This is an image of the type of retaining wall we'd like to use. It's an Allan Wall. They're stacked units, and it's pervious so water can run through it. We're planning to use PermaTURF, which is a type of recycled plastic. It's a grid of these little honeycomb shapes that holds the root system of the grass below the level of the cars so you can drive on the grass. That's just simply to have as much greenspace as possible.

We did a perc test three years ago in this area. We have all our storm drainage units lined up here, buried in the ground. That's for the building. That perc test showed

very sandy soil. So we feel that this is going to drain very nicely. Everything is pitched slightly downhill, in this direction.

Boardmember Cameron: Where is this wall going?

Ms. Griffin: This wall is coming on each side of the property and across. There will be steps coming up. This is almost level, this area. They were planning to do thick, very natural-looking stone steps that are set into the ground going up the side of the patio.

Boardmember Cameron: What kind of wall are you putting at the bottom to hold up this new road?

Ms. Griffin: We are also putting in a small retaining wall about 30 inches high because at this point the drop is not as high. And this hatched area is an erosion control blanket. This is a material that we use. We've also used it on the hill here, and it works really well to keep any kind of erosion going on while we're waiting for the plants to get established. This will also be the Allan Block, this little wall.

Boardmember Cameron: And out of curiosity, why is the new driveway 23 feet wide? Is that for the fire truck or something? I mean, you don't need it if it's just your two cars going in there. I'm just curious why it's so wide.

Ms. Griffin: I'm open to suggestions. You know, I think I need the depth at this point, but not here. And it's so heavily shaded I'm just not sure. We could consider some green space there, yes.

I don't know if you can see this photograph, but we have used this reddish colored gravel. We have it in our own driveway at home, and we lined it with stone. It's a very earthy appearance. The reason for using that, it has an angular shape. And I would like to match the color of the earth, but I can only get that in pea gravel, which doesn't hold up as well as this type of gravel for cars.

Boardmember Cameron: Because if you made it only a single lane, why? Maybe you need it for that, but you wouldn't need the bollard. I'm a person who's sort of against what I'll refer to as gated communities, even though I know it's only your house it's going to. If it was only a single lane wide going back there you wouldn't need the bollard because nobody would ever come down there because they'd have to back back out again. I'm just throwing that out.

Ms. Griffin: You know, I wish that were true. I'm not sure. The only reason for the bollard is to keep people from ... if there are two cars here, then they can't turn around. Actually, Meg Walker suggested it, and I thought maybe that would help solve the problem. I'm not sure if a single lane will be enough to discourage people from going down here.

Chairperson Speranza: And leaving their cars.

Boardmember Cameron: Well, it's not going down the driveway. I think that would end pretty quickly.

Boardmember Dale: I was curious. You made the decision not to have the turnabout. I think what I liked a whole lot about your original proposal was you did have the turnabout. It was a give-back to the Village and, clearly, to Ridge Street, to the folks who live there. I could understand that there's a condition on the left side of the street that you may not want to tackle.

Ms. Griffin: The only reason why is simply cost. When we've gone this far with developing this house, way more than we ever imagined, and we tried to sell it without parking – and even if we decide to downscale, we need parking – we just finally decided we'd try again. It's very expensive to extend the wall we way we had it and make it all ... originally, it was going to be blacktop – because that's what the Village wanted a few years ago – because that would be the least maintenance. Our agreement with them would be to maintain this, as well. But that's the reason we don't have the turnaround.

Boardmember Dale: It's a shame it wasn't accepted back then the way it was originally proposed. Because now you do have the issue of the gated community: is it private, is it not, is somebody going to go in there. All of this would have been moot if, in fact, they had approved it originally.

Ms. Griffin: Also, we can't go back and get funding for that from the bank. It's way too late. If it would have been approved in the beginning we could have planned that out and we would have handled it differently.

Boardmember Dale: Lost opportunities.

Boardmember Alligood: Bruce just expressed my concern, which is that it isn't the original application which I was in support of. My feeling is that it's public property that you want use of. And that makes sense when, as Bruce put it, there's some public give-back and it's not a completely privatized street. But what you're proposing is privatizing that street with a gate, and that's just ... I'm uncomfortable with that.

Ms. Griffin: I don't think we're totally privatizing it. One thing we discussed with the Trustees was to have some kind of signage to make sure it's clear that, pedestrians, this is Village-owned property, thus you can use it. I'm not sure what the sign will say; just no vehicular traffic.

Boardmember Dale: Bicycles and Walkers Welcome, or something, would suggest it.

Mr. Wolf: Just to go back and talk about this, what we have here is a situation ... and going right back to the basics, the Village code, in 295-22, states that all buildings enlarged shall be provided with off-street parking – 295-4E?

Chairperson Speranza: I have to interrupt you there because we've had a discussion and the code does say that. But I don't think we should go back. I think you've come up with a nice solution.

Mr. Wolf: I don't want to go back. I just want to go back to the fact that we proposed it originally at the Board of Trustees. It was tentatively approved provided we comply with certain conditions, and we complied with them. Then we did not get the approval. And the original project was actually much larger. It actually had another stage, another floor, that was much closer to this area.

And then when we came before here, we were talking about coming off of Warburton. We got the approval. The Planning Board made it very clear they wanted us to come in from Ridge Street and that we should return. The problem that Mr. Dale raises is really an engineering problem. When we started this whole thing, we were talking about extending the retaining wall, which is a major undertaking. So what we tried to do is to do something narrow where we would not have to get in there, where we could use the existing wall.

To address your point, I don't think that it's privatizing a road. I think this is a balancing act to get the off-street parking. We're not parking on Village land. We're just extending an exiting right-of-way. It is a mapped street, it's just a paper street. So all we're doing is getting access. Nobody in the Village is any worse for it because they don't have it now. And, in fact, they will be better off because they'll be occupants, they will not be parking on Warburton Avenue, and there'll be increased tax revenue for the Village. So it's an access question, on a public street, to a private off-street parking location.

Chairperson Speranza: I was reminded of a similar situation this morning when I was out looking at the Brandt Street property up on Pearl Street, which was an unmapped, or an unpaved, mapped street that someone had access to for one home. And they ended up extending, or actually completing, the road – finishing the road – to the house that was to be built. You could say also that that was private use of a public street. I see it in the same way.

Boardmember Alligood: But it's not restricted.

