

**VILLAGE OF HASTINGS-ON-HUDSON, NEW YORK
PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARING
AUGUST 26, 2010**

A Regular Meeting and Public Hearing was held by the Planning Board on Thursday, August 26, 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 William Logan, Boardmember Jamie Cameron, Boardmember Eva Alligood, Boardmember Bruce Dale, and Building Inspector Deven Sharma

CITIZENS: XXX

I. ROLL CALL

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Meeting of July 15, 2010

Chairperson Speranza: The first order of business is the approval of our minutes from July 15. Are there any changes to the minutes?

Boardmember Dale: On page 10, on the last paragraph, where I'm speaking: "... *the one that is a code, the IGCC, which is for nonresidential ...*" it says "documents." The word was "development."

And also on page 12, in the middle of the page, the second paragraph, where I'm speaking: "... *particularly, it was concern ...*" Well, it's actually a spelling error, but it's OK. No, it's fine. Ignore that comment.

And last, but not least, was on page 34, about a third of the way down: "*The Affordable Housing Committee will be more of a presentation 'for' feet back, rather than 'of' feet back.*"

Boardmember Alligood: I have a couple of minor ones. On page 31, where I'm speaking, second to last paragraph at the end of the paragraph, just change ... it says ... the last sentence is: "*So I thought that was ...*" Add the word "good," period.

And then on the next page, 32, third paragraph down, where I'm speaking, second line: "*Getting information out to the community ...*" just take out "*because they're encountering.*" Put 'to the community to encourage participation in' *some of these big questions we're grappling with.*"

Chairperson Speranza: Got it.

Chairperson Speranza: And that was it for me.

I just had one. It's on page 7. There's reference to a motion, the motion made by Boardmember Wertz. It references the site plan approval. That first motion was actually to accept a negative declaration on the Environmental Review Act process for the Sprint/Nextel application. The way that it reads now, it's as if we approved site plan twice and took no action on the environmental.

So I just want it clear that we did, in fact, issue the negative declaration on that application.

On MOTION of Boardmember Dale, SECONDED by Boardmember Alligood with a voice vote of all in favor, the Minutes of the Meeting of July 15, 2010 were approved as amended.

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS

New Business

- 1. Amendment to site plan for 45 Main Street. Request by Daniel and Segal Fanning to convert a studio apartment into a one bedroom apartment.**

Chairperson Speranza: The next order of business is the amendment to a site plan for 45 Main Street. This is requested by Daniel and Segal Fanning. It's the conversion of a studio apartment into a one-bedroom apartment.

Katherine Zalantis, Silverberg Zalantis LLP: We represent the applicants, Mr. and Mrs. Fanning. And with me tonight is Mr. Fanning also.

We submitted a letter to this board outlining our position.

Ms. Zalantis: And I won't go through it in detail. I just wanted to highlight that really the reason we're here is because the site plan listed out all the units in the building. We're not seeking to make any exterior changes. The construction's solely

interior. The parking requirement is the same for both a one-bedroom and a studio. There's really no impact on the site whatsoever.

Those people most arguably impacted by this modification -- the condominium unit owners, as represented by the condo board -- have consented to this, subject of course to municipal approval. And that letter is attached to our submission as Exhibit A.

So we just request that this be granted so that the apartment could be retrofitted to this family's needs, and we would like to get that approval as soon as possible, if possible.

Chairperson Speranza: OK, thank you. Mr. Fanning, is there anything you want to add?

Questions, comments?

Boardmember Dale: I had one question. I have no problem with the amendment. Clearly the plan shows that it can easily accommodate the bedroom and has adequate light in the window. My only question is why they bought the apartment in the first place if they have two children. It just seemed to me strange.

Ms. Zalantis: I think maybe the children ... did the children come after? I don't know.

Daniel Fanning, applicant - 45 Main Street : We were told that we could erect a partition of the [off-mic]. We didn't check it out.

Ms. Zalantis: It's an oversize studio. It's 830 square feet. I mean, that's more typical square footage of what you would see for a one-bedroom or even two-bedroom. So they were under the impression initially that they could do this.

