

**VILLAGE OF HASTINGS-ON-HUDSON, NEW YORK
PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARING
JULY 15, 2010**

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

PRESENT: Chairperson Patricia Speranza, Boardmember Fred Wertz, Boardmember Jamie Cameron, Boardmember Eva Alligood, Boardmember Bruce Dale, Boardmember Ed Dandridge [8:40 p.m.], Village Attorney Marianne Stecich, and Building Inspector Deven Sharma

CITIZENS: Richard Comi

I. ROLL CALL

Chairperson Speranza: Good evening. I'd like to call the meeting of the Planning Board to order. It is Thursday, July 15. Samantha, would you handle the roll first, please?

Ed will be here. He said he would be here this evening.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Meeting of June 17, 2010

Chairperson Speranza: Are there any changes or comments, corrections?

Boardmember Dale: On page 18, the first paragraph, when I'm talking: "*What is the Columbia proposal? What is the IDCC?*" It should be "the IGCC." I guess that's it because my marker's gone.

Actually, I had another.

Chairperson Speranza: And just for the record, let it show that Mr. Dandridge has arrived.

Boardmember Dale: On the bottom of page 12, the last sentence, where it says there was [crosstalk]: "So if we went ahead of the state, we would be out of compliance" is the words that are missing.

Chairperson Speranza: It's on the record. If that's it, then can I have a motion to approve the minutes as amended?

On MOTION of Boardmember Alligood, SECONDED by Boardmember Dale with a voice vote of all in favor, the Minutes of the Meeting of June 17, 2010 were approved as amended.

Building Inspector Sharma: Just one quick thought. Not a whole lot of times, sometimes, you miss who did the resolution, who moved and who seconded it. So it might make sense to identify, name them.

Chairperson Speranza: We can do that.

Building Inspector Sharma: For the minutes of the meeting, that comes in handy. Thank you.

Chairperson Speranza: Great. OK, will do, Deven. If I forget, remind me.

III. OLD BUSINESS

Continued Public Hearing on the application of Sprint/Nextel for the addition and alterations to the existing wireless antenna system at Andrus Home, 185 Old Broadway

Chairperson Speranza: Next on the agenda is a continued public hearing on the application for Sprint and Nextel, or Sprint slash Nextel, for replacement facilities at the Andrus Home on 185 Old Broadway. Stephanie, if you'd like to come?

Building Inspector Sharma: Please take a microphone.

Chairperson Speranza: Yes, take the mic. Or you know what? You can even stand at the mic -- you don't have a board to point to? -- and just kind of a little summary for what you're here to do.

Stephanie Bortnyk, attorney for applicant - Sprint/Nextel Clearwire: Again, as mentioned last time during the initial public hearing, it's simply an upgrade to existing facilities: a replacement of three existing panel antenna of approximately the same size; an addition of four microwave dishes which, since our last meeting, we're actually proposing

now to move those, all four of them, below the panel antenna; one new GPS antenna; and one new cabinet inside the equipment room.

So that was the initial application, with that one change of moving the microwave dishes down. Since our last meeting, I think the Village wanted to get some input from outside consultants. We've had an opportunity to do that, and have come to, I guess, an agreement on a couple of changes, such as the movement of the microwave dishes. I believe Mr. Comi actually requested five items be included in an approval.

Chairperson Speranza: Just so people are aware of how the process works, the applicant has come forth with the application. There are things that are beyond the expertise of this board -- telecommunications/radio frequency stuff being one of them -- so we do ask for ... we hire someone to serve as the Village's representative in the review of those aspects of the plan.

So that said, Mr. Comi, would you like to come and present us with your report?

Richard Comi, Comi Telecommunication Services: Yes, ma'am. Good evening, chairman, members of the Board. I'm the wireless consultant for the community. Been out and visited the site, reviewed the applications, had discussions with the applicant. And basically, as they've stated, this is an upgrade to a facility whereby they're also adding microwave dishes for the utilization of Clearwire.

Those dishes, when we went out to the site, some of them were proposed to be above the façade, which made them more visible. They've agreed that they can operate them below the façade level, which will reduce the visibility pretty dramatically. And they've also agreed to paint everything to match the brick that's up there. So with that in mind, that took care of that issue.

At the same time, as you may or may not be aware -- but you have pictures in the application -- there's quite a number of antennas at this site. It isn't just Sprint. It's a lot of other issues and items. And on that upper floor outside the main -- it looks like an administrative or a room where a lot of the people can spend time -- there's actually a pretty good walkway outside the glass windows.

With all of the antennas up there -- and the applicant has agreed to this -- that after they install their antennas we will discuss where we would like to have actual measurements taken to ensure absolute compliance with the federal regulation on RF emission in any area that the public or maintenance people or anyone else can get to.

And Mr. Sharma, your Building Inspector, may talk a little bit more about the façade itself. When we were up there, the façade that now has the antennas on it is deteriorating, and I believe there is going to be building work done there. However, what's liable to occur -- because this is a pretty significant existing cell site for the applicant -- they certainly aren't going to want to take it off the air, nor would the community want them to do it for any extended period of time.

So they may need some temporary arrangements and equipment. But that's an issue in coordination, and the applicant should come forward to your community requesting that. But with what they've done here, and those issues in having the RF emissions tested afterwards, I would state that this meets your regulation. It's your compliance, it's in your zone where you want it, and it's been now made to be very unobtrusive so it does comply with your regulation.

I can answer any question the Board or anyone else may have.

Boardmember Cameron: So your view is that they can actually paint the dishes, as well.

Mr. Comi: Absolutely.

Boardmember Cameron: Because one of the issues -- and I did read your letter -- those were put up a whole bunch of years ago, the other ones, and they were supposed to be painted. You agreed to paint some, and then you never did. I want to make sure that the understanding is your letter covers everything that's up there now, not just the new stuff you're putting up. I'll certainly be looking to make sure you paint them once you put them up.

I have this feeling that you knew they weren't painted, and you knew you were supposed to, and you just left them there anyway. And they're a bit of an eyesore in this town. That's not a good citizenship point of view.

Chairperson Speranza: And we had talked at one meeting about getting them painted before they're installed. Do they have to be painted before they go up? I mean, do they have to be painted after?

Building Inspector Sharma: After.

Chairperson Speranza: Really? They can't be painted before they're installed?

Mr. Comi: Remember, you have a brick façade. And you want to match the brick as closely as you can, so you do want the antenna physically there. But there should not be any delay. By the way, they're supposed to get a certificate of compliance from this community, and that certificate of compliance should not be issued until the painting's done.

And I'm not saying we need to be involved. Your Building Inspector can do that. But if there's any questions, Deven and I talk on a pretty regular basis now so we can make sure that that doesn't occur.

Boardmember Cameron: While we're on the topic of painting them their color, there are ones up there from one of your competitors which, in my personal view, were painted rather well and have a good color. I would not want to see antennas up, two different colors. So maybe, Deven, you could work with them to see whether that color really is the best one around.

But having antennas up with different colors, we're going to end up with a patchwork on the building. And I think having them all one uniform color would be a better result for us, long term.