Chairperson Speranza: I think if this was not Ridge Street – if this street only had two homes – you probably wouldn't need to have that. But I think it is an issue in that the work done in the past on Ridge Street does show that there are issues with people parking all over the place and even at the end of the paved area. So I can understand

why you need to have some treatment, but obviously the intention is not to prohibit it. It's not private. People will be able to go in and walk whatever trail is back there.

Ms. Griffin: I would be happy to have some kind of garden area. You know, there are people on that street who have no property. I know there's a gardener that comes down here, and maybe we could get a little greenspace. But I don't think this should be a private area. We just don't want vehicles to come down here.

Mr. Wolf: One of the things that was expressed to us originally when we brought this up is that they felt there was already too much traffic on Ridge Street. And they didn't want to encourage a lot of people, especially commuters who were trying to make a train who will just pull into anywhere and just leave their car there for the day. The real reason for the bollard is so that the people who have the off-street parking will be able to get access to it, and that they won't be parked-in or prevented from getting in there. That's the sole purpose of it.

Also, my understanding – and Marianne can correct me – is that this is temporal in nature. In other words, if there is somebody else who has access to Ridge Street and wants to have parking at some point in the future they can make application for further use of Ridge Street. All it is is a granting, on a public street, of access to private parking. And my understanding of paper streets is that they are mapped, but then the Village doesn't want to go and have to provide services for a street where nobody needs the services.

Boardmember Cameron: I don't think it gives the Village the ability to let anyone else in there.

Village Attorney Stecich: Yes. First of all, paragraph five: "*The public shall be permitted access and use of the Ridge Street extension, except that no motor vehicle shall be permitted except for those entering or exiting the property at 433 Warburton Avenue.*" The concern there was safety. Well, Peter said the only reason was so it wouldn't block those cars. I think there was also concern that if those parking spaces were filled, and a car came down there, it wouldn't be able to turn around.

And then the next one, and I just modified this paragraph after the Board meeting to make it even clearer: "*This agreement shall not impair the Village's right to construct whatever improvements it chooses over the Ridge Street extension or to remove any improvements installed by the licensee that would impair public use of the Ridge Street extension.*" That was put in there so if a house further down wanted ... they need to build the street and they tell them remove the stuff and they don't remove it, well then the Village can remove it.

Boardmember Dale: But this is a landlocked site there, right?

Village Attorney Stecich: That was the intent. Do you want to word it differently? You want to propose different wording? I'm open to it. I see that as a pretty plain-language way to explain it.

Then also we made it clear that it was not exclusive and that it is a license agreement. License agreements are always revocable.

Boardmember Cameron: I'm totally in favor of you having the parking down there, and I'm totally in favor of you going down that road and parking there and turning around and coming back out. We all voted for it before, and I think we're just dealing with how it's done, not whether it's done. I think you should realize that we're struggling with that.

Village Attorney Stecich: One thing that occurs to me in this is that the Board ... if you were disposed to permit the modification and the site plan approval, specify what you want the signs to say. And that could be part of the site plan approval: that whatever signs have to say this.

Chairperson Speranza: My only concern about going to that specific – and please weigh in on this – is that the Board of Trustees has not acted. Should they act, and they don't like the wording that we have chosen, does it have to then ... formally, it would have to come back here for a review and site plan approval.

Village Attorney Stecich: I see what you're saying. You could maybe say it subject to there being signs with language agreed to by certain people that say this, and just leave the language open. But the fact that there are to be signs that make it clear that it's available for public use. Because the public isn't going to see the license agreement.

Boardmember Dale: But it clearly has to exclude vehicles, otherwise the problem's going to be created. Is this thing closed so you have to use an electronic opener to get through the barrier?

Mr. Wolf: Yes, it would. Today there's just a post there that nobody can go down, but we would move the post back about 60 some odd feet and put in this bollard that goes up and down. It would work pretty much like a garage opener.

Boardmember Dale: But the question came up about whether the fire or emergency vehicle would have access.

Ms. Griffin: They would come from Warburton Avenue.

Boardmember Dale: For that property.

Ms. Griffin: Yes. Actually, I would like to share some of my thoughts. Because originally I thought, we'll make it a dirt road. I've done houses that have dirt roads leading to them, and I asked a few clients what's it like. One of them said every time there's a storm they keep this one company very busy because they fill the potholes. But I really thought that we could maybe keep this very natural. I thought that was maybe too extreme.

We have this reddish-colored ... it's really a reddish-brown color, and we have to top it off every few years to keep it level. So we are familiar with the kind of maintenance. But I really wouldn't mind the idea of making a little greenspace, and this did occur to me. But I don't necessarily want this to feel like someone's private domain. You know, we can maybe work out the signage with the Board of Trustees what it needs to say, but we should make it clear.

There have been people who are interested and have been on the trailway down there, although it dead ends in someone else's property. But still, for some of these people who live nearby there's a building here that has eight units and no property. Now, the kids play out here. It gives them a little more space. We see toys lined up, bikes and things. I wouldn't want this to feel like it's off-limits to them.

Boardmember Alligood: I'm not comfortable with those barriers there. I think everybody has driveways that need to be accessed and has the risk. I live near the school. People sometimes block my driveway. That happens. I just think that it really privatizes this space and it gives the feel of a gated community. I completely support the idea of getting you parking in there, but not with sort of a privatized gate.

Mr. Wolf: Excuse me. There's no gate, there's just a bollard.

Boardmember Alligood: Well, the bollard is a gate. It's a barrier.

Mr. Wolf: It's just a post that comes up and down. There's a post there now, and the people can't drive there now and they can walk there and do anything else. They'll be able to walk or do anything else that they could now. It really doesn't change anything.

Boardmember Alligood: You're asking permission to get cars in there, and you want it just for your private use.

Ms. Griffin: I think that's really in response to the concern of cars coming down when this is filled, and there could be other ways to handle that. That's just one idea. I don't know if it's just signage or maybe a chain. I'm not sure, but I don't know how you discourage anyone.

We did have one comment from a Trustee that may solve this problem. Bruce Jennings said he felt this turnaround was so close to this driveway that you could

almost go back and then turn back and go that way. Because actually, a lot of times we drive up to the back of our house and we turn the other way.

Boardmember Alligood: Right now, can you explain again? Because it's been a couple of years. I've been stuck on that street.

Boardmember Cameron: Turn around right here.

Boardmember Alligood: I remember that, but is that private property just by luck whether there's an opening to turn around?