Chairperson Speranza: Just so people are aware -- and I know it may seem, you know, why are we, the Planning Board, concerned about what's going to happen inside this apartment, inside this apartment building. One of the reasons for our taking action on a change to the site plan has to do with the fact that when the bedroom and apartment mix was included in the site plan it was very specific for -- as you've mentioned -- the number of parking spaces that were required on-site, as well as a concern with respect to other impacts such as the number of children that might be accommodated in the apartment.

So that's why, especially for this particular development, the site plan approval did in fact include the number of units and the mix of units. So that was just some background as to why.

Boardmember Cameron: Would it also have affected how many units they had, the other development on Warburton?

Chairperson Speranza: It could if it was tied to that.

Boardmember Cameron: Sorry, I'm just curious.

Chairperson Speranza: Yes, but it wasn't tied to that one-to-one. As we know, there are more units down at 422 Warburton that would have been required in this.

Boardmember Dale: There was four required, and they provided 14...

Chairperson Speranza: Fourteen, yes.

Boardmember Alligood: I have one question and one comment. The question is the impact on taxes; the difference between it being a studio and a one-bedroom. And I don't know if anybody in this room knows the answer, but that is of relevance to us as a municipality.

And then the other comment is, I find it deeply troubling that the Realtor would sell this unit as potentially a one-bedroom. I find that a very slippery slope for us as a planning board. Because as Patty said, there are a lot of considerations that go into our approvals for the number of units, the kinds of units. And, most importantly, we talked about impacts and Patty mentioned it, but the impact on the school system is huge.

We have an enormous tax burden, and when we consider new developments we look very carefully at the impact on the school system because that is a large cost to our costs as a municipality. So I find it ... I have to say, I looked at and immediately found it very troubling that a developer would consciously oversize a studio and then market it as something that they encourage a buyer to convert to a one-bedroom because of the impact.

As you can imagine, one case may not seem like a big impact. But certainly, if this becomes a precedent and the next developer does this more consciously -- I'm not saying this was done consciously. But the fact that a Realtor actually marketed it that way was is troubling to me, and evidence that there's some thought behind it. But it certainly opens a door, and legal precedent for other developers to claim that they should allow they buyers to convert in the future.

So I find this ... this is a problematic one. Certainly, on an individual basis, I have sympathy and don't want to cause hardship. But at the same time, it was sold as a studio and there were a lot of considerations that went into the approval of that project. And it was actually quite a controversial project. You know, to say there's no impact by converting from a studio to a one-bedroom is actually not the case.

Boardmember Cameron: It's about a \$52,000 cost to the schools.

Ms. Zalantis: If I could just respond to those two comments, first, I would say with respect to the assessment, I'm sure, like any other building permit, once the building permit is pulled the assessor is going to get notice of it and the taxes will be increased accordingly.

Boardmember Alligood: I'm not sure because it's a condo. So it's not the same as taxes that get changed when you make renovations to a single-family home. So I know it's more complicated with a condo, and I actually don't know.

Boardmember Dale: Each condominium unit is assessed separately.

Ms. Zalantis: Right.

Boardmember Dale: It's not assessed as a building, therefore. It's a condominium, each unit is separate.

Boardmember Alligood: And the taxes are based on the unit size?

Boardmember Dale: On the value of the unit.

Building Inspector Sharma: By the way, when they apply for the building permit to make the modifications a copy of permit documents, the modification, goes to the assessor.

Boardmember Alligood: Right. But I also know ... I know that the taxes on condos are lower than single-family homes.

Building Inspector Sharma: That is true.

Boardmember Alligood: So we're already behind in terms of recouping our costs as a village to the development in terms of impact on the school system. So that is something that I consider ...

Ms. Zalantis: And just to respond, the current situation is that the children are residing with their parents. So there's really no change to that. In terms of future applications, this board could consider imposing some kind of restriction that if it's a studio it cannot be converted, or it could only be sold with some kind of occupancy restriction.