Boardmember Dale: I also think it would be a whole lot easier to spray paint them before you put them up and have them dry, than try and bend over the parapet to reach them and spray paint them.

Boardmember Cameron: I agree with you.

Mr. Comi: The difficulty is, if you want them to look like bricks ...

Boardmember Dale: If we have the color ...

Mr. Comi: If you have the right color you want, yes, sir, absolutely. If you want them a solid color to match the other solid color it could be done beforehand.

Boardmember Cameron: So they were going to go up there and paint little bricks?

Mr. Comi: Oh, they can actually put a material that looks like bricks on them. In terms of these antennas, they can nowadays pretty much do whatever your imagination says is necessary because the materials are out there not to degrade their signal to any tremendous degree.

Chairperson Speranza: You raised one issue, and I'm trying to figure out how, given your work for us in this application, there's going to be radio frequency emissions testing done after the installation.

Mr. Comi: Yes, ma'am.

Chairperson Speranza: That's something that you can review or you can make sure of?

Mr. Comi: Absolutely.

Chairperson Speranza: And that's OK?

Mr. Comi: It should be agreed to in terms of the process between us and the applicant: what equipment they use, where they take the measurements, how they exactly do it so that once we get the measurements there's no argument. Then we review it and we will provide the community a letter that, from our opinion, it's in compliance with the federal regulations.

Yes, that's all part of it so you have something on the record for your citizens, from us as your consultant, stating that it meets that. Absolutely.

Any other questions for me?

Chairperson Speranza: Thank you for your help.

Mr. Comi: Thank you very much.

Chairperson Speranza: I just want to hear -- might as well say on the record -- that you're amenable to this.

Ms. Bortnyk: Of course. I believe Mr. Comi pointed out five different conditions that he's recommending the Board make part of the approval, should you be so inclined, and we're agreeable to all five.

Chairperson Speranza: My recollection is that there are a couple of actions, Marianne, we have to do on this. Right? SEQRA, we had declared ourselves lead agency I'm sure.

Village Attorney Stecich: I believe you're the only Village agency that has authority.

Chairperson Speranza: Yes, that's right. So we had a SEQRA form as part of our packet. It wasn't this time. It was a couple of meetings ago we had the SEQRA form. I looked through it and I didn't see anything at odds.

For the record, the application will be changed because you had four 24-inch diameter dish antennas which were not ...

[crosstalk]

Ms. Bortnyk: It's four 24-inch diameter dish antennas. But now they'll be placed all four below as opposed to three above and one below, I believe.

Chairperson Speranza: That's right. So the proposed action is the same. Now, what we do with SEQRA is the project description, and then our findings as to whether or not there are any kinds of impacts on land and water. I would say -- and if somebody disagrees, please let me know -- that there would be no significant impacts in any of these categories, and we could issue a negative declaration.

Mr. Comi: Madam Chairperson, one suggestion before you do that?

Building Inspector Sharma: Please speak in the microphone.

Mr. Comi: This is a continuation of the public hearing. Before you take action on SEQRA you need to close your public hearing if you're going to do that.

Chairperson Speranza: Thank you very much. I knew that, but I didn't do it.

Is there any member of the public here who wishes to speak on this application? Then we will close the public hearing on this application. Thank you. See, if there had been public here I wouldn't have forgotten.

So for SEQRA we could issue a negative declaration on the application. It's the application for site plan approval for the Sprint/Nextel in the personal wireless service overlay district. Again, it's a motion on a negative declaration for the environmental review.

On MOTION of Boardmember Wertz, SECONDED by Boardmember Cameron with a voice vote of all in favor, the Board resolved for a negative declaration on the Environmental Review Act process for the Sprint/Nextel application in the personal wireless service overlay district.

Chairperson Speranza: OK, then we have an action on the site plan approval.

Now I need a motion to approve the site plan for the application at 185 Old Broadway.

Ms. Bortnyk: Site plan and special use.

Village Attorney Stecich: You need a site plan approval and a special use permit. That's separate. She just didn't get to it yet.

On MOTION of Boardmember Alligood, SECONDED by Boardmember Wertz with a voice vote of all in favor, the Board resolved for site plan approval.

Chairperson Speranza: And now we need an action to approve the special use permit for the antennas at 185 Old Broadway.

Mr. Comi: I'm sorry. Just procedurally, if you don't mind, I would suggest that you add the conditions as part of that motion.

Chairperson Speranza: Yes. OK, thank you. This is good. I have a lot of help tonight. All this assistance to the Village.

So I need a motion now for approval of the special use permit, subject to the conditions outlined in Mr. Comi's letter of July, 7, 2010.

Village Attorney Stecich: There are also a couple others. Because I don't believe the painting is one of those.

Chairperson Speranza: It can be painted to match the façade.

Village Attorney Stecich: OK. And also the payment of all fees. I would suggest that if you generally approve I'll write up a resolution of approval so you've got it for the file that matches everything, that matches the discussion.

Chairperson Speranza: OK.

Village Attorney Stecich: But you could vote on it tonight. So it'll be effective tonight, and I'll just do a follow-up resolution for your signature.

Chairperson Speranza: OK. So it would include the payment of all special fees and, again, the agreement that a final radio frequency emissions report will be done by Mr. Comi and submitted to the Board.

On MOTION of Boardmember Dale, SECONDED by Boardmember Wertz with a voice vote of all in favor, the Board resolved approval of the special use permit, subject to the conditions outlined in Mr. Comi's letter of July, 7, 2010; it would include the payment of all special fees and, again, the agreement that a final radio frequency emissions report will be done by Mr. Comi and submitted to the Board.

Chairperson Speranza: Thank you.

Village Attorney Stecich: Patty, just so they know, they have to also go to the ARB -- if you haven't already.

Ms. Bortnyk: I was told that that was part of the approval, but I didn't believe that that needed to actually go.

Village Attorney Stecich: I would think so. It also might make sense for the painting. If for no other reason to go to the ARB, the ARB might be able to help them decide on a paint color.

Ms. Bortnyk: Should we do that before a building permit, or as part of a formal approval?

Building Inspector Sharma: By the way, I do have an application for the ARB and the \$25 fee from them already.

Village Attorney Stecich: So they just have to go to the ARB before they get their final permit. That's just one of the steps.

Ms. Bortnyk: Before the building permit. Right?

Village Attorney Stecich: Yes, but it doesn't have to be noticed or anything like that. So it shouldn't hold you up.

Chairperson Speranza: I think they meet the first Monday of the month.

Building Inspector Sharma: That is true.

IV. DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Greening our Code

Chairperson Speranza: Next item on the agenda is our lengthy discussion, as always, of greening our code. And I think things are moving at a rapid rate to actually seriously look at adopting what I call a "green code." And, in effect, it is called an International Green Construction Code.

We talked about it a little bit at the last meeting. There was a meeting that was held July 7 at the Community Center. The Mayor was there and Trustee Jennings. Eva was there, Fred was there, Bruce was there, Deven was there. And it was a woman who's with the International Construction Code Council -- I believe that's what it's called -- and the New York State Department of State Code Division. And Ron Peester from New York State gave a really good overview of how this potentially would work with our current codes.