Mr. Wolf: No. The Village is paying \$200 a month for that honor.

Boardmember Alligood: The Village rents it and keeps it open for people to turn around.

Mr. Wolf: Yes.

Boardmember Alligood: So that condition will still be there if you get your space.

Ms. Griffin: That was built to be the turnaround. It works, but there's a dumpster. If that wasn't there I think it would feel more comfortable turning around, but it works.

Boardmember Alligood: Yes, I've used it. I just couldn't remember whether it was Village property.

Mr. Wolf: Well, it's private property. It's, again, a license agreement.

Boardmember Cameron: Is this driveway presently as wide as it is, or are you widening it from the bollard down?

Ms. Griffin: There's this tiny piece of land that's only about 16 inches between the curb of Ridge Street and this retaining wall. So I just brought the gravel right up to it. But actually, I think we really only need this full depth where we have this parking area.

Boardmember Cameron: You actually don't need the full depth for your northern car. You just need it, actually, for your southern car. Because your northern car could turn into the space behind the southern space when you get right down to it.

Ms. Griffin: Yes.

Boardmember Cameron: Going back to it, I think that if you narrowed it down to one lane, and you left yourself about six or eight feet to turn around the southern car, you could swing out quite easily and you wouldn't have this whole issue of the

bollard. Because you make more shallow that indent beyond your property. In other words, you just make it so nobody could go down there. I mean, they could go down and park in your driveway.

But the number of people who actually park in your driveway more than once is just about zero, I would think. Or you could just narrow the whole driveway, then you get rid of the whole privacy issue. We're actually trying to help.

Boardmember Dale: I'm not sure you get rid of it that way. Then you'd clearly have a driveway that's theirs.

Boardmember Cameron: But it just happens to be a road that's only 10 feet wide.

Boardmember Dale: But you're making it more private rather than less. I'd be more comfortable with a barrier.

Chairperson Speranza: Making it appear that it's more of a private driveway.

Boardmember Cameron: I've gotten rid of the gate.

Chairperson Speranza: But that may address, though, the issue of control.

Boardmember Cameron: You could put two bollards on your own property line so nobody could park in your parking spot. Just kidding.

Ms. Griffin: Or we could have a narrow one-way drive up to this area.

Boardmember Cameron: I'm just saying that would work, I think.

Ms. Griffin: And maybe the signage says Authorized Vehicles. I'm not sure. We have to work on that.

Chairperson Speranza: Authorized Vehicles Only.

Ms. Griffin: Or something like that.

Boardmember Dale: But again, you're authorized by your license agreement.

Chairperson Speranza: It doesn't sound really homey or cozy, but I don't park in spaces that say that.

Boardmember Dale: Authorized Vehicles, and Bicycles are Welcome.

Boardmember Logan: Would you also be able to protect that so you don't get blocked in by somebody parking down at the end of Ridge Street?

Ms. Griffin: It will still be a problem, hopefully occasionally.

Boardmember Logan: I'm just wondering if it was narrowed and it would read more like a driveway, a conventional driveway, that people would understand it better than if it was the full width. You may be less likely to get blocked in if there's this narrower strip down the middle.

Boardmember Dale: What's on the side of that, the two things on the side? Up on the top, on the left and right.

Ms. Griffin: On Ridge Street, there's a strip of land.

Boardmember Dale: No, going across. On either side of the drawing there's a little fence.

Ms. Griffin: There is a fence and a post here now, and then a bollard.

Boardmember Dale: So that fence is there now?

Ms. Griffin: Yes. And our plan also shows the safety fence.

Boardmember Dale: And do people actually park across the end of Ridge Street now?

Mr. Wolf: Well, we've seen cars there. They're not supposed to. In other words, what you were talking about with the turnaround, across the street from there it's striped. Nobody's allowed to park, nobody's allowed to park at the end. But we've seen cars over there, we've seen cars at the end. That was the thought, really, behind the bollard. I think both Christina and I are open to a better solution if you have one, but that was the thought behind it. That we were afraid that people would get pinned in.

Chairperson Speranza: Can I just take a break now? Because there are some people in the audience. I just want to see if anybody has any comments or questions about the proposal. No? OK.

We have to decide what we're going to do on this. It's site plan approval. There seems to be, oh, various ideas with respect to the actual scale of Ridge Street; what's noted as the new driveway. I'm just so happy that there's parking in the back there. To me, the rest of it is details. I'm not overly concerned about any of the other aspects of it.

And dare I say, I hope the Board of Trustees wasn't hoping that we were going to come back and tell them what the language on the sign should be. I hope they weren't

thinking, "Well, it's going to the Planning Board. Maybe they'll come up with the language."

Boardmember Dale: My sense of the Board, since I was at the meeting, was that for the most part, except for one Boardmember, they were in favor of it. And the one Boardmember, much like Jamie is expressing, was in favor of it as well, but concerned about that sense of privacy. And I don't think that's going to go away regardless of what solution we propose.

So I'm comfortable to live with the solution that's been proposed. I don't think we're going to find the magic way to make this happen, where it's not private use of government property.

Chairperson Speranza: Right. And to me, I just want to avoid process and process and more process. Is there a way that we can approve the site plan conditioned upon subsequent modification by the Board of Trustees, and if they say that they want it neck-down or they want the signage?

Boardmember Cameron: Let me ask a question on that. Don't we just approve what's on their property? Do we actually approve things off their property?

Chairperson Speranza: I don't know.

Boardmember Cameron: And if we just approve their property, we can approve that and the Trustees can deal with the thing off their property. Because no matter what we do, what's on their property they're going to need. So it's off their property, we would discuss it. I'm sorry, but that's the way we do it.

Chairperson Speranza: Excellent suggestion.

Boardmember Alligood: So essentially, all we're approving is the creation of parking. And then we would leave it to the Trustees to decide how to access the parking? That's not usually how we do it.

Boardmember Dale: Well, it's their decision about what happens to the mapped street and whether they're willing to give the license or not.

Boardmember Cameron: I don't know.

Village Attorney Stecich: Jamie's right.

Boardmember Cameron: We can't approve things in the middle of the street. We approve the site.

Village Attorney Stecich: Clearly, though, if the Planning Board had some recommendations to make ... because you have more experience with driving access and driveway access and stuff.

Boardmember Dale: Well, that was with their help.

Village Attorney Stecich: But Jamie's right.

Boardmember Cameron: We tried that once and it didn't work.