But that's how this board could handle future applications so we don't end up in a situation like this, where I believe the developer purposely oversized the apartment. And in the case of my clients, who didn't know any better, they were told that they could use it. And they bought it with the family.

You made me realize again that I asked that same question in the interview when the clients came in and the children were already there. It's not like they moved into it and then there were children. Everybody knew that they were children involved.

Boardmember Alligood: Well clearly, the Realtor's interest is selling the unit to whoever they can. So that's just their job and that's what they do.

Boardmember Cameron: I guess, looking at this building, my question would be whether any of the existing two-bedrooms can be converted to three-bedrooms; whether we're going to see a string of those come rolling in the door.

Boardmember Alligood: Or one-bedrooms to two-bedrooms. That's exactly what I thought.

Mr. Fanning: According to the site plan it's not possible, being a very unique situation of we're the same as a one-bedroom. And if you can convert it from a one-to two-, or from two- to three-, the number of parking spaces [crosstalk]. So our situation is unique.

Ms. Zalantis: Right. And there's only one studio in the building.

Boardmember Cameron: Leave us with the name of the Realtor, please, when you leave?

Ms. Zalantis: So Mr. Fanning makes a good point: this is unique, there's only one studio, and the parking requirement for the one-bedroom and the studio are the same. You're not going to have the same impacts if you're talking about a two- and a three-.

Boardmember Alligood: It still doesn't address the problem pressing in our deliberation.

Chairperson Speranza: That's true.

Ms. Zalantis: Well, I think it could be addressed in future applications with a condition to the site plan approval. You know, so a situation like this doesn't happen again.

Building Inspector Sharma: The Building Department, my office, we have also been remiss in a studio apartment, efficiency apartment. No more than three people are permitted, and we overlooked that in the apartment. Obviously they did not do any checking, did not check with us; and obviously, for all this time, four people -- Mr. and Mrs. Fanning and two children.

From our standpoint, in hindsight, they've been living in there in violation of what the code requires. In a studio apartment there can't be more than three people living.

Boardmember Alligood: But it wouldn't have come to your attention until somebody wanted to make a change.

Building Inspector Sharma: That is true.

Boardmember Alligood: So it's really an ethical violation on the part of the Realtor and the developer who might have actually really thought about making a studio that was large enough that it could be converted.

Building Inspector Sharma: And also it adds to the value of the unit, from a studio to a one-bedroom.

Boardmember Alligood: Yes, of course.

Building Inspector Sharma: So the developer, the seller, the brokers, they are all involved.

Boardmember Alligood: Given the controversy of this project, I find it deeply troubling that this owner is now in this situation. I'm not blaming the owner and I feel for your case, but it really is troubling to me. It cannot have been just a simple oversight.

Ms. Zalantis: Well, this would actually bring it in compliance with the occupancy requirement that the Building Department raises. So we'd be addressing that issue also.

Chairperson Speranza: OK. I, too, was glad to know that this was the only studio apartment. I was also glad in realizing that there was only one parking space required. Again I, too, am sympathetic to the owner.

Maybe it's something that we do during our downtime is review, take a look at, the site plan. I know the building is not full, which is something else. And that's probably a good thing in this case because the issue of the density and the overall occupancy is something that's not troubling in this circumstance.

Boardmember Dale: There have been additional rentals since the recession began. And I gather there are two possible rentals on the commercial spaces.

Chairperson Speranza: Right.

Boardmember Alligood: This is not a permanent situation. Eventually that entire building will be filled. There's no doubt about that. So whether it hits us now or later, it will.

Chairperson Speranza: As a board we just have to do due diligence. And I think we can certainly let the record show that should there be an approval action here that this is not reflective of our sense of future conversions, but additions, to the bedrooms in the building. This is a unique circumstance.

Boardmember Cameron: I guess I have a question. Since we've evidently learned that this studio is the same size as a one-bedroom, why did the builder submit it as a studio apartment? I wasn't around at that time. Did he get away with something because he's called it a studio, but now where it should be changed to a one-bedroom.

Chairperson Speranza: I can't imagine what it would be. I mean, it's not parking.