There's still a lot of work that would need to be done, and the Conservation Commission members -- Kerrie Jane and Sharon have been doing a dynamite job in lining up people to participate in a work group. I invite anyone, any of the Boardmembers -- and they've invited, any of the Boardmembers -- to serve on this smaller working group.

I am not going to serve on the working group. There are other things and, quite honestly, while greening the code is really good and process is really important to me, how many units of energy reduction we need to include is not something of interest to me. And it's something that I don't feel qualified to participate, really, in the discussion. So I open it up to other Boardmembers. I think they've got a really good group that they've started so far.

At this point, I'm going to turn it over to Bruce to talk about a little more of the details. And I did warn him in advance that I hoped he would speak a little bit about this so I wouldn't have to keep talking.

Boardmember Dale: Well, essentially there are two codes. Actually, there's one code and a standard, which is a major distinction. The one that is a code, the IGCC -- which is for nonresidential development, primarily -- is set, in itself, a code. And as a code, it's written in affirmative language that basically says, "You must do this, you must comply." It's an

administrative code, and it tells you what you can and cannot do. And it covers all new construction as well as renovation of all nonresidential properties.

There are, I would assume, certain choices or options that have to be gone through in the process of adopting that code. But, in effect, it's a good three quarters of an inch thick, and a real code. And it's based on the ICC codes, which are fairly well adopted throughout the country. This is brand-new. It is not fully ... it's still in the process, but it's been adopted by a couple of states at this point.

Chairperson Speranza: The state of Rhode Island, I remember.

Boardmember Dale: Rhode Island is one, and a couple of cities have adopted it. They were extremely anxious that Hastings, if it wanted to, could be first in Westchester County and New York State, which sort of intrigued our mayor who felt that would be a good position to be in.

We'll come back to this code. The difference between the two, the other was referred to as the ICC 700-2008 National Green Building Standard, of which we have a copy, as well. Which is, unlike this, not a code although the language is very similar. And not unlike LEED, you get points for various line items that you comply with when you're building. It does require somebody like Deven to review a project to make sure that, in fact, they have accumulated the right number of points. And there are different gradations, from bronze to gold, or platinum. They had slightly different ...

[crosstalk]

Chairperson Speranza: Some emerald in there.

Boardmember Dale: Emerald. They have different standards than LEED. They distinguish themselves from LEED in a big way, and they felt that this is based on code language and it's based on actual construction techniques. So that it's choosing which technique you will use in solving a given problem as opposed to LEED, which says if you put a bicycle rack on you get 20 points, or if you do such-and-such you get points. The points here are accumulated for actual work that is necessary in residential construction.

Village Attorney Stecich: Could you give an example?

Boardmember Dale: No, I haven't read it. They didn't actually give it to us. Looking through it, what it describes is walls. And it describes, in this case, five different types of walls and then says how many points you might get according to which technique you use.

Chairperson Speranza: Different levels of insulation.

Boardmember Dale: Exactly. As opposed to the other approach, which is accumulating points by not so much the technique you use, but the problems you solve.

I think the big thing we should be talking about is this commission, or group committee, that has to go back through it. They spent a lot of time discussing the fact that if we decide to adopt -- and we could adopt either or both of them for the Village -- the state is considering adopting it, but hasn't. There's a process that the state is in the middle of going through, and it won't be complete until, I think he said, November.

Chairperson Speranza: November to adopt, and then January to implement.

Boardmember Dale: To implement, right. So the state's approval, we could sort of sneak in before the state and get a certain amount of publicity value out of it.

The issue that the Mayor raised, and I think is what this commission has to resolve, which is crucial, is what is the relationship between our code and this code. Particularly, it was concerned about the residential more than commercial. That might actually, for the most part, just substitute for ours.

But it seems that you do have to have basically -- which they are willing to do with us ... is to sit down. And what they proposed was a charette, where you actually went through the two documents -- our code and the building standards -- and determined what the integration would be. The Mayor raised the concern that if we adopt this, and this is very difficult to meet the conditions that are in here, then we're going to get a reputation as a village we can't build and nobody's going to want to develop in Hastings because they can't, and don't understand how to, comply.

His question was, does this go beyond that which architects traditionally, and in practice today, are comfortable with and are familiar with. Or are we imposing on them an entirely new standard which is going to be costly to their clients for them to actually design to this standard.

The decision was made after I left, by the people that were still there, that there would be a committee. That the Conservation Commission would reach out to a group of architects and practitioners to bring them together to study exactly what is in these two and how, in fact, that integrates with our existing code. So people who are already familiar with the code could read this -- or may actually be familiar with, since it's been around for a couple of

years already -- and see how it would work. And then go into this charette and, along with their organization, their technicians, just go through the process of integrating the two documents so that we would be then comfortable that we could adopt this as a law and a standard we want to see building to and feel comfortable that it actually could be implemented.

Boardmember Cameron: Help me. Just one of the things that occurred to me is a very simple thing: building heights. We have different required building heights in different parts of our town. We would have to put that somehow into it.

Boardmember Dale: Well, it doesn't overrule your zoning.

Village Attorney Stecich: So when you're saying "how it fits into our code," you mean the building code.

Boardmember Dale: The building code.

Village Attorney Stecich: OK. So that's not our code, the state building code, because the zoning code doesn't deal all that much with building other than the setbacks and heights.

Boardmember Dale: Permits and materials, and where they want to use them. That's included.

Boardmember Cameron: Well, we have definitions of what the floor is and what half a floor is.

Boardmember Dale: And what a structure is.

Boardmember Cameron: That's construction code, too.

Boardmember Dale: Some overlap.

Village Attorney Stecich: But, see, I guess the thing I don't understand is, principally it's the building code. Why don't they already know that? Do you know what I mean? Because our building code is the state building code. That's what I sort of don't understand.

Chairperson Speranza: And what's interesting about this code -- at least the green construction code for primarily nonresidential uses -- is that the community determines a standard for each category. And I raised the issue of if the state ... what does it mean when

they say "the state is going to adopt this"? Because what we set as a standard for Hastings may be different than what Elmira might set as a standard for their community.

We're different climates, we're different phases of development. The gentleman from the state Department of State said New York State would adopt this code as the framework, but communities would still have to go through the process of setting what it is; what they refer to as "the jurisdictional requirements." New York State may adopt a minimum. We may say our emphasis is going to be much more on energy conservation as opposed to water conservation.

They described it as an overlay: "This is an overlay to the building code."

Boardmember Cameron: I guess I'd like to go back to the original question. Is there anything in our building code which is not actually New York State at the present time -- New York State's standard building code? We haven't amended the building code, so we have the New York State building code.

Chairperson Speranza: Right.

Boardmember Dale: But we have things in our zoning code that are different than what's in the building code. And those are the things that, in part, need to be in it. What they said, and what Patty was referring to, was that every jurisdiction has, I think ... remember there were 12 items?

Chairperson Speranza: Right. The jurisdictional requirements ...