Village Attorney Stecich: The site plan only really does include the parking in the rear, and that's the way of doing that.

Boardmember Dale: My sense also is they did hope that we would have a solution since we're supposedly more experienced.

Boardmember Barr: And it's a Planning Board type issue.

Chairperson Speranza: Are there concrete suggestions? I kind of like the idea of having some greenspace in there as well, and having it be narrower with some green area.

Ms. Griffin: [off-mic]. You really only need like 8 feet. And the Rowley's Bridge trail, I think the driveway is 12 feet or 15 feet. What if we make it like 8, minimal, and make these greenspaces.

Boardmember Alligood: I think that would help. Certainly nobody would park on top of your planted green vegetation. I think that would be disincentive enough. I think it would take somebody really outside the boundaries to park on your grass.

Mr. Wolf: Or really late for a train.

Boardmember Alligood: I would be comfortable with that because I think it would solve the problem. I don't think you would need the bollard if you've narrowed that.

Boardmember Cameron: But I think I would actually take that greenspace and draw it all the way down on the west side. Because the other suggestion I have is, have the bollard but try not using it for awhile and see what happens. Because that really breaks into that thing. And if the greenspace is all the way down that side you discourage people from parking right opposite your cars when you're trying not to use the bollard.

Ms. Griffin: My first choice was dirt road. Second choice was PermaTURF. Because we experimented with it and it really works. I really think it works. But there's a nice bit of sun here, and there isn't very much sun here at all. I'm just

thinking we may not succeed. So that's why we decided to go with the gravel, but not a gray gravel.

I don't know. I guess we could. I guess that could work if this can back out this way.

Boardmember Cameron: Yes, because you never go on that.

Boardmember Dale: You really don't need that space.

Boardmember Cameron: Your turnaround is not out there, unless you're bringing a moving truck in that space. Which they will, once.

Mr. Wolf: Well, they'll come in from here.

Ms. Griffin: And, you know, it could even say No Authorized Vehicles - Public Trailway. That certainly would be sort of an invitation to let people come in and use the area, pedestrians.

Mr. Wolf: As I said, we're flexible. We can certainly try that. Because all we're trying to do is prevent those two cars from being penned in. That's the sole purpose of this.

And what it is, there's already a differentiation because it's paved up to that point and from this point it would not be paved. So there would be a natural differentiation but as I said, we just want to assure that people don't pin these other people in, or ourselves.

Boardmember Dale: Whether it's green, or whatever differentiation on the sides that way, would discourage anybody from going in just as effectively as the bollard. I think it establishes it.

Ms. Griffin: I agree. I think it would help.

Boardmember Dale: In effect, it's more private. But also it's more limited, as well. Somebody's not going to try to want to come in and park in there, for example.

Mr. Wolf: Well, that's what we're trying to do. We're trying to have no chain so that the vehicles go up to that point where they go up to now, and there's pedestrian access and it continues to be pedestrian access.

Boardmember Dale: But with a sign that says No Unauthorized Vehicles, or Authorized Vehicles Only.

Boardmember Cameron: One of the issues, this was designed to give you two parking spots. And I guess one of the concerns would be if suddenly four cars appear

there. People tend to accumulate cars. That's what I like about having the greenspace that you suggested. I think it discourages even the owners of that building putting more than two cars back there.

Mr. Wolf: Actually, the theory of the LEED home, part of it, is compact design and then natural access. So the idea of someone who comes there, I hope, was to have only one car. And then they would walk to the Village, walk to the train, or use public transport. That's part of that concept.

Ms. Griffin: We got so many points for that, to reduce the reliance on cars and use previously developed land, be close to the train station.

Boardmember Cameron: I just hope the first owner of that place is as responsible as you guys are.

Chairperson Speranza: Are we ready for an action then? So who wants to craft the wording of this approval? Someone will have to make a motion which states the approval of the site plan, showing access to a parking area off of Ridge Street; recommendation of the treatment of the Ridge Street extension to include a narrowing down from what's shown on the plan with appropriate vegetation and vegetation on either side; and appropriate signage. Subject, of course, to the approval by the Board of Trustees.

Boardmember Alligood: So it is going to have a bollard.

Boardmember Logan: No bollard, no.

Boardmember Alligood: I think we have to specify that in our recommendation, in our vote. Because that's how I feel. I'm OK with it without the bollard. If the bollard's in there I'm still not comfortable.

Boardmember Cameron: I think, quite frankly, the bollard's up to the Trustees.

Boardmember Alligood: I know. But we can say "we recommend." We discussed it, we can recommend.

Chairperson Speranza: Who wants to include elimination of the bollard?

Boardmember Logan: I'm happy either way with that.

Boardmember Dale: I can live with it.

Boardmember Alligood: I suggest it, but if you don't adopt it then I just will vote against it, which is fine. But that's just how I feel.

Boardmember Cameron: If we have a resolution without discussing the bollard, you're going to vote against it?

Boardmember Alligood: I want the specific recommendation that we say we don't recommend the bollard. I've stated that, and that's how I still feel about it. But if the rest of the Board doesn't feel that way, then you can not mention it. I'm a no vote without a specific recommendation that the bollard not go in.

Chairperson Speranza: Got that? So the resolution is to approve the site plan, subject to modifications to what is shown.

Larry Young, 118 Palisades Street - Dobbs Ferry: Could I say something?

Chairperson Speranza: Sure. You have to come to the mic.

Mr. Young: I have property on Ridge Street. I would like the bollard there, or whatever they call that thing, because it's my property that's further on. People now can't go through.

Chairperson Speranza: Well, it's nice to meet you.

Mr. Young: People now can't go through because they'd have to walk on my property. So they don't have a right-of-way like everybody's been talking. But people do take their bikes through, they take cars and they put them in wrong places there. It would be better for me, I believe, to have that thing there to make sure that people who don't belong there don't go there.

Boardmember Dale: You would still put the other post at the end of where your cars are turning about, right?

Chairperson Speranza: No, there wouldn't be any.

Boardmember Dale: This is on the southern end.

Boardmember Cameron: The southern end there would still be the fence.

Chairperson Speranza: Oh, down at the end. Yes.

Boardmember Dale: Is that the part that you're concerned about?

Mr. Young: Right where it is now.

Boardmember Dale: Where's your property in relation to this?

Mr. Young: Beyond it.

Boardmember Dale: But that post will be relocated to the bottom, the existing wood post.