Boardmember Logan: I think the market conditions are changing. And if we look to what happened on 9-A, we had a project that was going to be live/work lofts. And it had much more space than you'd expect from a normal studio, but with a workspace included.

So I think if we're concerned retroactively about conversions of large studios to one-bedrooms or two-bedrooms that we should think about this going forward with those sorts of approvals as we review those. But I think it's speculation about the developer's intentions at this stage. And market conditions have changed, and at one point large studio/loft-style living was in demand.

So I think we have to draw the line about what we can determine fact-based as opposed to what developer's intentions might have been. I think this whole 45 Main-442 Warburton, the Village has come out ahead in this regard. We have affordable units, which we have tried for years and years to get. So there is a net benefit, I think, to the development. So this is not an all-bad situation. I think we have to consider this case in isolation, but look at the implications going forward.

Chairperson Speranza: Very well said.

Boardmember Dale: The other issue this raises is, when you put on special conditions the ability to enforce them is a real issue. So if you can't build in enforcement, then putting on special conditions is just not really ... it makes you feel better, but you're not accomplishing necessarily your goal.

Boardmember Alligood: What tends to happen is, in this situation we have sympathy for the owners. And so it's very hard to punish the owners, but it puts us in an awkward situation.

Boardmember Dale: Yes. Our only enforcement ability is to say no.

Boardmember Alligood: Right. We couldn't have anticipated that the Realtor would be marketing it as essentially a one-bedroom.

Chairperson Speranza: Sell the unit, that's the goal.

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

Mr. Fanning: May I make one more point? There are presently 11 children in the building.

Chairperson Speranza: OK, thank you.

Are we ready for an action on the proposed amendment to the site plan for 45 Main Street?

Boardmember Alligood: I'm still thinking. I'm glad you said that the Realtor sold it to you as potentially a one-bedroom. Because that makes me feel OK with saying that I don't want you to be punished for that. I am deeply troubled that they did that, but I think you weren't aware of the situation you were being put in.

So I will approve it so that it doesn't cause you the hardship, but I think we need to make sure this doesn't happen again.

Boardmember Cameron: But you should tell the Building Inspector.

Mr. Fanning: Yes, I certainly will, sir.

On MOTION of Boardmember Logan, SECONDED by Boardmember Dale with a voice vote of all in favor, the Board resolved to approve the amendment for the site plan at 45 Main Street -- negative declaration, view preservation, site plan approval.

Ms. Zalantis: Thank you.

Building Inspector Sharma: Congratulations.

Chairperson Speranza: Enjoy. How long have you been in Hastings now? I'm just curious.

Mr. Fanning: Almost two years now.

Chairperson Speranza: OK, thank you.

2. Site Plan and View Preservation for Robert and Elizabeth Brady at 603 Warburton Avenue.

Chairperson Speranza: OK. Next item on the agenda is the site plan and view preservation for Robert and Elizabeth Brady, 603 Warburton Avenue. I will say from the start, with respect to this application, there was a bit of confusion as far as the steps in the process. The Zoning Board of Appeals has actually already acted on the view preservation application.

Building Inspector Sharma: Contingent upon favorable action by the Planning Board.

Chairperson Speranza: But it has to come to us for site plan approval as well, since it's in the central commercial district.

Hello, Christina.

Christina Griffin, architect: We're here for two reasons. One is to review for a view preservation for a deck extension on the first-floor level. There's a platform coming out the back, and we're extending the size of it. What you see in yellow is the extension. They are also adding, up on the second-floor level, a two-foot extension to that deck. We received a zoning variance because we don't have the correct setback to that, by a few feet.

This deck is the outdoor space for this new unit. This is being totally renovated to be the primary home of the owners, and it's going to be a handicapped-accessible two-bedroom dwelling. This is their outdoor space, and this little spiral gives them access to the garden. That spiral comes down on the new deck extension and allows them to go down to the garden. Just so you know, the first-floor level is commercial space.