[crosstalk]

Boardmember Cameron: I don't know as you can choose.

Boardmember Dale: ...that we choose. And then the architect that is implementing the project has the different number of responses that they can make to those jurisdictional requirements, all of which would have been satisfied. So that there would still be freedom on the part of the designer on how they met the jurisdictional requirements.

Village Attorney Stecich: But back to Jamie's point, because it's kind of basic, I don't think -- but Deven can confirm -- that we have things in our code that are different from the big building code. Because our code reads ... our building code is the code of New York State. And I don't remember filing ... and in order to have something different than what's in the state building code, you have to file a petition up at the state.

Chairperson Speranza: Right.

Village Attorney Stecich: And I don't ever remember doing that. So my guess is ...

[crosstalk]

Chairperson Speranza: No. The code is, right now, the state building code.

Village Attorney Stecich: I know, but somebody just said there are things in our code that are different from what's in the state building code. Are there?

Building Inspector Sharma: Yes.

Boardmember Dale: We made changes even in the short time that I've been here.

Chairperson Speranza: The zoning code.

Boardmember Cameron: But not to the building code.

Village Attorney Stecich: But not the building code, OK.

Boardmember Dale: But they're in contradiction to what might be in the building code. And we have the right to do that, based on what the state representative was saying, as long as we don't go below the standard of the state code.

Village Attorney Stecich: I guess it'd be helpful to have an example because I can't quite picture that. So Deven, what do we have in our code that's different than what's in the state building code?

Building Inspector Sharma: Historically we had the sprinkler code, which is far more stringent, far more restrictive, than the state code. And I've been an advocate of kind of repealing our code and going with the state code. But that has existed before the state came up in their code.

After the state has adopted some codes, and we come up with a different code which is more restrictive and difficult than the state code, then we had to file with the state and had to get their blessing to actually enforce it.

Village Attorney Stecich: Yes, but the question is, what do we have in our building code? The sprinklers -- that's an example.

Building Inspector Sharma: The sprinkler is the only one thing that I know, a sprinkler requirement. For example, for residential buildings, up to three stories no sprinklers are required. But our code requires, even if it's a single story, if you do any new construction with respect to whatever use, even if it's single story, that requires sprinklers. And we've been enforcing it.

Also, to give you an idea, by the way, of how this, code -- green code, or standards -- will work, there is a software we use currently in the energy code. It has some kind of a built-in total system, and there are points for different things you can do to the building. For example, there's a prescriptive method which says you have to put R-38 insulation in the ceiling or 19 in the walls, et cetera, et cetera.

But while you're designing -- an architectural engineer is designing -- he might see that he can't really do 38 in the ceiling, but can do 23 in the walls. So that kind of combination, or permutation, there are elements that you can put in different kinds of doors and windows. So depending on what you do, as long as the net result ends up being at a certain number of points, it's compliant.

So most of this code, green code, is based on the performance code. When the state might adopt and the jurisdiction might adopt, it will be many different levels of compliance: names of metals like bronze, silver. So the state might adopt, as a minimum, that certain kinds of buildings must meet the bronze standard. But in order to meet the bronze standard, there are many different ways of doing it as opposed to just building/construction things.

So those kinds of options and choices are there. And one last thing about electives. I'm going to use the example as in schools and colleges. Like IT's an elective course, and then you have this steward of technology. There are some mandatory courses they have to take to get so many credits. But there are so many extra credits they can get through elective courses. So they have a choice. They can either take a course that Deven teaches, or somebody else teaches.

So that thing is also built in to that code. Here, the jurisdiction might adopt it, or New York State might adopt it: *"This is the basic minimum you must do, then here are 10 or 12 more credits, or points, you must get through elective practices. Here's a list of practices you can choose from."* So it's going to be a little bit different. As a matter of fact, a lot different from the building code. It's going to become a building code.

Once you build a building, you have to meet certain criteria in terms of sustainability, green construction, conservation, reusable energy things. But instead of saying that you have to do just this, they're saying you had to get at least so many points or you had to meet at least the bronze standard or the gold standard, et cetera, et cetera. Communities may come around and say, "OK, state only once the bronze standard for residential buildings and commercial buildings. But we, Hastings-on-Hudson, would like our community to go a step further."

So when we do that, then there's a process that we have to work with the state. And the state seems ... you know, the impression we got is that they're very motivated to just let you do it; make it easier for you to go ahead and do that.

Chairperson Speranza: Oh, they promised us all the help in the world -- anything that we need to do.

Building Inspector Sharma: That is true.

Chairperson Speranza: And it is a process that we are going to have to go through in terms of setting the standards for this community. We have to do it, so we might as well just start the process now.

Boardmember Cameron: I think we all know how politics work, and I'm just curious whether New York State is capable of adopting a code -- construction code.

Boardmember Dale: That came up.

Boardmember Cameron: Without amending it. I mean, there's nobody who's politically powerful enough up there in this industry? They're not going to get in to the legislator and amend the thing?

Chairperson Speranza: Well, you saw the comments. Right?

Boardmember Cameron: Just for the fun of it, because Patty sent me the Web site, I went through and looked at the comments which are coming up in the August meeting in Chicago. Maybe we'll all get a free ticket. And it's just filled with comments by people who are representing an industry or a kind of company.

And they all are suggesting a change to this code that prefers their industry -- like temporary buildings don't have to comply with these things because they're temporary; even though all it means when it says they're temporary is that they're capable of moving them; not that

they're not going to be there for a hundred years, but they're just capable of being moved and therefore they shouldn't have to comply with this code.

Building Inspector Sharma: But the states have, for the longest time, already been adopting standards and codes. And actually, the building code is on a three-year change cycle. So it will definitely get adopted, whatever the process they have to take. They're expecting 2,000 pages of public comment.

The same thing has happened, for example, currently in ICC and New York State. ICC is actually working on sprinklers in residential buildings. Right now there is no requirement for it and, of course, lobbyists for and against it. Sooner or later this is going to get resolved, then is going to become a part of the code.

Boardmember Dale: They actually said that the code itself is not written in stone and, at this point, it is a continuous process.

Boardmember Cameron: There'll be a new version in 2012.

Boardmember Dale: There is this possibility of evolution built into it.

Boardmember Cameron: Then this is the question. If we adopt ours now, then when New York State adopts it in January do we adopt theirs? Do we have to adopt theirs? When their new one is adopted in 2012, do we adopt that one?

Boardmember Dale: The state said that we are free to adopt any code we want, as long as it's not lower in the level of security.

Building Inspector Sharma: Than the state code.

Boardmember Cameron: So their view is that this code, in all respects, has got a higher standard than their code.

Boardmember Dale: Than the existing code in terms of sustainability.

Boardmember Cameron: It has to be in all respects. It can't be for most of the stuff.

Boardmember Dale: But they're addressing primarily sustainability issues, and view conservation, and things of that sort. So that when you integrate it with the existing code you're still maintaining all the structural issues that the code requires. You know, it's not 100 percent replacement. It's an integration, and that's the process they volunteered.