Ms. Griffin: We're planning to walk in here. I know what you're concerned about. Some people think there's a trailway.

Mr. Young: I find a lot of stuff on that pathway on my property. Not every Saturday, but every other Saturday maybe, I have to take stuff to the dump. I would just like to keep people off, maybe a truck backing up there and dumping.

Chairperson Speranza: OK, and that's included in the plan – to have it at the end of the property.

Boardmember Barr: Patty, I don't want to add a layer of complication, but I think that actually laying out the thing, maybe the advice of the Safety Council, but if there are delivery trucks what provides for the easiest flow of cars in and out without ... I mean, for us to sit here and design just where you're going to put grass and so forth, or greenery...

Chairperson Speranza: Right. And I agree with you. My only concern is, I don't want to be approving a plan that then gets modified either by the Safety Council and the Board of Trustees, and then it's got to come back to us yet again because it's been modified.

Boardmember Barr: Let's leave a little bit of openness to modification.

Chairperson Speranza: I agree.

Boardmember Cameron: Patty, can't we actually have two resolutions? One approving the site plan, and the other one making suggestions? And if we approve the site plan, I don't think the Trustees can do anything that will make it any different that it has to come back to us because all we're approving is the two parking spots and up to the property line. So it will never come back, and Marianne will make sure it never comes back.

Boardmember Barr: Good idea.

Boardmember Dale: And then we make a second resolution recommending...

Boardmember Cameron: Recommending that on the Village property that such-and-such appears and such-and-such appears, and we just go from there.

Chairperson Speranza: I want to make sure that it's clear that it's not every element of this plan.

Village Attorney Stecich: Yes. "To modify the site plan to approve parking in the rear." The parking in the rear as shown on the plan. That's all.

Chairperson Speranza: Specifically related to the property owner's property.

Boardmember Cameron: We approve amendments to the site plan "of the property of," and we name the property. We're not going outside of the property.

Chairperson Speranza: Well, I wanted to make sure that's clear.

Boardmember Dale: Just say that we're not approving recommendations or changes to the public road, the mapped road.

Boardmember Cameron: Then if we have a second resolution saying that we suggest that for the Village property...

Village Attorney Stecich: You know, it's defined on there as parking area. So if you just say you vote to approve a site plan amendment, that permits this parking area as shown.

Chairperson Speranza: So we need a resolution to approve the site plan for the parking area in the rear of 433 Warburton Avenue.

On MOTION of Boardmember Dale, SECONDED by Boardmember Cameron with a voice vote of all in favor, the Board resolved to approve the site plan for the parking area in the rear of 433 Warburton Avenue.

Chairperson Speranza: And now we want to make recommendations to the Board of Trustees, and we can certainly speak of the Ridge Street extension shown on the plan as the new driveway. And there is a sense that it should be narrowed as compared to what we're seeing on the plan, recommended with vegetation on either side. And these are recommendations.

Boardmember Cameron: Or we suggested to the applicant that.

Boardmember Alligood: And can we say – and this, hopefully, everybody can be comfortable with – we recommend designing the access to the extent possible without a bollard?

Chairperson Speranza: No. See, I would say it the other way. I would say we cannot come to a consensus on the treatment for controlling access between the

extension and the new street because we can't come to a consensus. And we don't need to on this.

Boardmember Dale: We don't need to come to a consensus.

Chairperson Speranza: We don't need to, but we don't need to vote either.

Boardmember Dale: I do think that there is a strong argument for why that access by anybody should be blocked, period. And that's whatever the bollards would accomplish because a car could not drive onto that property for safety reasons. Because if anybody did, they're not going to be able to get out.

Boardmember Alligood: Why couldn't they get out?

Boardmember Dale: They'd have to back out. They couldn't turn around.

Boardmember Alligood: That's not a safety issue.

Boardmember Dale: Or they'd be driving on the grass. I think there are reasons to prevent cars from going in there altogether. I think, hopefully, the public is smart enough not to, and it will appear as a private driveway. And it would have a sign, No Unauthorized Cars. But it wouldn't eliminate that the Board of Trustees could impose a sign, a post of some sort.

Boardmember Alligood: My recommendation was not to say that we recommend absolutely not to use it. What I'm suggesting is that we say if they can find a way to design it without using it, they should.

Boardmember Dale: These are our recommendations to the Board of Trustees.

Boardmember Alligood: That's what I'm suggesting. I just voted yes for the parking, but I want to register my concern about putting that there if it's not necessary. I want it on the record, and we don't have to say it was unanimous. This is a recommendation. We can say one Planning Board member felt strongly, and this was expressed earlier.

I wasn't the only one who expressed it. It's just others don't feel as strongly about it. But I think we can put it on the record that there was a concern that by blocking it off we are creating the impression to the public that we've privatized a public street. And I think we can express that concern. We can't recommend ... they can hear that it wasn't everybody who felt that way, and they can design it as they see fit. But I think it should go into the record, that they consider that concern.

Boardmember Cameron: Maybe we suggest that they narrow the gravel surface so it's only a single lane, number one. And suggest that we have a trial period without a

bollard, recognizing a way which could include a bollard could be required to stop cars from occupying a roadway which is going to be a parking spot. If people just drive down there and start parking on that, and they can't get their cars in and out of their parking spot, I'm in favor of the bollard.

Boardmember Alligood: So that's a possible recommendation, that they consider a trail, period. And again, I understand it's a recommendation. But it's a careful consideration.

Boardmember Cameron: I want to give them the opportunity, if the trial period doesn't work, they actually have the right to put the bollard in. We don't want to leave it that they put the road in, and then the bollard doesn't go in even though cars are parking left, right, and center.

Boardmember Dale: I agree with that.

Boardmember Cameron: That's fine.

Boardmember Alligood: We don't have control over that anyway. You pointed that out.

Boardmember Cameron: I'm just suggesting what we're suggesting to the Board of Trustees.

Chairperson Speranza: Marianne, do you have something as far as a recommendation? Narrowing the gravel surface of the extension?

Village Attorney Stecich: Yes, that Ridge Street be extended, but the gravel surface be narrowed, with vegetation on both sides.

Chairperson Speranza: Careful consideration to control of access to the extension.

Boardmember Dale: You'll be presenting this to the Board at their next meeting?

Ms. Griffin: Yes, we're going back.

Boardmember Dale: And you're going to put the side vegetation in?

Ms. Griffin: Yes, we can do that.

Chairperson Speranza: Careful consideration to control of the access. There is a concern with respect to the bollard.