Now, even though I have photographs of neighboring properties it was very hard to see if this would have any impact on the view. This is the back of the building right now. We're in the process of renovating the second floor. This is the platform that is in terrible shape that we're planning to rebuild and extend, and we're extending it to the right just so that we can pick up that spiral. Then there's a roof terrace right now that's going to be renovated and extended two feet deeper. It's really just to make it a more usable space, going from something like seven feet to nine feet.

This is the house next door, and to the right of that is a driveway. And that's the driveway that comes down from Warburton Avenue to Overseas Auto Body. This is the garage of Overseas Auto Body directly across from their site, which is right here.

Now, the second reason why we're here is for a new driveway, a new parking space. They have an easement to allow them access down that driveway and through the neighbor's property onto theirs. So they'd like to put a small parking space there. That way, they will have a place to put their car. Right now, they can only park on the street.

Of course, they have to coordinate how they do that with the neighbors, but that way they can manage to get a car in the back. They will come out through this little patio space, up on to the new platform, and up the spiral. The spiral is just a secondary way. They can actually come into the house, there's actually now going to be an elevator to allow them to go up to the second floor.

Just to give you a little more information, this is the front of the building. This is actually right next to the gas station. This is a law office down here, and this is the entrance to the new apartment. It will have bedroom spaces in the front, and in the back we have glass doors out to our new deck with the spiral stair to the bottom platform. We received Architectural Review Board approval some time in, I think, June.

Boardmember Alligood: What is it now upstairs? It's an apartment now?

Ms. Griffin: Yes, there was an old apartment there. We reorganized it so that we can put the living area in the back and master bedroom in the front. I'll show you the floor plan. You enter the door, and you go either up the stair or up the elevator. There'll be a master bedroom, guest bedroom. The kitchen is in the same location it was. Same with the bath. And this will be now a big living room. We took out a partition so it's an open space.

Boardmember Cameron: So if they take the elevator they have to go down the driveway to get to their car.

Ms. Griffin: I think the space for the car is a place where they can put the car. They can drop someone off and come up through the elevator. This is the main entrance.

Boardmember Cameron: The back staircase is more like a fire escape so you have two exits from the building?

Ms. Griffin: In a residential unit you need two ways out; the window and the front door. The spiral will not satisfy code for egress. It's not necessary to have this. It's just a convenience for them so they can come down to the yard rather than going all the way down the driveway.

Boardmember Dale: Parking in the rear will be without a garage?

Ms. Griffin: Open.

Boardmember Dale: Oh, it'll be an open-parking?

Ms. Griffin: Yes. This was a rental unit before the renovation, and the backyard wasn't really maintained too much. You know, it was just a yard, an open yard. And we just want to develop that so that it's a very attractive space, with fencing/patio.

Boardmember Dale: No, I was quite surprised when I was there to see that you're surrounded by cars. There's a parking garage, the gas station is on your right, and the mechanical work being done on cars on your neighbor on the other side.

Ms. Griffin: Well, we want to screen all that.

Boardmember Dale: Because the door was open, and there were clearly several cars inside, as well.

Boardmember Cameron: You're going to put a fence on to retain it.

Ms. Griffin: Yes. This is a low retaining wall just to make the transition from grade to the parking spot. Right now it's a slope of about two feet from one end to the other.

Chairperson Speranza: OK. Anything else you would like to say? Or Mr. and Mrs. Brady, I don't know if there's anything you want to add. No? OK.

This is a public hearing, so I do want to find out if there's anybody here from the public who wishes to speak on the application. No? OK.

Boardmembers? Questions, comments? We have a couple of actions to take on this, if there are any other questions or comments.

Boardmember Alligood: It's a lovely project. I love the building, I love that it's being renovated. I hope the owners don't mind all the cars and the noise and the repairs that go on at all times. But it's a nice example of revitalizing a residence in the middle of our downtown.

Chairperson Speranza: Living above the store.

Boardmember Alligood: Which is a nice thing for Hastings.

Boardmember Dale: I agree, it's definitely an improvement over the current situation. And having another car back there will make very little difference in terms of the environment. Repairing the garden to be a garden I think would be a major contribution to that location.