Boardmember Cameron: I was saying earlier, it has one good thing. That is that you have to be one linear foot above the floodplain for the building versus what we had on 9-A.

Chairperson Speranza: Well, if 9-A comes back, whatever we want.

Anyway, there is going to be a follow-up group if anybody wants to participate. Bruce, do you want to follow this? Ed, I don't know if you want to become involved in this.

Boardmember Dale: Sure, I'll try.

Boardmember Alligood: Patty, I volunteer my husband, the architect.

Chairperson Speranza: We have a Planning Board architect. The Planning Board spouse/architect will participate.

Fred you were there. Is there anything you want to add to the discussion?

Boardmember Wertz: I think you've answered the questions I had. They really surrounded ... and I left before the variance, so maybe they addressed these things after I left.

But about the sequence of what we are going to do and what we can do, what our options are, and how that relates to the time frame that New York State is on, when are they going to adopt it. What are the implications of our doing this before they do, and how the sequencing would work? And I think you clarified that to a great extent.

Boardmember Dale: I think the Mayor was intrigued by the headlines of our being first.

Boardmember Wertz: That's of less concern to me.

Boardmember Cameron: One of the things which we may be asked as a planning board is to look at all the alternatives and provide them with a view of the alternatives. They may have all their own view, and they may be more informed than ours, but there are a lot of choices that the town can make. And we might want to be looking at those, or thinking about them.

Boardmember Dale: That part would come from the commission that looks at it. It could possibly be resolved during that all-day charette when we try and integrate it. What that process would actually look like was a little confusing. I got the feeling -- I don't know if

Patty did, or not -- they were there to sell us on this plan. They were working hard to get us to buy into this.

Some of their arguments were fairly compelling. It is being supported by every major building organization in the country: AIA, contractors' and builders' associations, there's a whole list of them. There are not planning organizations supporting it, which I thought was kind of interesting.

Chairperson Speranza: And I think they realize that. That in order to complete the process, they have to reach out to the planners also who are, many of them, struggling like we are in terms of coming up with a way to become more sustainable. They also made the point that they've received lots of calls and lots of questions about what can we do as a community to become more green. And then once they start discussing it with the community, the communities say, "Oh, well, maybe we don't want to do that. It's too much work."

Boardmember Wertz: Well, we've taken on the initiative ourselves and we've started to explore and research all the alternatives. Everybody all over the country is concerned about this, and there are many different ways of going about it. And I think we started to realize that there are many different systems out there. They're all floating around, and I think it becomes very difficult to choose one over the other.

I reported on Gold Star, and that seemed like it made a lot of sense in a lot of principles. And it seems to me, although I haven't reviewed the standard 2008 one, that it was built in the same genre as Gold Star. So where there's a goal that has a kind of net green result, but that people who were building have a lot of flexibility to choose this or that or that or that depending on what their interests are.

So it's good. I always like that kind of flexibility. So I think these systems, these approaches, are consistent with what we were looking for. And if it's true that they've done all the footwork, why not take advantage of that rather than reinventing the wheel when we don't have all the resources to even do it?

Boardmember Dale: And I think the strong points about this, like Deven just said, it's a performance thing. So you're going to get the end result.

Boardmember Wertz: You get the end result, and you're not rigidly forced to do it in a particular way.

Boardmember Dale: And it leaves those decisions up to the designers. And, too, that this is written as a code; so it's not just describing a result, and you can go find it. It's much more specific.

Boardmember Wertz: And we had struggled with that, too. Do we want to have a code, or do we want to have standards? I mean, that's the language they used. And we weren't using that language, but we were struggling with it. So you have wiser minds than ours sorting all this out, figuring it out, and then actually doing it. We could have been here for years struggling with this stuff, as we found out when we started to take it on on our own.

And so, in a way, it's perfect that something like this would come along at this time. And not only ... but if it is something that is going to be widely adopted, they're selling it but it was convincing enough. And if it's going to be adopted by New York State, then this is exactly what we're looking for.

Boardmember Alligood: I agree with your points. I think also the fact that it comes in with some built-in technical assistance --

[crosstalk]

Boardmember Wertz: That's great, sure.

Boardmember Alligood: ...and giving us a very concrete task of coming up with the idea of the working group, where we really just kind of go through it and say what would this mean in terms of meshing with our current systems -- that makes sense because it gives us something very concrete to kind of come out with and say, "Does this work for us, or not?" Because if there are too many things that are going to have to be worked out and don't quite mesh, you might come to the conclusion this really is too much for us right now.

Or we may say no, this makes sense. To your point earlier, Patty, at some point we anticipate having to do this anyway.

Boardmember Wertz: So you're saying it's worth exploring. We're not committing ourselves to anything anyway. And not only that, we have resources now because we're first. They really want to work with us. Plus, they're motivated to make us very happy with the result. So with those resources, and all the motivation to make it a showcase for the rest of the state and even the country, why not take advantage of that opportunity.

Boardmember Cameron: There is something unusual about us, and that is that we are an almost totally built-out community. So one of the things we were struggling with -- which I

haven't looked at the code yet -- is what level of renovation do you have before these provisions have impact on you. And I think we need to look at that because we don't want to put too much of a burden on the people who already live in older homes. At the same time, we want to move forward.

Boardmember Alligood: And it's only for nonresidential uses, so it's really only going to affect a very small sliver of people.

Boardmember Cameron: No, they have a resolution.

Boardmember Alligood: Are we considering both of them?

Boardmember Wertz: It's both, right?

Chairperson Speranza: As the companion piece.

Boardmember Dale: Yes. This is the residential piece.

Boardmember Alligood: So we're not just going to take on the one piece.

Boardmember Dale: How much nonresidential construction are we going to see in this?

Boardmember Wertz: But renovation, we'll see.

Boardmember Dale: Perhaps on the waterfront, which is a whole new issue.

Building Inspector Sharma: By the way, the guidelines for what level of alterations or renovations will kick in what kinds of requirements, similar to our current building code, is built in to this code already.

Boardmember Cameron: Well, we talked of renovating a kitchen. You'd have to put Energy Star appliances in. I don't know what the answer is. Maybe you do. That'd be great, but I just think we should look at that.

Boardmember Dale: I think he's right.

Building Inspector Sharma: What I do know, I did read through this IC 700. It would require a level of expertise, training, education, and resources to implement and enforce this. To develop that, in itself, could take a fairly good amount of time that is just not there. That anybody could come in, and say, "OK, I know how to do it" is not quite true. So I think

intentions are there, good intentions are there, and a lot of focus is on it -- not only coming up with the standard codes, but to train people how to enforce it.

For the building code, every time it changes there is a mechanism. We all have to take a certain number of training classes. All through the year, we had to take like 32 hours of continuing education. This is going to be something new. A lot of us have picked up a lot of buzz words already, but when it comes to ...

[crosstalk]

Chairperson Speranza: Bruce picked you up a brochure on residential examiner certification. So they've already started.

Boardmember Dale: We've already thought of that.

Chairperson Speranza: Man, they're very complete.

Building Inspector Sharma: That might compete with LEED. I was going to go for LEED accreditation, but there'd be competition whether to that or this.