Boardmember Alligood: If you want to say it was only one Boardmember, that's fine.

Boardmember Cameron: I'd do it the other way around. That we might try a trial period without the bollard, but recognizing that they need to be able to have access.

Chairperson Speranza: I think that's good: there's a concern with respect to the bollard, we recommend there be a trial, period.

Boardmember Alligood: Without it.

Boardmember Cameron: Peter, I'll take a shot at it this way. I don't think they're going to want to put the road in and do this whole thing without having to write putting a bollard in.

Chairperson Speranza: Definitely.

Boardmember Cameron: So we have to put that part of the sentence in there. Because when the Board of Trustees approves it, it has to be with the recommendation that if it doesn't work they can put a chain across or a bollard or something of that nature.

Mr. Wolf: Just a point of information in this discussion. We did talk to one of the owners of the property at the end of Ridge Street about how often people actually park there, and he says pretty frequently and he tries to call the police. Sometimes they ticket, and sometimes they don't.

Chairperson Speranza: Yes, we know that's an issue. Sir, you want to make another statement? No?

So I think we keep saying the same thing over again. We will make sure that the concern about the bollard is in the recommendations. Marianne, do you want to draft these?

Village Attorney Stecich: I'm not sure. Is everybody agreed on that about the bollard part of it?

Chairperson Speranza: Have it as a trial period.

Village Attorney Stecich: OK, fine. Are you saying now you want me to write something up? Or I'll write something and circulate it.

Chairperson Speranza: Sure. Then we're done.

Village Attorney Stecich: With them.

Boardmember Dale: We have to vote now.

Chairperson Speranza: We did. The recommendations just get transmitted. So we're good.

We are not finished though. We did have another request. It's extension of the subdivision approval for Blue River.

Chairperson Speranza: If you recall, this is a property on Broadway. The lots were actually combined. There is a requirement in our code that a building permit must be received within, I believe it's 180 days of the subdivision. And they are approaching, the applicant is approaching, that time period. If you recall, we did have them go to other boards and they're just not ready, although they are expecting to be ready soon. So they simply need us to approve an extension by 90 days for their subdivision. It doesn't need a hearing or anything.

Boardmember Cameron: I'll make the motion then, since I voted against it.

On MOTION of Boardmember Cameron, SECONDED by Boardmember Dale with a voice vote of all in favor, the Board resolved to approve a 90 day extension.

IV. DISCUSSION ITEM

Greening Our Code

Chairperson Speranza: Greening the code, we're not going to speak much about unless that's why you're here. C'mon up.

Mark Vandersande, 81 Tompkins Avenue: Obviously, we were here earlier for 31 Brandt Street.

Boardmember Cameron: We remember you.

Mr. Vandersande: So it's something that...

Building Inspector Sharma: Microphone, and mention your name again.

Mr. Vandersande: The first sentence is actually kind of harsh, but I'll explain the reason behind it. I wrote: "*Obviously, with LEED, people are just trying to get points to make it to the next level, regardless of the impact on the environment.*" This is a quote I'd found from some architects on the Internet: "*The point system creates perverse incentives to design around a checklist rather than building the greenest possible building.*"

A couple quick examples, and then the last page is actually something from the *New York Times* where they do kind of talk about this. You get a point for your proximity to downtown. If you're a half-mile away from downtown, you get a point. You get a point for a bicycle rack. There's no requirement to have a bicycle, but you get a point for a bicycle rack. You also get a point for putting a high-efficiency HVAC unit in. So I don't know how you can compare like a \$300 bicycle rack to \$10,000, \$20,000, \$30,000, where you're actually trying to do something to minimize your energy, or your carbon footprint.

A parking spot with a plug for an electric car, you get a point. You don't have to have an electric car, you have to have a plug for an electric car. So this is actually kind of backwards. I wrote it this morning. But if you go to the last page, they talk about "*the federal building in downtown Youngstown, Ohio features*" blah, blah, blah: "*It has a LEED certification, the country's most recognized seal of approval.*" And if you skip down to what's the third or fourth paragraph: "*The building's cooling system, a major gas guzzler, was one culprit.*" Basically, it did not pass the Energy Star rating.

Another was: "*Its design to get its LEED label, it racked up points in things like native landscaping rather than structural, energy-saving features.*" So my thing with that is ... and I had read your previous minutes about this, where you do talk about adopting a minimum standard for LEED. My only point in bringing it up is, if it's a point system it's a checklist. You can say, "Well, I can spend ... if I'm one point away, I can throw in a bike rack" versus throwing in something that's actually truly energy efficient."

So that was my concern with that. On top of that, LEED is costly. Someone did mention it. In doing that house, we were looking at a minimum of – just for the consulting work – about \$5,000. So you need a consultant, independent, that's going to watch the project, manage it. You have to have a day-long training where you get all the subs in, and you say, "We're going to green this, and here's how we're going to do it." So you're paying for everyone's time to do that. Beyond that, there's additional permits, there's everything else.

I then go on to things that I believe work in doing my due diligence in what we wanted to do. Energy Star-rated appliances, you've touched on that in the past; water; efficient appliances and fixtures; things like dual-flush toilets; energy efficient windows; energy efficient 8-track; proper vapor barrier insulation; SIPS, which my architect mentioned. If you actually turn to the fourth page you'll see what is a thermal image from what on the left is a traditional-built stick home, which is 99 percent of all the homes in Hastings. And you can see all the heat coming through.

A SIPS panel, which is what's built on the right and what's actually shown below, it's foam that's sandwiched between two pieces of OSB. It's more modern, it's better. But you can see the difference. The only heat coming out of there is at the windows.

So back to the first page: alternate energy, geothermal, solar, wind. I know you guys had mentioned that.

Energy efficient light bulbs, I actually have something on that if you go to the third page. If you look at the picture at the top, many of you have probably seen those lights. I know I got one going to college, a 300-watt halogen bulb. And if you look at it, it's actually 1,100 degrees Fahrenheit. If you do the cost on that, you go down to what is that little Excel graph down at the bottom, if you run that seven hours a day 365 days a year, it's 766 kilowatts per year at a cost of 30 cents per kilowatt. It costs \$229 a year to run that.

You can go to Lowe's for \$90 and you can buy one. It's the same form factor, the same look, the same feel. It's \$90, it uses a 38-watt bulb. The cost on that is \$29 to run it a year. So instantly, if you go out and buy that today you're going to save, year one, \$100, period. Over five years, it's \$900. And part of that goes to educating people.