And I think you're right about there being no interference in terms of view preservation of any of the buildings in any of the area surrounding it. So I have no objections. I think it improves the situation.

Chairperson Speranza: Anything else? We have an environmental action to take, too, because it is site plan approval. The Short Environmental Assessment was completed. And what I've seen, and what I've heard about the project, I agree that there would not be any significant impacts on the environment due to this project.

So why don't we take that as the first action, then, the issuance of a negative declaration on the site plan and view preservation for the premises at 603 Warburton Avenue.

On MOTION of Boardmember Dale, SECONDED by Boardmember Cameron with a voice vote of all in favor, the Board resolved the issuance of a negative declaration on the site plan and view preservation for the premises at 603 Warburton Avenue.

Chairperson Speranza: OK, SEQRA's done.

The second action is to, I'll say retroactively, issue our recommendation to the Zoning Board of Appeals with respect to view preservation. And we send our recommendation that the application be approved.

On MOTION of Boardmember Dale, SECONDED by Boardmember Alligood with a voice vote of all in favor, the Board resolved the issue recommendation to the Zoning Board of Appeals with respect to view preservation, and send recommendation that the application be approved.

Chairperson Speranza: And third is site plan approval for the premises at 603 Warburton Avenue.

On MOTION of Boardmember Dale, SECONDED by Boardmember Logan with a voice vote of all in favor, the Board resolved the site plan approval for the premises at 603 Warburton Avenue.

Chairperson Speranza: OK, great. Thank you. Enjoy.

3. **Accessory apartment permit renewal for Leah Rossner - 115 Pinecrest Parkway - Sheet 6/Block 791/Lot 6 & 7 Waiver required for parking.**

Chairperson Speranza: OK, next order of business is an accessory apartment renewal for the premises at 115 Pinecrest Parkway, Leah Rossner. There is a waiver requested for off-street parking.

The accessory apartment application on this premise has been before us. I'm looking at the report from the Building Inspector. There is no apparent change from the conditions that existed previously at the time of previous renewal three years ago.

Is there anyone here who wishes to speak on the application? No? Boardmembers, comments, questions about it? No? Then can I have a resolution to approve the accessory apartment for 115 Pinecrest Parkway, including a variance for off-street parking?

On MOTION of Boardmember Cameron, SECONDED by Boardmember Alligood with a voice vote of all in favor, the Board resolved to approve accessory apartment for 115 Pinecrest Parkway, including a variance for off-street parking.

4. Request for extension of re-subdivision approval for David Steinmetz - 663-665 North Broadway.

Chairperson Speranza: Blue River Valley, LLC. These are premises at 663-665 Broadway. If you recall, a couple of months ago the applicant came to us requesting the extension of the re-subdivision approval. They had not, at that time, been able to secure the building permit. We granted that extension.

They are back before us now. Deven, they're working diligently to submit their papers to receive their building permit?

Building Inspector Sharma: I've had a few meetings with the architects. They're getting ready to submit plans for the building permit. But I guess they have to file re-subdivision papers before I'll be able to issue the building permit.

Chairperson Speranza: Right, the extension. Yes, they have to get an extension: "*You recall that your board granted resubdivision lot merger approval by resolution dated December 17, 2009.*" We granted the extension May 20, 2010. The applicant's architects are working to finalize plans, but they will request a second extension of the approval. So they would like a second 90-day extension.

If anyone has any questions or comments, we'll hear them now. If not, I'll have a motion for the extension of the re-subdivision approval.

On MOTION of Boardmember Cameron, SECONDED by Boardmember Logan with a voice vote of all in favor, the Board resolved the extension of the re-subdivision approval.

Building Inspector Sharma: And the extension's for how long?

Chairperson Speranza: Ninety days.

IV. DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Boardmember Logan Replacement

Chairperson Speranza: We have one order of business that is not on the agenda.

Building Inspector Sharma: I didn't know about it.

Chairperson Speranza: I know. Bill Logan is going to be leaving our board. You're the last person who left here since when I joined the Board. Clearly, we thank you for your years of service. It's almost 20 years?

Boardmember Logan: It's actually 17 years, and I did a year or two on the Architectural Review Board before that.