Boardmember Dale: It spoke about LEED. Those were some of the questions that were asked: the difference between what the Columbia people were suggesting and adopting. The difference is, this is a real code. Columbia is telling you to adopt LEED, which is a standard and a standard which you can't really certify.

Building Inspector Sharma: In the absence of these standards, I think LEED and Energy Star will be the thing. People were looking at shortcuts to try to understand, number one. Talking LEED is one thing. Understanding LEED is something different, similar to Energy Star. What do we really understand of Energy Star, and how do we put the mechanism in place to implement and enforce it?

The ICC, the International Code Council, is in the business of producing the codes and the mechanics for its implementation. They would even give you a model code to put into your local codes to adopt this code. Of course our attorneys would have to work on it, but they give you the model language.

Boardmember Wertz: One of the ways they sold it was, they said, "In developing this code, we were already looking at enforcement." So whereas LEED wasn't really developed as an enforceable code, it was developed as a voluntary option.

Chairperson Speranza: That's right. That's true, they did mention that.

Boardmember Wertz: This code is developed together with enforcers and looking at the viability of enforcement. That was a big selling point, I thought.

Chairperson Speranza: Right. That's true, I'd forgotten that.

Building Inspector Sharma: Also, this ICC 700 had been in place for a couple of years already.

Boardmember Cameron: 2008.

Building Inspector Sharma: Because different organizations got involved with it, and there may be a way one could struggle with it to make it apply to nonresidential things also. However, it was only written for residential developments. As they tried to tell us some of the states may have adopted it, some jurisdictions. And if we try to do that, maybe we need to go to those states and find out what kind of staff they have, what their qualifications are, what their college education levels are or how they got trained to do some of the things.

There's a lot of juggling here. Some might say, "Oh, I know I heard that before." There are a lot of things that you would have kind of a strange look on your face: "I don't know what they're talking about." So when the Mayor said the other day that he read through some pages of it and it was a lot of gibberish, gibberish is what you're not familiar with. I read a medical journal, that would be all gibberish to me.

Chairperson Speranza: Right. But you can read the building code and you understand it.

Building Inspector Sharma: So people who understand are trained to understand. For others it will remain gibberish; the contract of the homeowner, especially. So we need to develop resource, and I think that's part of a process. That we'll understand, be convinced, and also be able to implement.

Then, of course, money comes into the picture, too. With the current financial situation, how is that going to happen, how is that going to play into it, even with the best of intentions. Are we going to be able to do it? I don't know.

Chairperson Speranza: Well, it shouldn't cost us anything.

Building Inspector Sharma: Deven can do everything, I guess.

Boardmember Dale: Yes, Deven. All you have to do is go take a couple of classes.

Chairperson Speranza: But this is why we're getting all this assistance from them. I'm not saying it's not going to cost anything, but it shouldn't cost very much. Again, it's one of the real good things about having them be engaged now, the ICC and the Department of State.

So we'll see. All of this stuff is to be worked out through the working group. If anybody's interested, let me know. I'll pass your name to Kerrie Jane, or you can get in touch with Kerrie Jane and just say include me on the group.

So that's it for greening our code.

Boardmember Cameron: We should take a look at what they are, I guess -- the ICC 700 from 2008 -- because passing this construction code without asking that is fruitless, since we're 90 percent ...

[crosstalk]

Boardmember Dale: I could make copies of this.

Boardmember Cameron: I'm sure there's an electronic document.

Chairperson Speranza: There is an electronic version.

Boardmember Dale: Their Web site.

2. Comprehensive Plan

Boardmember Alligood: Patty, I was wondering -- because the last time we spoke about the Comprehensive Plan and we were all getting prepared to have discussions ... and it was before we were invited to have this joint session with the Board of Trustees.

Chairperson Speranza: That's right. So we don't have to go into it. I'll be honest, I'm not completely through it. I like the way that it's been set up. I have some questions, I have a few comments. I think as a document and as a path, and certainly the organization of it, I think, is very well done. But you're right. On Tuesday, the 20th ...

[crosstalk]

Boardmember Dale: Next Tuesday.

Boardmember Alligood: It's Tuesday, yes. How many people are going to attend?

Chairperson Speranza: At 7 o'clock. We can go through it.

Boardmember Alligood: I'm going to be there. You're going to be there.

Boardmember Cameron: I probably won't be there.

Chairperson Speranza: So, Jamie, do you want to speak to the document?

Boardmember Cameron: No. I'll make up a little list, and I'll send it. Anybody can bring up any of the points that they want to.

I guess I have a couple of overall points. I think the best chance of getting something done with the Comprehensive Plan is that they put a real planning mechanism into this document so that the Trustees embrace something each year. We need that.

Boardmember Dale: Chapter 9 is to follow.

Boardmember Cameron: But you get trailways and things like that. Unless people really get out there and start making it a priority to pick up pieces of land that the Village wants to acquire for its trailway mechanism it's just never going to happen. We need to have that actual plan being put in place.

Also, there was a discussion in here which I just had trouble understanding: that we were going to acquire Children's Village and we were going to acquire the ice cream place, which is no longer with us. And in Children's Village, there's just a little piece that's in Hastings. Most of it actually, I believe, is in Dobbs Ferry.

My personal view is that while I love land, we seem to have enough land up there on that side of the Village, at least as much as we can afford. And even there, we're somewhat willing to put real trails in it, but people don't really use it very much. So I have trouble understanding that. I'm sure everyone always loves acquiring more land.

I was very interested in how to attract businesses to this town. Interesting enough, there's a bunch of businesses that exist in this world which actually don't depend on size. An example of that is a bank branch. Citibank is here selling services, but they have to have a branch

here. It doesn't matter that they could put a bigger one someplace else. Maybe if we focused on those kinds of businesses we might attract more into town.

The other thing ... it's funny, you can speak to advertisers. They're all interested in selling things to younger people. I think maybe we need to find a way of making this town more attractive to our children. That's a real way to bring some length and time downtown. Really focus on that.

The other thing, just throwing out comments -- and I'll put more of these in writing -- is that there was a focus on putting a kiosk up at Five Corners. I was thinking that if I was taking a friend of mine down the Aqueduct and I wanted to give them a tour of Hastings, I would have actually come down Flower or I'd come down Edgar's Lane. And I would come and walk them through this town from one end of Warburton to the other. I wouldn't bring them down past our magnificent A&P and past our Citibank. That's not the way I would come.

So I thought that kiosk was a great idea. We should find a way of steering people off the Aqueduct by bringing them up [off-mic] down here. It even occurred to me that maybe we should try to steer them off our Quarry Trail, and actually eventually put stairs up to Warburton so you could come down the Quarry Trail and be on Warburton walking through town.

Boardmember Dale: I have the feeling that circulation, and gateways to the Village, was really talking about automobile traffic and not so much about ...

[crosstalk]

Boardmember Cameron: Well, I think on the kiosk ...

[crosstalk]

Boardmember Dale: Pedestrian, yes. That people would stop at the kiosk and learn what's in Hastings to see, then they would get back in their cars.