On existing homes ... and I live at 81 Tompkins Avenue, the house is built in the '50s. You know, when we first moved in – probably like five years ago – you'd feel it would be cold in certain areas. We actually ended up stripping off the outside of the house and spray-foaming it. But once we did that, you saw the insulation back in the '50s no one cared about. Energy was cheap, you could put whatever. It settles over 50, 60 years.

So replace windows with efficient ones, insulate walls with foam – changes thermal envelope in the attic from being the bottom of the attic – if you have an air handler with the AC in there through the ceiling. It doesn't make sense to run a duct in an attic that's 120 or 150 degrees with R-3 insulation on it and be pumping cold air through that. Because all you're going to do is cool your attic. The air may come out of the handler at 60 degrees, but by the time it actually comes in to the house, or through the ceiling, it's at 70 degrees. So it's not efficient.

Energy efficient appliances and 8-track, obvious. The other thing I noticed you guys had talked about was how do you incentivize people to do it. You mentioned tax credits. I think Deven had mentioned that; whether you go from 2.5 to 3 stories, maybe it's an incentive to have people do it. You put solar, you meet so many of these criteria; expedited permit processing; easy access to green builders. The biggest problem I find – and the reason I chose him as an architect, Frank – was, I'd gone to his Web site. He'd talked a lot about it.

It was important to me. And the title on – I don't know if you have the full set of prints – it's "a greener building". I didn't want to go for LEED. It was too much of a problem, too much of a hassle. But I am energy-conscious, probably more for selfish reasons. You know, you want to lower your energy bills, things like that.

Lastly, education. And this goes to something I found on the Internet. It's this thing called "Kill A Watt." I don't know if you guys have seen it. You put in the cost of your energy, you plug in your appliance, and you let it run. It'll tell you, based upon your usage, what that costs you per month or per year. You know, things that people don't understand is, you leave your TV on. Well, you have it powered off and it's still drawing energy.

They make power bricks out there that the only thing you really need on now is your DVR. If you go away on vacation, you don't need the TV on. It serves no purpose, but it's still drawing energy. But your DVR if you're recording things, so they do have power strips where there's a master shut-off that kills the power to everything: your VCR, your DVD player, your stereo. But your DVR will still work because it's on a bypass. I forget what I ran that at, but if you go away for a few weeks you're probably going to save \$10 or \$20.

Boardmember Cameron: But when you're building your house, one of the smart things to do is to have wall outlets where the switch controls the bottom outlets. I did that on another house. You hit the switch and it turns off all the stuff.

Mr. Vandersande: Yes, and the DVR can go on one on a bypass. Exactly.

Below that is just some of my thoughts of what I saw in my own house. But I figure you guys can read it and kind of relate to it. I think that's all I had.

Chairperson Speranza: Well, thank you.

Boardmember Cameron: Yes, this is terrific. One of the issues I think we have is that as you look at Hastings today, and you look at all the houses here, how do we get the population to be more enthusiastic, like you, about trying to resolve their issues about overregulating. That's where they need to pass the issue. I mean, we can go and buy kill switches and have Deven walk around everyone's house, the kilowatts, and have people look at them. But how do we incentivize this?

Boardmember Barr: I'm going to open my mouth because I'm just substituting tonight. I read all the other notes. I think the point that he made is educate, not regulate. In fact, if you want to talk about saving energy, eliminate the SEQRA law. Just think of what it costs to print all this stuff, distribute it, have it going on for years. I always thought that all the regulation makes things much worse.

But we could have programs. For example, in the beginning of the spring season and the fall season there could be "Greening Hastings for the Summer," "Greening Hastings for the Winter." You could do educational programs. With buildings being built, new ones, you could have certain regulations and incentives. But with the existing ones, to have all kinds of regulations that, well, if your dishwasher suddenly

goes out two days before Thanksgiving you have to get a permit or something like, that doesn't make sense.

So I think his ideas and this information are very valuable to really make it an effort to educate. Because I think people are going to want to. They don't have to be beaten into it.

Boardmember Dale: One recommendation that I made in response to what you were saying, Jamie, is right now to impose on anybody, a private house, and say you have to do this, this, or this, creates a problem because you're imposing an economic issue on the family. But if somebody applies to the Village to renovate their house in some way – to do an extension or whatever the renovation is that requires an action by the Village for a permit to go forward – we're requiring them to get an energy audit, and to comply with major issues raised in that energy audit and fold that into their renovation.

It would be a minor increase to the overall cost of what they're doing, and they have to do it if they want Village authorization to go forward. And I think that's one way to get to the existing housing stock without imposing on families who are unwilling to undertake it.

Boardmember Alligood: The only tricky part about that, Bruce – I read it in your memo, and I thought your memo was excellent summarizing all the issues and the territory we covered – the only question I have about that is, are we going to be accused of being arbitrary. Because there isn't a set standard for the things that you have to meet. It's going to sort of depend on that auditor and what they find, and their recommendations could very, very much be based on who you see.

Requiring people to actually follow what's in the recommendations could be tricky.

Boardmember Dale: That is tricky, and I agree. I just had an energy audit done on my house, and I've given it to one contractor and then had somebody else look at it. I got one quote of \$4,500 and I got another quote for \$13,000. It's a difference of what material and how extensive, and you can go on. So yes, there is a definition. But I think also, like his suggestion, we're not asking for LEED certification. We're asking people to follow the LEED checklist.

And when you set a limit that you want to reach, the minimum amount of work on our checklist – taking from LEED – would be those items that get you a certain amount of efficiency. And that could be the case with how you set limits on an energy audit. You don't have to decide for that person which one of these things. What you want him to do is insulate his attic, whether he uses cellulose or whether he uses plastic, foam, or whatever method he uses.

So we could set certain standards, and take certain standards from LEED as well, that are the goals that we're trying to achieve. Like I don't like the idea of shooting for gold LEED arbitrarily because then you end up with bicycle racks for people who don't have bicycles, et cetera, et cetera.

Boardmember Cameron: You want to go for platinum, right?

Boardmember Dale: So I think if we set a clear standard that we're trying to reach, then we could use all of this.

Boardmember Alligood: So going in to the process, we could say we have five major areas that we want the auditor to look at. And they can recommend other things, but if you get recommendations around the insulation we require you to take some action towards fulfilling them. So that it's not arbitrary. When you go in, there's certain things that need to be rectified. We could have parameters about it can't cost \$50,000 or something that would be outside the bounds of what's reasonable.