But I spoke to Sue Maggiotto in the spring, and I wasn't sure how long I'd been on the Board. She said actually this year would be the end of my five-year term, and I'm aware that the Board of Trustees was encouraging maximum two terms. I'm finishing up my third five-year term, and I finished a two-year term that someone had to leave. I'm not sure who it was, but Louise Leaf was the chair at that point.

So it's been 17 years, and I think it's time for some other voices to be heard. But I do want to thank at least four Village Boards for nominating me, or approving me, for this position. And three mayors and at least four chairs of the Planning Board for working with me. It's been an honor and a privilege to serve.

Building Inspector Sharma: How many Building Inspectors have come and gone?

Chairperson Speranza: That's more.

Boardmember Logan: Ahh, I should have thought of that. Probably at least three, possibly four. But it's a great village, and I see new signs of life happening here, especially along Main Street. The new Village Community Center seems to be a thriving point, and the Rainwater Grill is thriving -- I walked past it today. And the

Village faces many challenges, especially the waterfront, going forward. But also my pet peeve is the lighting issues.

Boardmember Cameron: We'll name it after you.

Chairperson Speranza: Oh, that's good: Logan Lighting.

Building Inspector Sharma: You can volunteer to do some work in my office.

Boardmember Logan: I would be happy to help out in issues relating to that. And it is a challenge. I think it's a constant challenge before the Village, and it's not always from the outside. Sometimes it's internally -- misguided efforts to over-light spaces. I think we have great lighting downtown, but I think we have to be diligent about light trespass and glare and other issues that affect basically the scale and character of the community. That's really the bottom line.

So I thank everybody.

Chairperson Speranza: Yes, we'll miss you. You're staying in the Village, though?

Boardmember Logan: Yes, I'm going to be in the Village.

Chairperson Speranza: Because I can't imagine walking along Broadway and not seeing one of your creations.

Boardmember Logan: I will hopefully be here for awhile.

Chairperson Speranza: Good, excellent. And you got work to do on the Aqueduct, too. Well, thank you again very much.

So out with the old, in with the new. Kathleen, why don't you come up. The Board of Trustees appointed, on Tuesday night, Kathleen Sullivan to replace Bill Logan. "Replace" is a harsh word. You know what we're talking about. Kathleen, we're really glad to have you here.

Boardmember Logan: Yes, why don't you come up and take a seat, and I'll move over.

Boardmember Sullivan: No, no. This is fine for now.

Chairperson Speranza: We welcome you, we can't wait. September, you're here.

For those who may not know, watching at home ... although if you're watching at home and you watch the government channel, you've seen Kathleen a lot because of her efforts on the Comprehensive Plan. So I think it's just terrific that you're going to

be here, that you're going to be on the Board, and that you will now be in a position to be able to really implement and hold our feet to the fire on the concepts that have been developed in the Comprehensive Plan.

So September, you'll start working.

Boardmember Sullivan: Well, I look forward to it very much. And I'm not replacing Bill. Hopefully I can succeed him in a fine fashion. Thank you for all your years of service. And I hope my few years on the Comprehensive Plan ... it sounds like after awhile you just start snowballing into service. But I am very grateful for the chance to work with you folks, and look forward to September.

Chairperson Speranza: Great. Thank you.

Building Inspector Sharma: I don't know, for some reason I'm partial to architects. They tend to use both sides of their brains.

Boardmember Cameron: It's sort of a backwards way to get the chairman of the Comprehensive Plan to be a member of the Planning Board.

Chairperson Speranza: There you go.

2. Miscellaneous

Chairperson Speranza: OK, any other business? Any other comments that Boardmembers have? Greening our code is in the hands of a great subcommittee. I don't know if anybody has heard anything recently between the summer vacations and just being outside and enjoying things. I'm sure that will all pick up again in the fall.

Boardmember Alligood: And in the fall there will also be a second part to the Comprehensive Plan with the Board of Trustees.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Chairperson Speranza: All right. Well, everybody enjoy the rest of the summer. See you September 16.

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