Boardmember Wertz: The main concern was cars. But you're right that the kiosk is really something that's going to serve walkers more than people in vehicles. So there's a little incongruity there with the goal, and the strategy to achieve it.

I think the feeling was that Five Corners really needed to be upgraded in terms of notifying -- I think, really, people in vehicles primarily -- that we have a downtown and it's right down there and it's a great place. And exactly how you do that -- whether a kiosk which, as you're

saying, may be more appropriate for walkers. And if there aren't ... you know, then again are we sure that there aren't walkers coming in that way.

I like your strategy that it be that of a person ... you know, it might be your special understanding of the Village that would lead you to do it that way, whereas most people who don't know the Village are going to come down Five Corners.

Boardmember Cameron: There is actually a magnificent trail -- which is now not in good shape -- which goes right next to the firehouse, right next to the Community Center. If you go in the back of the firehouse, you can walk. There's a trail that goes right across and goes diagonally up to the Aqueduct. In fact, if you want to see what it used to look like you go and look at the picture -- the walking trail map we have. You'll see it right there in the back, and it used to be a magnificent trail that's now in terrible shape. But it's a wonderful way.

Boardmember Dale: Jamie, responding to something you said, I think it is useful to remember that having this plan does not necessarily mean we're going to implement the entire plan. Part of it is that you create the legal framework for future decisions that you could make that are justified by the intent of the plan the Village has accepted. So yes, there's a lot of stuff in here the Village should do which we can't afford to do.

Boardmember Wertz: Or even the details of the recommendations, in some ways, are only kind of examples of how this could be solved. I think if we're really going to be putting in the time and energy to solve one of these problems, we would review the means of doing it that are suggested here and possibly alter it or modify it to be more effective.

I don't think this is a document where you wave a magic wand and you get what you wish for. There's a process of implementation, where the Village Board will have to even make things a priority. Then they will discuss it and they ...

[crosstalk]

Boardmember Dale: Or not touch it at all, but just have it as an objective that the Village has adopted. So that if you later make a decision that "I'm changing the zoning," for example, it's based on ...

[crosstalk]

Boardmember Wertz: It's like a menu. Part of it's a legal framework, and another part of it is a menu for what we want to do this year.

Boardmember Dale: And that aspect of the plan is important to keep in mind and not get lost.

Boardmember Alligood: I want to say, overall ... I mean, I think I have a lot of comments on the details. I'm very pleased about the vision of what it's trying to accomplish and some of the strategies for accomplishing that vision. I think it's very progressive. I think it embraces the right things about Hastings: preserving green, our gateway.

I think it focused on some things that you don't normally think about on a daily basis. But you say, "Hey, you know, we really could fix that. That's a good idea," or, "I hadn't thought about, overnight, how we feel about this corner of our village changing." And it anticipates things that could come up in the future that we wouldn't be happy with.

We're fine with the way they are now, but we may be forced .. you know, to your point, Bruce, we may have, at some point, some proposal before us that would completely alter something that we really care about, we just hadn't thought about, and hadn't taken the steps to protect.

So part of it's protecting what we like about Hastings, part of it's fixing things that we think could be improved. On that level, I'm very pleased with where this ...

[crosstalk]

Boardmember Dale: And this would give you the rationale, at a future planning meeting, to say no, we don't want that because it's inconsistent with the plan.

Boardmember Wertz: I think that to work through all the details of all the recommendations is, we'll see how far we can get next week. But I know what it was like developing this in the first place. And I think the level of detail that it goes down to may not be appropriate for the process of adoption because it would just take too long.

Some stand out, and you just say, "Well, wait a minute. This just shouldn't be in here." But to micromanage the whole document is not going to be fruitful at this point.

Chairperson Speranza: And I don't think that's the purpose of the meeting.

Boardmember Dandridge: I would make some tweaks, particularly in the area of where we talk about parking, small things. There's an emphasis of sort of the retail piece. But I also think it misses, in large part, the residential commuter issue, which currently puts an unfair burden on working families when the first-come, first-served parking is currently

taking longer for a parent. To have child care issues, that's a big social equity issue that this town hasn't addressed.

The sidewalks issue, which really sort of predominates about making sure people have access to downtown, puts us at risk on a public policy standpoint because the focus needs to be on safety. We have way too many blind spots and steep slopes where we don't have sidewalks. So I would tweak those.

But the big issue, and I want to choose my words carefully, goes back to something Jamie mentioned very early on about the whole issue of advertisers want to target younger demographics. I happen to be in that business a little bit, although I'm not young anymore. But I do know that space. What troubles me is that there's absolutely nothing in the way of an analytical look at the demographics of the town -- past, present, and future -- that would give us real projectable data to talk about what our real needs are going to be.

The town has changed significantly just in the 10 years that I've been here. There's a lot of language, flowery language, about us being a typical American suburb. I would challenge what that notion is today. So I think everything that Eva said is right, which is that it aspires to some of our highest points. There are some very big analytical foundations missing.

Chairperson Speranza: No, you raise a good point in terms of forecasting what the needs are going to be. I'm not sure that they need be, but I think there's a data set that's very clearly missing that would help anyone sort of form an opinion. Now all you're left with is your own anecdotal experience, which I think is very valuable, but it's probably not particularly representative of where we're going to be heading in the future.

Boardmember Cameron: Well, the numbers on population clearly show how quickly this thing goes out of date from that point of view. I mean, I was reading that, and then I just read the *Hastings Enterprise* and it said the U.S. census data shows our population went up 4 percent.

Chairperson Speranza: That's timing. The week it comes out, the census information gets published.

Boardmember Cameron: But an example of some simple things we can do that make a nice change is, I think the narrowing of Broadway has helped us a great deal. I notice it's much easier to go up and down that road, and you don't have people that try to whip by you on the inside edge or try to push you over -- get four lanes going both ways -- as you go by the synogue. You don't need to go that fast.

Boardmember Dale: There is a suggestion in here that I think could be very useful for affordable housing about using the ... they talk about public trust landfills. There are a couple of properties on Southside which are owned by something called Argent Ventures. It's land that originally went back to the railroad that the railroad doesn't use. The railroad doesn't like to own property, so the property's being held by this corporation, Argent Ventures. The railroad has no intention of using it.

We contacted them to see if they would be interested in donating the land, for affordable housing, to the Village. The guy who runs Argent Ventures turns out to be ... he's looking at his real estate holding, and that has value. And he's not a not-for-profit, but a for-profit, who bought the rights to these properties in a public bidding process from ...

[crosstalk]

Chairperson Speranza: Conrail.

Boardmember Dale: ...from whoever held the land before. It would seem to me we're not in a position to develop those two sites. But if the plan is approved, and Southside is rezoned as residential, those two pieces of property will pick up a huge amount of future benefit. And it would be very important if we could secure that land now while its value is quite low by using the land trust somehow to purchase it for future affordable housing. So that when it does get zoned for luxury housing you would have a mix, and the ultimate development.

Boardmember Cameron: That's a good thought.

Boardmember Dale: That would be very useful.