Boardmember Dale: When we first started this discussion, I gave a handout that we're using in my office: 10 points that you need to meet. I think that's a start for setting that standard. These are 10 items that, if these are in your energy audit, do it. How you do them is up to you.

Boardmember Barr: There's a difference between if someone's coming in to renovate their house and looking for a building permit, then these are things you have to do. If that's not the case, there are also things that we could recommend. If you're just sitting there with your existing house, you know, you can change those light bulbs.

Boardmember Alligood: Right. And that's a different form.

Boardmember Barr: So you're not regulating people just because they breathe and walk and have a Hastings address.

Boardmember Dale: I think public education is part of Bruce Jennings' recommendations.

Chairperson Speranza: And the Conservation Commission. I did go to ... but let me just very briefly mention what we have done since our last meeting. There was a meeting – Eva was gracious enough to host Kerrie Jane and Sharon and I – and we got a little tutorial from her husband, Doug Alligood, who is a LEED-certified architect and mentioned some of the exact things that you were talking about with respect to the point levels and what you can get points for and how some things are kind of skewed and odd.

But he also mentioned that going from ... one of the things we have been struggling with was, if we're looking at LEED silver and we go to LEED gold, what does that mean. And Doug mentioned that, in fact, that is a big jump in terms of dollar commitment to have a homeowner get it. So that was very good and very helpful.

Then Kerrie Jane and Sharon – I wasn't able to do it – went and met with the commission of planning for the Town of Greenburgh, and got a little more explanation of how things have been going since they're using Energy Star and LEED-equivalent; not LEED-certified, but LEED-equivalent. There are some follow-up questions as a result of that meeting that they have.

Then last week I went to the Conservation Commission and we spoke – again, it was Sharon and Kerrie Jane – about what we have been doing here, and how we can move forward. I have since been in touch with them and they're also looking at another standard which we have actually seen, thanks to Deven who gave us this brochure on the IGCC – International Green Construction Code – which I have yet to go through. I very, very briefly went through it.

But I think you're right. It's almost time to step back yet again. And maybe we have to look at five different points when we talk about greening the code and the sustainability. Rhoda, I think, came up with a great phrase: "educate, not regulate." But the renovations, I think there are some things that maybe what I can try to do is, based on the comments that I have received – particularly with respect to the model ordinance and discussions we've had here – put together the things.

For instance, somebody comes in for a renovation. What are we considering a renovation? Is it the 50 percent of the house, or the two major systems, or ... and that those are what the possibilities are.

Boardmember Cameron: I like the Columbia University formulation, and Bruce wrote about that. I like the division of having Energy Star for one- and two-family homes, and maybe LEED silver for larger buildings.

Chairperson Speranza: Equivalent.

Boardmember Cameron: One of the reasons I'm attracted to that is, first of all, they have done some of the drafting. And secondly, maybe because it's Columbia, because they actually designed it sort of for Westchester, there'll be a whole bunch of communities out here that start doing the same thing. Because it's always best in a lot of these things to be what I call "comfortably in the rear." You're in the front, but you're in the rear part of the front. Otherwise, you get hammered too often. You don't know what to do. We want to be innovators, but not too far out there.

Chairperson Speranza: Not the ones who get slapped for doing it wrong.

Boardmember Cameron: Because we will make mistakes if we're too far out front. So I'd love to explore Bruce's memo and Columbia University. And the difference between Columbia seems, for some reason, to allow a housing development no matter how big, as long as it's not more than two stories high, not to go LEED. And I'm not quite sure. We have to look at that very carefully because that's what's going to happen here.

What we're going to end up with is having blocks of 30 or 40 houses being built, whatever open acreage we have. And maybe that should have tougher standards because it's more sophisticated than going on, and save Energy Star for single-family homes, and people building.

Boardmember Dale: We could easily – it's not that long, the legislation – have a work session and go through it.

Chairperson Speranza: I'm willing to do that.

Boardmember Dale: And just choose the options. Because the options are very clearly laid out. And most of them, I don't think, would be applicable to what we want to do.

Boardmember Cameron: We could also take advantage of some free advice. They suggest to you that you might send your comments in to them at Columbia. First of all, they're going to respond to your comments. And secondly, they're going to come out with a revised version of that legislation later this summer.

Chairperson Speranza: Yes. Later this summer, right.

Boardmember Cameron: So we should just come up with a list of questions – or why are you doing this, why are you doing that – and launch them straight at Michael Gerard. And we'll get a nice response back, I would predict.

Chairperson Speranza: So we'll have a work session.

Mr. Vandersande: Just one quick thing – I know everyone wants to go – on how you incentivize it or whatever; whether you mandate it, or incentivize it. I think one option, rather than mandating it, is to say like you may have five different things. One may be alternative energy sources. You could say, all right, if more than 50 percent of your home is powered by solar we'll give you a 10 percent tax break for five years.

Chairperson Speranza: Not in Hastings.

Boardmember Dale: Yes, not in Hastings.

Chairperson Speranza: It's a possibility.

Boardmember Dale: As much as the residents would like it, we can't afford it.

Mr. Vandersande: The reality is, it'll work. And you can't really go ahead and say, "Well, you're going to have to spend an extra \$40,000 on your house."

Chairperson Speranza: You get to be the first item on the agenda at the Planning Board when you come in.

Boardmember Cameron: I think we should put you in charge of marketing.

Chairperson Speranza: Well, I hope you will continue to participate. That's great.

Marianne, one thing. You were in touch with Michael Gerard? There was this issue with respect to whether or not we could go ahead and adopt something like that ordinance.

Village Attorney Stecich: Without getting the approval by the state.

Chairperson Speranza: Right. So we don't need to get a waiver from the building code.

Village Attorney Stecich: No, because it's only the building code that requires the waiver, not the energy part of it.

Chairperson Speranza: So this would be considered the energy code. There we go. That's good.

Building Inspector Sharma: I had a question on the extension to the subdivision.

Village Attorney Stecich: You know what? I think a letter's a good idea, though. I'll send a letter.

Chairperson Speranza: That we voted it at the Planning Board.

Village Attorney Stecich: Yes, I'll just send a letter tomorrow.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Chairperson Speranza: Hearing no further action – yes, we're not used to staying up this late – the meeting's adjourned.