Boardmember Alligood: I wasn't going to comment on a lot of the details and go into whole sections, but I do think there was one section that deserved our attention because it had to do a lot with Planning Board procedures and suggestions.

Chairperson Speranza: Site plans.

Boardmember Alligood: So I thought we should give some thought to this particular section starting on page 49. But I thought requiring fiscal impact analysis on projects that are ... I think it had to obviously meet a certain threshold. But we talked about that, and certainly it's come up a lot in the comments about the waterfront. So I thought that was good. I agree with that suggestion.

And a couple other little things that they suggested about sending out an email notice on some of the larger projects that the various boards vote on, that the community has been very involved with or concerned about or had a lot of public participation on. Usually, River Towns *Enterprise* covers it, or something. But just say, you know, one of the suggestions was to circulate the results by email.

The Village is very good about getting information out. If you're on the list you get emails constantly: "*Just last night the Architectural Review Board, or the Planning Board or the Board of Trustees, voted on X, and here were the results and here were the conditions put on the project.*" Just to kind of build on transparency, it can be viewed on TV or on the Internet.

But I thought some of those suggestions made sense to me in terms of really reaching out to the community to encourage participation in some of these big questions that we grapple with.

Chairperson Speranza: Yes. I'm glad you pointed out this section because there is a lot that pertains specifically to our work. And I think there's room for refinement. Instead of talking about a fiscal impact analysis for site plan, it's got to be more than site plan because sometimes we don't have a site plan action, we have a subdivision. So again, just a little bit of lag, but I think the concept is fine.

And the idea of developing the brochure, or flow chart, for someone who comes to the Village and wants to know how to ... you know, "I just have this piece of property," or, "I'm thinking of buying this house, and what can I do?" You know, "The broker says that I can add on. Can I really add on, and how would I do that?" I think would be something that would be really good.

Boardmember Cameron: Well, I was fascinated by this thing on the fiscal impact. Because if you listen to developers you hear them talking about the highest and best use, which means [off-mic] profitable.

Chairperson Speranza: That's right.

Boardmember Dale: That means profit.

Boardmember Cameron: And, you know, sometimes that's just not the interest of the Village. Because if it's going to be something ... although it makes the developer a lot of money, if it's going to require the town to render services such that it will never make it back on the tax side, then that doesn't actually work for the town.

You know, this seemed to have us looking at it before we change the zoning to make it that way. I don't think we have the ability to change the zoning once somebody owns the property unless we're doing it as part of a larger plan. It's called "spot zoning," I believe, just to take the property and make it so we get a higher return on it even though the developer gets the lower return on it.

But I think it's a very serious matter because ... and this thing points it out even more: the differentiation between taxes paid by single-family dwellings and taxes paid by multi-family dwellings. But I had a solution to that whole problem, and it was very simple. And that is that we should all go to a rent-based tax system. That would solve the problem immediately.

But all that would happen is that the taxes paid by single-family dwellings would go down, and then the rate would have to go up to get the same amount of money. That's what would happen. You can guess why the [off-mic].

Boardmember Dandridge: Realtors would have quite a field day with that.

Boardmember Cameron: Sure. They could change this [off-mic] yet, because it's clearly an unfair ... if you get to a problem on what you're going to do with your [off-mic].

Boardmember Dandridge: There's no question. The question is, how do you do it in wholesale so we don't end up perceptually disadvantaged.

Boardmember Cameron: Right. Just a small aside [off-mic]. I was just in France for awhile, and in France they have speed bumps. The speed bumps there are different, though.

Chairperson Speranza: What are they called?

Boardmember Cameron: I'm going to tell you that. [off-mic] of my story, please.

And they're quite long. They're about 60, 70 feet long. They have one in absolutely every town that goes up like this, goes to one level, and goes down again. And the French, of course, have a good humor. They're called "gendarme couchés" -- sleeping policemen. So you feel like you're going along and you're running over a dozen policemen, and down the other side. That's what they call them.

Boardmember Dale: In Spain and parts of Latin America they use a series of little bumps.

Boardmember Cameron: They don't have any snow.

Boardmember Dale: The big ones, I think, can take snow.

3. Miscellaneous

Chairperson Speranza: OK. Let me just do a count for the meeting in August. We will likely have at least one application.

Boardmember Dale: There'll be something from the affordable housing committee.

Chairperson Speranza: August 19.

Boardmember Alligood: I probably won't be here. I think I'll be away that week.

Boardmember Dale: But the Affordable Housing Committee will be more of a presentation for feedback on options for the development of the two sites.

Chairperson Speranza: Oh, the two sites that you're ... OK.

Boardmember Dale: They have three architects that have looked at it, and they need some feedback on several issues in terms of what's possible and what kind of variances might be available, et cetera.

Chairperson Speranza: I'll be here. Obviously you're going to be here. And do you know?

Boardmember Dandridge: It's unlikely, but I will do my level best to try to be here.

Boardmember Wertz: And I probably will be.

Chairperson Speranza: No, Eva?

Boardmember Alligood: Pretty sure no, but I'll let you know.

Boardmember Cameron: I'm a candidate for the 26th, if you want to move it a week.

Chairperson Speranza: That's possible. I was going to say if the 26th is better, how would that work? Especially if Affordable Housing wants to do a presentation.

Boardmember Dale: You should talk to Sue Smith.

Chairperson Speranza: Because that works for me.

Boardmember Wertz: Probably better for me, too.

Boardmember Cameron: Maybe we should just do the half-section. You'll get four out of that.

Chairperson Speranza: That's good. If there's only one application, and then affordable housing ...

[crosstalk]

Village Attorney Stecich: Yes, that application is not a big deal. I mean, I can review the stuff ahead of time.

Boardmember Dale: You will be useful on the affordable housing.

Village Attorney Stecich: I can't be there on the 26th.

Boardmember Dale: One of the questions is parking, and what the code will or will not allow.

Village Attorney Stecich: As a general matter, though, probably if there's legal questions it's better to deal with them off-line.

Chairperson Speranza: And in advance.

[crosstalk]

Boardmember Cameron: You could meet them on the 19th, though [off-mic].

Boardmember Dale: So we'll tell Sue to contact you.

Chairperson Speranza: Yes, we'll see about the 26th of August.

Building Inspector Sharma: The 26th for anybody instead of the 19th?

Boardmember Cameron: Yes, move it to the 26th.

Building Inspector Sharma: But would you then want to hold another meeting for Christina's application?

Chairperson Speranza: My understanding is they'll submit for our August meeting.

Building Inspector Sharma: In your email you had said that maybe you would want to hold a special meeting.

Chairperson Speranza: Yes, and then she emailed back and said ... because she was thinking of coming here to make a presentation, but then she said she will wait until the August meeting.

Building Inspector Sharma: August 26.

Chairperson Speranza: And get the site plan and everything that we need.

Anything else?

VI. ADJOURNMENT

On MOTION of Boardmember Dandridge, SECONDED by Boardmember Wertz with a voice vote of all in favor, Chairperson Speranza adjourned the Regular Meeting at 9:45 p.m.